

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 October 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

UNMARKED POLICE VEHICLES

In reply to **Mr FERGUSON** (20 September).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Unmarked traffic patrol cars have been operating in South Australia on a limited basis for a number of years. It would be extremely difficult to say, however, if the use of these cars has had any influence in reducing the number of accidents or the road toll.

Traffic police at three metropolitan regions are each equipped with an unmarked Ford pursuit car. These vehicles are deployed at locations where irresponsible driver behaviour is difficult to detect by normal patrol methods. They are also used in selective enforcement campaigns, e.g., drink/driving campaigns, visits to country centres and special traffic operations conducted during holiday weekends. Additional unmarked cars are drawn from the general fleet, as required. As a general rule, unmarked cars are manned by uniformed personnel and only in special circumstances justifying such action are plainclothed crews used.

I can appreciate that there may be a considerable body of opinion that unmarked vehicles have a deterrent value in reducing the road toll. There is no scientific basis, to my knowledge, for such a view, however, and for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the increased risk to both police personnel and other road users when unmarked cars come into high speed pursuit situations, I am inclined to the view that a visible police presence is a preferable option at this stage.

POLICE FORCE

In reply to **Mr EVANS** (1 September).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Regulation 14 of the regulations under the Police Regulation Act stipulates that a 'person shall not be eligible for appointment as a member of the Force unless that person conforms with the physical standards specified in writing by the Commissioner pursuant to general orders. Provided that where a person is to be recruited for a specific task the Commissioner may dispense with such standards.'

The physical standards specified by General Order 2700.6 are:

Male—Minimum height 175 cm

Female—Minimum height 163 cm

(Weight requirements are proportionate to height.)

Regulation 13 further provides that 'a person shall not be eligible for appointment as a member of the Force unless that person is an Australian citizen or British subject . . .' These physical standards are waived from time to time in order to recruit persons possessing specific skills and/or qualifications which are considered to be of special and significant benefit to the Department.

The South Australian Police Force, in common with other Australian police forces, is constantly mindful of the need

to address the issues associated with minority group representation and liaison. There exists, for example, a Police Ethnic Liaison Committee, on which there currently serves two Indo-Chinese representatives. This committee maintains a close liaison with the Indo-Chinese Refugee Association. Significant progress has been made in creating open lines of communication between police and the ethnic community. It is recognised, however, that a number of cultural barriers need to be overcome before the police service can be seen as an attractive employment option for some, particularly those of Vietnamese origin. In saying that, it is significant to add that no Vietnamese nationals have, to the present, shown interest in joining the force.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In reply to **Mrs APPLEBY** (1 September).

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: Police personnel receive training and education in relation to domestic violence in varying degrees. The following is a summary:

Cadet Training

Police cadets undertake a modular programme. The Community Service and Crisis Intervention Module is designed to provide trainees with an awareness of the concept of police provision of service to the community, particularly in times of crisis, as distinct from the authoritative role generally associated with police; and inculcate acceptance of the awareness and need to act as sensitive non-judgmental professionals.

Within this module are two directives that specifically relate to domestic and/or family violence, e.g., the—

1. Domestic dispute directive aimed to develop an awareness of the nature of domestic disputes, and the laws, procedures and techniques which may be adopted during police intervention, and the role of appropriate social agencies in conflict resolution.
2. Crisis intervention directive aimed to provide an understanding of the principles of crisis intervention and the nature of social problems in the community.

The psychology module covers the understanding of the psychological principles involved in operationally encountered interpersonal and crisis intervention situations. This includes domestic violence. The legal and evidentiary requirements are also covered during modules related to those subjects.

All of these subjects are presented by direct lectures, discussion sessions, utilisation of training films and videos, panel discussions and practical workshops. Visiting lecturers and panel members come from the Crisis Care, Women's Shelter, Central Mission, Victims of Crime Service, Adult Probation Service organisations, and the Police Psychology Unit. Trainees are required to demonstrate their understanding of all aspects of the domestic violence issue during operational safety and practical workshops, which are video recorded for assessment, counselling and further discussion. In a hand-out study precis called *Basic Psychology for Police Officers*, the subject is covered in a chapter entitled 'Domestic Disputes'.

Vocational Training

Refresher Courses for personnel in their 3rd and 7th year of service have lectures and discussions on the topic of disputes. This includes domestic disputes and briefly covers legal, operational and psychological issues. Section 99 of the Justices Act (Restraint Orders) is covered. That particular subject is also covered in depth for personnel participating in the Prosecutors Course. It is proposed to extend the course for personnel training for the role of patrol officers to three weeks duration. A specific module covering crisis intervention will include material on domestic disputes.

Police personnel attending Sergeant Seminars, or non-commissioned officer courses for personnel approaching the seageant rank are provided with a detailed precis on Crisis Intervention as pre-reading course material. This precis includes the subject, domestic disputes. The subject can then be raised during elective periods, when required by course participants. Regional Training Officers responsible for training within their particular localised regional area provide information on domestic or family violence/disputes during training days or roll call (commencement parade) segments on a perceived needs basis. Based on need it is a matter of policy to include the subject of domestic violence with associated issues, in police training and education programmes. Statistics on the frequency of requests for police to attend incidents involving domestic violence are not kept.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

In reply to **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (4 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Requirements for management of radioactive wastes arising from the mining and milling of radioactive ores are covered in two codes of practice published under the Environment Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act, 1978. They are the Radiation Protection (Mining and Milling) Code (1980) and the Radioactive Waste Management (Mining and Milling) Code (1982).

Maximum permissible exposures to radiation are laid down in the Radiation Protection Code, while the Radioactive Waste Management Code is principally concerned with the administrative arrangements for ensuring that wastes will be properly managed. Many of the requirements are designed for the case of new mining or milling operations (e.g., approval must be obtained before operations begin) and are therefore not appropriate to the case at Port Pirie. However, the central aim of both Codes, that is, that radiation doses should be as low as reasonably achievable, is being pursued. Although monitoring results indicate that radiation doses to Port Pirie residents resulting from the uranium tailings dams were already well below the limits of the Radiation Protection Code, it was decided that a further reduction should be made by covering the dams with a 1 m thick layer of slag from the B.H.A.S. smelters.

This work is in hand, and along the southern side of the dams a 1.7 m high mound of slag, capped with sandy loam has been laid. A drip irrigation system has been installed and approximately 350 trees and shrubs are being planted, including species of eucalyptus, melaleuca, acacia and casuarina. As well as improving aesthetics, these trees will serve as a trial planting should further revegetation be required. Work is now proceeding to cover the approximately 10-hectare area of the dams which contain tailings. The remaining 12 hectares will be retained as a water catchment and evaporation area to prevent rainfall runoff from escaping from the site. At the present rate of delivery of slag from B.H.A.S., it is expected that three years will be required to cover the required area to a depth of 1 m.

On Wednesday 29 June 1983 the Minister of Health visited the site, and discussed work in progress with officers of the Department of Mines and Energy (the Chief Inspector of Mines, and the Mines Division Horticulturist), and discussed the radiation hazards and associated monitoring of the site with a Scientific Officer from the Radiation Control Section of the S.A. Health Commission.

HOSPITALITY COURSE

In reply to **Ms LENEHAN** (11 August).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In her question the honourable member states that the Department of TAFE has

decided not to offer hospitality courses in the area of food and catering at the Noarlunga College. The facts are:

(1) It had been hoped that major alterations could have been made to the buildings at the Noarlunga College to provide specialist facilities for the teaching of hospitality subjects. It was never intended that all the subjects taught at Regency Park would be taught there—for instance commercial cookery was not contemplated for Noarlunga.

(2) The cost of the proposed alterations and equipment was approaching \$100 000. In the budget context the decision has had to be made that this sum cannot be afforded for this purpose.

(3) Non-provision of specialist facilities does not necessarily prevent courses being run at a more basic level. Indeed, successful courses have been run from colleges with no specialist facilities, such as at Mount Gambier and Ceduna. Industrial premises have been used where needed.

(4) Investigations are currently taking place to see how courses at the more elementary level in hospitality can be run at Noarlunga. The college is keen that this occur, and will hold discussions with head office staff when their proposals are fully formulated.

(5) Provision of training at advanced levels for the food and catering industry is a very expensive business in terms of both capital and recurrent costs. In the foreseeable future it seems unlikely that such training can be provided at Noarlunga.

AEROSOL SNIFFING

In reply to **Hon. H. ALLISON** (25 August).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member suggested, as reported in *Hansard* on 25 August 1983, that my Department seek to acquire a film on aerosol sniffing, shown recently on channel 9, to use in schools as a deterrent to solvent abuse. Concern over solvent abuse, including the misuse of aerosols, is shared by my officers.

The use of such a film on a show like the *Mike Walsh Show* with a day-time viewing audience, predominantly adult, may well be helpful in raising parent awareness of common household substances likely to be abused. Both my officers, and officers of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, are however very cautious about the use of such films with children or the television audiences which contain many children, as has channel 9s *60 Minutes* screened at 7.30 p.m. on a Sunday. Unfortunately, publicity concerning the risks of solvent abuse is likely to challenge a significant number of children to experiment, to live dangerously, so that they can prove they are 'not children'. It is likely to be counter-productive for many.

This publicity needs to be directed more to adult audiences, to shopkeepers, and to manufacturers. I do not believe the channel 9 film would be helpful as a teaching aid but acknowledge that we must continue to examine appropriate measures to prevent aerosol abuse and thank the honourable member for his concern.

WALLABIES AND OPOSSUMS

In reply to **Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (13 September).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No on all counts. The commercialisation of a species would require a proclamation from the Governor to announce royalty payable to the Government, permits for all persons involved in taking, keeping and selling products of protected species, and the amendment of a sealed tag regulation to accommodate Tamar wallabies and brush-tailed possums. If the skins were to be sold overseas (which is the destination of most

furs) the State would have to produce a management plan and establish quotas before the Federal Government would issue export permits.

The question of whether it is wise to commercialise wallabies and possums, or to retain the *status quo*, must take into consideration the status of the species concerned, and the volume of trade expected or required to maintain an industry. The number of animals destroyed on permits for crop and pasture protection (10 000 wallabies, 2 000 possums) each year is not large enough to sustain a viable industry if the experiences of the kangaroo industry are a valid comparison. The Tammar wallaby is a threatened species even if it is locally over-abundant on Kangaroo Island. The species once ranged across mainland Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, but is now thought to be confined to small isolated colonies in Western Australia and the abundant population on Kangaroo Island. The current policy—namely the use of non-commercial destruction permits—is considered the correct one to follow for pastoral and crop problems with Tammar wallabies and brush-tailed possums on Kangaroo Island.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAS SUPPLIES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: This afternoon I met with Dr John McKee of Santos and Mr George Essery of Delhi, representing the Cooper Basin producers. They delivered letters which attest that a further 1 667 B.C.F. of gas is available to be added to the present production schedule which contains 2 177 B.C.F. This means that Schedule A of the A.G.L. agreement has been satisfied entirely, that is, to the year 2006, and that an amount equivalent to at least five years of PASA futures is also available.

Both the Government and the producers are confident of ultimately establishing reserves in excess of all PASA futures agreement requirements. Today's announcement is a landmark, finally laying to rest the myth that gas supply to South Australia would cease in 1987. The Government will be seeking increased effort in gas exploration and development from the producers to further enhance the security of South Australia's long-term gas supplies. Security of supply and price will be the key issues for discussion with the producers in ensuing negotiations. The Government's efforts to pursue gas sharing, the establishment of a petro-chemical plant and to deal with the question of the A.G.L./PASA price differential are continuing.

QUESTION TIME

RAILWAY STATION DEVELOPMENT

Mr OLSEN: Will the Government guarantee the loans to be provided for the Adelaide railway station redevelopment and, if not, how will the risk of investment in the project be carried? My office has received a number of inquiries about this matter and without the heads of agreement or other relevant information about the financing arrangements, it has not been possible to answer them fully.

A report in the *Advertiser* on 4 October stated that the Japanese company Kumagai would provide \$65 million in loans for the project, and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust would lend \$43.5 million. It also stated that the Kumagai loan would be repayable over a period of seven years, whereas the investment trust loan had a 40-year term. As the Premier has said repeatedly

since he signed the heads of agreement in Tokyo that the project will proceed, I assume he will be able to give the House details of the loan arrangements.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I told the Leader of the Opposition yesterday in reply to virtually the identical question, I am considering tabling the full details of the heads of agreement, or at least that part of it not subject to commercial or other contractual problems. I simply repeat that undertaking and hope to do so soon.

SECURITY ALARMS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Chief Secretary say what licensing provisions apply to local firms engaged in installing security and similar devices designed to protect homes, especially when they are unattended. I am not sure whether this matter falls within the province of the Chief Secretary, in his capacity as Minister in charge of police, or within that of the Attorney-General. If the latter is the case, I expect that the Minister will refer the question to his colleague. On 21 September I asked a question regarding entry to private property in relation to burglar alarms going off continuously. Resulting from that question, I received representations from a constituent in my district who owns a security firm. He asked me the question I have just put to the Minister. On an inspection of the establishment where these systems are designed and manufactured, I had discussions with management personnel who said that they believed that the registration of firms and/or persons involved in the industry was essential because of fly-by-nighters who installed systems that were unsatisfactory and even outdated (and such persons did not follow up with proper servicing and maintenance), and because some persons employed in the industry could have been a security risk by reason of their suspect character. It was put to me that some of those persons could have passed information on to housebreakers. About five years ago security people came round in my district selling security systems. They knocked on my door and a month later my place was broken into. Subsequently, I tried to ascertain the name of the firm and where it was located. I rang the telephone number but it did not answer. A month later, I spoke to a workmate in the railway industry who informed me of a similar situation in which security people had come around selling chains and eye-viewers for doors. I view with concern the fact that this practice could break out again; hence my question.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the honourable member suspects, the responsibility for licensing would be controlled by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I will certainly raise this matter with him. I believe that the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs licenses security agents, but that is not the same as licensing people installing burglar alarms. The possibility that people canvassing from door to door are linked with house breaking is certainly a matter of concern to the police. Any information that can be provided that would link such canvassers with break-ins would be valuable indeed.

I believe that the Department of Consumer Affairs is very concerned with the high pressure tactics sometimes used by canvassers of security systems. I understand there was a spate of complaints about 12 months ago, and there is a distinct possibility that the Door-to-Door Sales Act may have been breached on these occasions. But, it does appear that there is no direct regulation of firms installing alarms, apart from the requirement that, if installations of electric systems cost more than \$250, the persons undertaking installations are required to hold a restricted building licence. As I said earlier in my answer, this is a matter for the Attorney-General in his responsibility as Minister of Con-

sumer Affairs. I will ask that he has this matter investigated and I will bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

GAS PRICES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Premier a question relating to a Ministerial statement made by the Minister of Mines and Energy today. What discussions has the Premier or the Minister had with the New South Wales Premier or with others in relation to rationalising the gas prices paid at the well head in South Australia and in New South Wales? The Premier was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* on 18 September as saying that a satisfactory conclusion of the matter would be reached within a couple of weeks. He also said:

Now that we have a firm decision and know precisely what figures everyone is working to, we can get down to business. South Australian consumers should not be paying higher well head prices than New South Wales.

Those statements were made about a month ago. The two problems which have been facing this State have been supply and the price for that supply. I point out that the information given to the House today by the Minister does not line up with the information given to the House during the Committee stages when questioned on this matter. It does not line up with a reply I got yesterday to a Question on Notice in relation to available reserves.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: You got it this afternoon.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I got an answer back yesterday which does not go near—

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not require a conversation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: More than two weeks has elapsed since the Premier said the question would be settled. What progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It seems that the Deputy Leader can hardly hide his disappointment that there has been some—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Let the honourable member listen to what I have to say, that there has been some reasonable—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If ever I needed proof of what I was about to say it was just demonstrated from the other side of the House. What I am attempting to say is that the statement I gave the House indicates that there has been some reasonable progress in a matter which has dogged the people of this State for very many years and involved two previous Governments of the persuasion of which I am proud to be a member, and also the former Liberal Government. It has been a very difficult area. Now there is a sudden silence from the other side because they had three years in which to demonstrate some progress or achievement in this area. Let me not try to portray to the House or let the House get the wrong impression.

I am not saying that this question is totally solved to date. I am saying there has been some progress in a matter which needed to be solved; I am confident that further progress can be made, as I have indicated in the statement given to the House today. The honourable member was asking what discussions have been held relative to the price differential which currently applies to gas sold in New South Wales and gas sold in South Australia.

The first point that needs to be made there is that it was the very member who asked the question who signed us into the situation which he is now asking me to redress.

That needs to be kept in mind. As I have told the House on a previous occasion I believe the former Minister erred in committing us ahead so far when an arbitration hearing was in progress, the result of which he could not have any real knowledge since it was in progress at the time. Yet, he took the chance, and that is what it was, of signing up ahead of any advice that might have been obtained resulting from that arbitration for the State a three-year period for certain fixed incremental increases in gas prices.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You weren't there, so you wouldn't know. You were not part of the negotiations.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Sir, the Deputy Leader said that I was not there, and I would suggest that the result that I am complaining about demonstrates that I was not there, because I do not think I would have accepted that as being a satisfactory result for South Australia.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You have got nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: During the Estimates Committees we were given an example by the Deputy Leader of how he believes such negotiations need to be conducted: by abusing people by name. For example, insulting remarks were made about Mr Williams, of A.G.L., during the progress of the Committee. It is terribly helpful when trying to negotiate matters on a basis of that nature. The Deputy Leader well knows that that is not the way to go about these matters.

I have had indications from Mr Williams of A.G.L. that it is very happy to enter sharing negotiations, and these matters are inextricably linked: the question of price, the price paid, and the question of sharing. So, I indicate, in answer to the question, that the matter is being addressed, that the proper time for disclosure of what is proposed is when it is commenced, and that at that time the Deputy Leader can expect further information.

ARTIFICIAL SWEETENERS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health, ask that Minister to consider, as a matter of urgency, having his Department investigate the safety to the general public of the consumption of the artificial sweeteners, cyclamate and saccharin. Cyclamate and saccharin are being widely used in South Australia as artificial sweeteners. They are used, for example, as sweeteners in Diet Coke. Cyclamate was banned as a sweetener in the United States by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as of 11 September 1970. Cyclamate has been shown not to be safe. In an 'interim decision', the U.S. F.D.A. administrative law judge Daniel J. Davidson has concluded that Abbott Laboratories has failed to show that the artificial sweetener cyclamate is safe for use in food. Judge Davidson said that Abbott's petition for F.D.A. permission to remarket cyclamate as a food additive should be denied.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member's question.

Mr FERGUSON: In answer to the interjection, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to ignore interjections and to press on with the question.

Mr FERGUSON: Judge Daniel J. Davidson found that cyclamate has not been shown to be safe as required by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and that Abbott failed to show that cyclamate does not cause cancer in test animals. The decision following the hearing on which Judge Davidson based his findings was requested by Abbott after F.D.A. in October 1976, denied its petition to remarket cyclamate. F.D.A. banned cyclamate in 1970, based on evidence that the sweetener can cause cancer. The use of saccharin in the

United States has been severely limited by Congress and may be sold only as an over the counter package. All labels must contain in easily readable bold-face type the following warning:

Use of this product may be hazardous to your health. This product contains saccharin, which has been determined to cause cancer in laboratory animals.

Most so-called diet drinks in America are sweetened by an artificial sweetener called 'Aspartame' (marketed as 'Equal').

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Is this a situation where the pecuniary interests legislation begins to show its value, in that the honourable member, I understand, has disclosed that he has shares in the Colonial Sugar Refinery? Under those circumstances, he obviously has an interest in the question and, as such, I would think that, if the legislation is worth anything, it should be disclosed.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I have concluded my question, but in answer to the—

The SPEAKER: No! Before calling on the Minister, I must say that I was in fact out of order myself in calling on the honourable member for Henley Beach. The honourable Chief Secretary.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I should declare that I do not have any shares in C.S.R. I point out to the Deputy Leader that the Colonial Sugar Refinery as a company no longer exists and has not for many years; if he wants to check it out, it might be of benefit to him. The matter raised by the honourable member is one of importance, particularly at a time when diet foods are so very popular and the use of sweeteners is prevalent. I undertake that I will refer this matter to my colleague the Minister of Health in another place and have a report brought down for the honourable member.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Housing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I had hoped that there would be some semblance of order, but we are having fragmented conversations across the floor of the House while people are attempting to answer and ask questions. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Housing make available to the House the advice that he says he received from the Attorney-General's Department that it was not necessary to list his house under the declaration of pecuniary interests?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: I can understand the consternation on the other side. The original return filed by the Minister stated that he had no property interests. In the *Advertiser* of 5 October the Minister is quoted as saying that he had received advice from the Attorney-General's Department that it was not necessary to list his home. This conflicts with statements made by the Attorney-General when he introduced the legislation earlier this year, and subsequently the Minister has filed an amended return which lists not one, but two properties: his Elizabeth Park home and a vacant block of land at Edithburgh. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will table in the House the advice that he received from the Attorney-General's Department that it was not necessary to list his properties.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister, I make it clear to the House that, during the course of the question by the Leader of the Opposition, which was quite within

Standing Orders, I heard two interjections, one from each side of the House, each one of which implied a potential criminal offence on the part of another person. That will not be tolerated: I will not tolerate that, and I will take the appropriate action. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will not table the advice that I received.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It was a junior officer of the Attorney-General's Department who vetted my view. I made the point that it was in my opinion that a house that was under mortgage was owned by a bank. I still maintain that, because I represent a working-class district in which there are many people who think that they own their own homes. They become unemployed and cannot meet their financial commitments. They think that they will get some return, and the banking institutions and mortgage companies sell that home over their heads.

I maintained and I still maintain that one owns one's own home if there is no debt owing on it. I still maintain that that should be the case. I do not own my own home: the Westpac Banking Corporation owns my home. But after talking to the Attorney-General I did submit a supplementary return. In regard to the property at Edithburgh, about which, at the time I had submitted that supplementary return, I had not finalised the details, I point out that it is a very small property which cost me \$4 200 and which, again, is financed by the Westpac Banking Corporation. I am sure that the member for Goyder will be pleased to know that when I eventually retire from this House I shall be living in retirement in Edithburgh and enjoying the company of the people in that township. As for the Leader's request for me to table the information, no, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling for any further questions, I feel in duty bound to draw the attention of members to the provisions contained in section 6 (1) (a) and (b) and 6 (2) of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983. I lay full emphasis on subsection (2) and the consequences that follow from that subsection. Section 6 (1) states:

A person shall not publish whether in Parliament or outside Parliament—

(a) any information derived from the register or a statement prepared pursuant to section 5 unless that information constitutes a fair and accurate summary of the information contained in the register or statement and is published in the public interest;

or

(b) any comment on the facts set forth in the register or statement unless that comment is fair and published in the public interest and without malice.

Section 6 (2), on which I place particular emphasis, states:

Where a person publishes within Parliament any information or comment in contravention of subsection (1), the person shall be guilty of a contempt of Parliament.

I have now given two warnings; there will not be a third.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

Mr TRAINER: I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in another place, on the subject of the pecuniary interests register, and I wish to stress that I do so without any malice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: In view of the evident lack of standardisation of the information supplied by members of this House for the pecuniary interests register (a lack of standardisation based on an apparent confusion as to which

details are relevant and which are not), can the assistance of the Solicitor-General be sought to prepare a more precise and more detailed set of guidelines to assist members in submitting the required information? My explanation of the question will not be quite as brief as is often the case, but I believe the question merits that type of attention. I believe that I speak for members on both sides of the House when I say that members in general have approached this issue with all due seriousness and have in general submitted their returns with the best of intentions to comply with the requirements of the Act. However, the view has been expressed to me (and it is a view that I share) that the lack of precise detail in the guidelines as to what aspects of a member's financial matters fall within the intended ambit of this legislation has led to a wide variety of interpretations. At one end of that spectrum of interpretations some members have responded in rather general terms.

Others, taking a more conservative approach, have listed quite trivial matters that might well be superfluous but were included because of a concern at the possibility, however remote, that some legal interpretations might consider the information to be relevant. For example, although several members who are former teachers did not consider it necessary to do so, I elected to include in my personal return the fact that I am still registered as a teacher with the Teachers Registration Board. One other member did likewise, only after I mentioned to him in the course of a brief conversation in the corridor just before he was to submit his listing of interests that I considered there was a remote chance that being registered with the Teachers Registration Board might be considered a relevant matter. Similarly, I included my life insurance policy only after another member mentioned to me that he had included his policy in his return.

In terms of land ownerships (as required to be listed under item 6 of the return) some members, like me, merely made a cursory reference to the existence of the family home while other members went into a great deal of detail quoting certificate of title, volumes and folio numbers. One construction that could be placed under item (6) was that the family home need not be listed at all if it was covered by a debt such as a mortgage. There was obvious doubt on the part of some members as to whether income from Parliamentary salary and allowances, payments to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund, or membership of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association should be included, or whether these matters were so self-evident as to be irrelevant.

A particularly fertile area for varying interpretations to be applied involved organisations and other bodies to which Parliamentarians belong, whether as patrons, office bearers, or members, or with which we are associated in any other way such as by making donations. Indeed, it was even put to me that any Parliamentarian who is a subscriber to the *National Geographic* magazine could be required, by a strict interpretation of the Act's requirements, to list that matter in his or her pecuniary interests return, because a subscription makes one a member of the National Geographic Society. Incidentally, that is one item which I forgot to include in my return and which I now place on public record in case it is relevant.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which I am sure is one which is of interest to all members in the House. I understand that the Clerk has provided invaluable assistance to members on request in fulfilling this obligation placed upon them by the legislation. I will be pleased to refer this matter to my colleague in another place and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Before calling any other questions, I must say that I was approached informally with a view to indicating my view of section 6 (1) (a) as it relates to section 6 (2). I point out that each of the parts that make up 6 (1) (a), bear careful consideration to determine whether, first, there is a fair and accurate summary and, secondly, whether it is published in the public interest in the Parliament. It certainly does not preclude reference to an interest in a particular establishment but it is made very clear by the Parliament itself (not by me) that anything that is said within these four walls has to be considered carefully.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek a clarification of your ruling, Mr Speaker. You mentioned in an earlier statement to the House that you had issued two warnings; is that in respect of two interjections you referred to?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It did not relate to a question?

The SPEAKER: No.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr GUNN: Will the Premier completely dissociate his Government from the advertisement published in the latest issue of the A.L.P. newspaper the *Herald* which was signed by the member for Elizabeth, among others, calling on the Federal Government to stop the Roxby Downs project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: To the extent that that advertisement talks about stopping the Roxby Downs project, yes, I do dissociate my Government from it and restate, as I do almost daily, that the Government is committed and has been committed to honouring the indenture and the progress of that project. That is our policy, and that is how we are proceeding.

ANSTEY HILL CONSERVATION PARK

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether it is correct that control of the Anstey Hill Conservation Park is to be transferred from the Minister for Environment and Planning, through the State Planning Authority, to the Department of Recreation and Sport? I have been told by constituents that rumours are circulating, especially in the Houghton, Tea Tree Gully, and Vista areas, indicating that control of the Anstey Hill Conservation Park is to be transferred from the Department of Environment and Planning (as I said, through the State Planning Authority) to the Department of Recreation and Sport.

My constituents are concerned lest they lose a valuable conservation area and they are also concerned that indications have been given by officers of the Department of Environment and Planning and/or the State Planning Authority that, once control is transferred, a BMX track, a motor cycle scramble track, and other sporting facilities will be developed in this attractive open-space area. A constituent has also told me that, when she approached an officer of the Department of Environment and Planning, he told her that he had lost interest in the area because its control was soon to be transferred and that he could not care less what happened there. My constituents believe that the present designation of and use for the land is preferable, although they would like better fire protection facilities to be developed, especially better fire breaks and C.F.S. vehicle tracks. Is the information given my constituents correct regarding the transfer and, if it is, why has such a retrograde decision been made which will have a severe effect on the Anstey Hill area and nearby residents?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will get the specific information for the honourable member, but I take the opportunity of explaining the philosophy behind the general set of decisions of which this forms a subset. In the 1962 town plan, a hierarchy of open spaces was recommended for Greater Adelaide: regional parks, major district open spaces, and minor district open spaces. With the setting up of the Planning and Development Fund in about 1970, funds were made available for the acquisition of these open spaces, and this has proceeded. For example, an area in the Cherry Gardens district is set aside as a regional park, an area at O'Halloran Hill has been purchased and partly developed as major district open space, and various smaller areas have been set aside as minor district open spaces. There is no longer a State Planning Authority, the body which had the care and control of these areas, and the Department of Environment and Planning is a somewhat different animal from that body.

It was recommended to me soon after we came to office (it may well be that this was initiated by my predecessor, but the honourable member can talk to his colleague about that if he wishes) that we should divest some of these areas and that the way in which the future management should be developed is that those areas with the major conservation potential (for example, the central area of the Onkaparinga estuary) should be reserved under the national parks and wildlife system as conservation reserves, and those areas not having that potential (because they were not under significant wet lands or scrub, etc.) should be transferred to the Department of Recreation and Sport for the development of recreation complexes at various levels of intensity (it was generally conceded that most of them would involve a fairly low level of intensity), and then smaller more localised areas would be transferred to local government for their care and control for local, sporting or open-space projects.

That procedure is going on. There have been discussions with local government, and for the most part I understand that there is agreement in local government for taking over these areas. There has also been considerable discussion with the Department of Recreation and Sport about taking over some of those larger areas, although we are short yet of a full Government approval for that to happen.

To return to the specifics of the honourable member's question, I just cannot remember off the top of my head whether the recommendation is that Anstey Hill should be transferred to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and become, if you like, an extension of Black Hill or whether the recommendation is that it should be transferred to Recreation and Sport. In any event, I will take the matter up and I will keep in mind the honourable member's representations.

NOISE POLLUTION

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether there is any intention at this time to investigate confusion arising in the community in relation to domestic noise pollution? I have been asked on many occasions in the course of my duties as member of my electorate to investigate domestic noise. It seems to arise in patches and quite usually involves electronic equipment, such as stereo systems, and so forth. The matter is causing great confusion, because the Department, the police or the councils do not seem to want to take responsibility for the situation and the residents, sometimes in fear, do not want to be named as the persons making the complaint.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Technically, there should be no confusion over this matter, because the Statutes that deal with it are quite clear. First of all, local government

has responsibility for noise emanating from domestic animals, and that is a power it has both in the Dog Control Act and also in regulations under the Local Government Act. Secondly, noise which emanates from domestic premises as a result of noisy parties or certain ordinary appurtenances of the household is clearly under the responsibility of the police. I draw the honourable member's attention to section 18 (3) of the Noise Control Act which makes that quite clear. I will return to that matter before I sit down. Thirdly, the Noise Control Act (I refer the honourable member to section 16) does three things in relation to other forms of noise, particularly industrial noise, and also noise which may emanate from outdoor entertainments such as rock concerts, and the like.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What about the trumpet?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Technically, trumpet blowing could be applied to this category or the previous category to which I have referred, although it seems to be fairly low in the order of complaints that come in. The Minister of Local Government, for example, has waxed eloquent recently in relation to swimming pool filters. The major complaints that the Department seems to get involve domestic air-conditioners, but certainly we get our share of complaints about swimming pool filters.

The regulations under section 16 list a series of devices such as bird-scaring devices, swimming pool filters, lawnmowers, and things like this, which are subject to the regulations; it sets maximum permissible levels (for the most part 45 d.b.a.); and it also lists the times in which these devices can be used. But, to return to the specifics of the honourable member's question, in relation to most domestic noise section 18 of the Act makes quite clear that the police have responsibility. I am given to understand that from time to time the police are reluctant to intervene in these matters, and one can well understand why that is so.

Sometimes complaints are brought out of malice. Sometimes there is what one might say almost a cultural element in the complaint put, in that an older person may well object to noisy rock music being played on a stereo whereas they would not object to Bach being played at the same volume, and so on. Obviously those sorts of problem create a difficult situation for the police. I will undertake to do two things for the honourable member and the House generally in relation to this matter. First of all, I will discuss with my colleague, the Chief Secretary, the specific problems that the police see that they have in relation to the administration of this section of the Act, to see what can be done to assist the police in this very necessary job of administration. Secondly, I point out that the Act to which I have referred is under review, and I would hope to be in a position early next year to bring amendments down. Where the honourable member or any other honourable members have particular matters that they believe that amendments should address, I would be only too happy to receive their representations.

PORT LINCOLN MARINA

Mr BLACKER: Can the Premier say whether he is satisfied with the response from the fishing community and their tangible commitments to the marina project at Port Lincoln and, if so, whether that response will bring forward the commencement date of the project? Several weeks ago the Premier visited Port Lincoln and issued a challenge to the fishing industry to show tangible support for the marina project. I understand that contracts were signed and deposits paid for 19 berths within 24 hours of the options being opened, and that within 10 days there was more than \$1 million committed by the fishing industry towards this

project. The local community believes this to be an immediate and a positive response to the Premier's challenge and it looks forward to Government acknowledgement and an ongoing commitment to the project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I was very pleased indeed to see that response from the community and it certainly reinforced the advice that we have been given that this project, which involves a number of elements, is one that the whole community in Port Lincoln is very much behind. That of course is one of the keys to its success because the unique feature of this project is that it involves the whole community, all levels of Government, and the public and private sectors combining, and it involves that support from those who live and work in the city of Port Lincoln. Certainly the very ready response—one might say the enthusiastic response—of the fishing community, and of course its tangible evidence that it is prepared to back that response with hard cash, has made the project a very much greater possibility. As the member would know, there is still feasibility work continuing. One of the keys to the marina development is the involvement of the travel operator with commitment to aspects of the development. I understand that the negotiations on that are proceeding very satisfactorily, and at this stage I can say that all the elements that are required from Government, local government, community, the fishing industry, and the tourist industry seem to be coming together. The feasibility stage is progressing well, and I hope that we will be able to report in due course that that project will become a reality.

TREE PLANTING

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Water Resources inform the House what action the Engineering and Water Supply Department is taking to advise the public of the problems associated with the growing of trees within the vicinity of sewerage and water pipes? This has been a problem that many people in South Australia have faced for some time in not knowing how far to plant trees and shrubs from water and sewerage pipes. It has cost this State an enormous amount of money in replacing pipes, and I ask the Minister whether the Department is advising people on how to plant trees and shrubs in this regard.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Department gives advice to the public at large with regard to the planting of trees on private property. There are also specific regulations concerning the planting of trees by councils because we do have problems. The individual has problems in regard to not really assessing the potential danger associated with these particular types of trees, and to that extent only a few weeks ago a new pamphlet was issued by the Department in relation to this matter. I do not think that people realise the cost and the problem involved in growing certain types of trees, for instance, poplars and willows, where the roots can travel something like 30 metres. Certainly we do not advise people to plant those sorts of trees where there is a danger to sewer or water pipes.

In addition to the pamphlet provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I would strongly advocate that every person who establishes a garden or plants new trees should contact not only the Engineering and Water Supply Department but other departmental or statutory governmental authorities; for instance, officers of the Botanic Gardens give advice, the Department of Agriculture, and other departmental authorities also can provide advice. However, first I would say that, if anyone is in doubt, certainly a pamphlet called *Don't get choked up* is available from the E. & W.S. Department. It will help to eliminate the problem that exists not only in relation to the individual

but also the Department resulting from lack of knowledge in regard to tree planting in private gardens and, indeed, on some occasions in relation to councils.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Housing confirm that he spoke to a junior officer of the Attorney-General's Department relative to his pecuniary interest, and did he convey the fact that he had spoken to a junior officer of the Attorney-General's Department to the Attorney-General?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It rather surprises me that members of the Opposition are worried about my living in a shoe box when they are not really worried about two of their members who are trying to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. This very problem is highlighted by section 6 (2) and it will not go on: each side scoring off the other. If there are allegations being made one against the other, this can be dealt with by the law courts. However, there are grave dangers facing members in their questions and answers, and I am not the one responsible for it: the House is responsible in its Standing Orders and in its Act.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. In the light of what you have just said, Mr Speaker, you are saying to the Minister in answering the question that he must answer it in a certain way and, therefore, he is not allowed to make any reference to what other things may be happening in respect of this legislation. That is what you are doing and saying. The second point is that I think personally that the Minister ought to be able to answer the question in his own vein, but you ruled accordingly. I am not suggesting that you ruled wrongly: I merely raise it with you. However, more importantly, in my view this is a very similar question, if not the same question, that was asked by the Leader of the Opposition a moment ago.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That is my submission. I am not calling on the Leader of the Opposition. I am asking the Speaker to determine and, first, to give a very firm ruling. If these questions are to be allowed from the Opposition (and you are allowing them: you have allowed at least two or three questions today), in the circumstances, I believe personally that the member answering the question ought to be able to answer in his own way and not be restricted in the answer, allegations or otherwise. We are inside this Parliament, after all, which has some protection. Secondly, I put to you, Sir, that the question asked by the member for Light is in exactly the same terms as that framed by the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: What confronts the House is a very difficult situation. I am not sure how many members have before them a copy of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983, and I refer particularly to the provisions contained in subsections (1) and (2) of section 6. So far as the first part of the point of order is concerned, I point out that it was not the same question. In fact exactly what I had been fearing might occur inside the Parliament has started to occur. It began when the first question was asked. That established a breach in the wall, and obviously someone was likely to retaliate. Then the retaliation came in the form of two interjections, one from each side of the House. I could not pick up who made those interjections, but in my view each of them was clearly contemptuous, in line with the provisions in section 6 (2). All I am saying is that there is no point of order.

I ask everyone in the House to read section 6 very carefully. I am not trying to impose my will; it was this Parliament

which imposed this Act on me and on all other honourable members. It is not a question, as the Deputy Premier may have implied (although I do not think that he perhaps meant to imply it), of my trying to muzzle an answer that is being given. As I see it, the difficulty is that a question can be framed in such a way as to limit quite clearly the question within the provisions of section 6 (1) and (2), and yet at the same time invite retaliation from another member. In those circumstances all I can do (and I am not going to go any further) is to warn honourable members of the existence of the provisions of subsection (2) of section 6. I also draw the attention of honourable members to the Constitution Act. The honourable the Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In reply to the first question, I point out that it was an officer of my Department who spoke to an officer of the Attorney-General's Department to confirm my view on section 6 of the Act—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate interjections.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—in regard to pecuniary interest returns. Subsequent to details on the register being disclosed, a member of the media rang me and asked whether I owned a home. I think the intention at that stage was to try to publish a story that I was perhaps living in a Housing Trust rental home: that story fell flat. I then consulted with the Attorney-General, who received advice from the Solicitor-General and who then advised me that I had misunderstood the provisions of section 6.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Just answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Light to order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As members of the House are so very interested in the matter of my property ownership, I would like briefly to describe to the House details of the house that I live in. It is at 19 Ifould Road; it has three bedrooms and it was built by the Housing Trust, I think in 1960, and I purchased it in 1977. It is a very nice house. It is painted white and it has a garage, a games room and an above-ground swimming pool.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: A fowl house?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, I do not keep chickens. The curtains are a beige colour. When I moved in in 1977 I decided to extend the porch. I took out a personal loan with the then Bank of New South Wales. I owe roughly \$10 200 on it and I think the loan runs for another five years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The swimming pool is hard to keep clean. My daughter mows the lawn for me every two weeks for which I pay her \$4. I did not want to put that on my return, because she is under 18.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The property that I purchased at Edithburgh was owned by the Lutheran Church. It is known as Lot 2, Anstey Street. I am assured that my colleague the member for Goyder will make sure that my interests are served when I retire there. It overlooks the 18th hole of Edithburgh golf course. It has a pleasant view and I intend to build a two-bedroom house on it just for my wife and me because by the time I retire all my children will have been married off and involved in successful careers and they will have become good Labor voters.

WATERING GARDENS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Water Resources investigate the possibility of encouraging South Australian property owners to use drip-feed irrigation for their gardens? Recently

on the Saturday morning A.B.C. garden programme a specialist garden adviser suggested that savings would be made and more benefits would accrue to South Australian gardeners if they were to introduce drip feed irrigation.

Mr Becker: You're making money out of excess water.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Despite the remark by the mumbler from Hanson, the Engineering and Water Supply Department supports any irrigation system for private gardens such as that mentioned by the member for Unley which conserves water. I think that was brought home to us clearly last season. Certainly we should encourage any system which not only conserves water but assists in lowering the cost of water to the individual and to the Government. I think the choice of a system should be left to the individual gardener. I am certainly not taking anything away from the advice given on the A.B.C. garden programme, but I think it depends on the type of garden. We encourage the use of any system that saves money. The Department will be promoting a conservation campaign again this year which will emphasise taking it easy.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It might not be of interest to the member for Todd but conservation of water is of interest to the community at large in the metropolitan area. I believe the campaigns that have been conducted over the years have made the public of South Australia more conscious of probably the most precious resource this State has. Certainly, we would not compel people to put in a certain type of drip irrigation system but we would encourage the use of any system that saves an important natural resource, such as water.

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: So that the record may be put straight, and in the event of anyone reading the point taken by the Deputy Premier to a question I asked quite legitimately in this House earlier this afternoon, I simply would say that two questions were asked of the Minister of Housing, neither of which impacted upon the ruling which you, Sir, had given. In asking two simple questions, first, had the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule this out of order. This is debating the matter, and I withdraw leave.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I find it quite unconscionable and beyond anything that I have experienced in this House that a member is prevented from giving a personal explanation which is in every sense a personal explanation and is not a debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am prepared to take advice on that matter.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am taking advice on the first point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Having taken advice, I am reinforced in my judgment that, far from straying from rulings given by my predecessors, I am merely upholding them. In other words, no matter how strongly the honourable member might have felt about the topic, he had strayed into debating it rather than giving a personal explanation. There have been numerous matters that have arisen over the course of the years which I can recall, sitting very close to where the

honourable member is now, where rulings have been made by the honourable member himself and by others, and therefore I rule that there is no point of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I give you notice, Sir, that I disagree to the ruling and I will prepare my reasons for doing so and bring them up in writing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have received the following note from the honourable member for Light:

I disagree to your ruling on the basis that it contravenes the practices of the House which permit a member to give a personal explanation where he believes he has been misrepresented.

The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Early this afternoon the House noted (quite correctly) your statements, Mr Speaker, in respect of the pecuniary interests legislation, where you had indicated the parameters within which any discussions on this issue should prevail. Earlier in the day (quite correctly) the Leader of the Opposition made a request to the Minister of Housing about his position as stated publicly outside this House and subsequently reported in a document tabled here. In answering the question, the Minister of Housing clearly indicated a course of action that he had adopted and, in outlining that course of action, he left some questions unanswered on matters that were relevant to the questions he had been asked. These questions concerned an inference that he had spoken to an officer of the Attorney-General's Department and that he had subsequently told the Attorney-General of the consequences of that discussion. So that there will be no misunderstanding, I will repeat my question, as follows:

Will the Minister of Housing confirm that he spoke to a junior officer of the Attorney-General's Department relative to his pecuniary interest, and did he convey to the Attorney-General the fact that he had spoken to the junior officer?

They were the two questions contained in the question which I asked the Minister of Housing and in response of which the Deputy Premier has taken a point of order. In reply, the Minister indicated that he had not spoken personally to a member of the Attorney-General's Department, therefore he could indicate that the view held as a result of listening closely to his original answer to the Leader was in error, if not on his part then on our part.

It was my clear understanding, and that of others, that in the first reply the Minister indicated that he had spoken to the Attorney-General's Department. I asked him to confirm that and he indicated that that was not so. The second part of the question, whether he had passed on the information to the Attorney-General, is still unanswered. The Minister embarked on a reply that made a complete farce of Ministerial responsibility in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the motion.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In order to set the record straight, I sought leave to make a personal explanation that I had not sought to infringe the ruling made by you, which I support, on the pecuniary interest legislation. Because of the inference drawn today from the Deputy Premier's statement questioning the validity of my question—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Aren't we allowed to do that now?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, and I do not deny other members that right either. Any member is at perfect liberty to take a point of order, just as any member is at perfect liberty to seek to make a personal explanation. The argument inherent in the motion currently before the Chair is that I find myself at variance with your interpretation, Mr Speaker, of what is a personal explanation on this occasion. I was setting the background to a series of events that would

suggest to the reader of the record of this debate that I had infringed the propriety of this House by the way in which I framed a question to the Minister of Housing. I completely refute that implication and I believe that, when members read the full record of this debate, they will realise the validity of my statement that the action taken by the Deputy Premier in implying that I had failed in my duty as a member to stay within your ruling was wrong.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is interesting to note the help I am getting from the front bench opposite at present. It is really a shallow attempt to overcome the embarrassment the Premier and Deputy Premier caused themselves by their actions this afternoon. I believe that you, Mr Speaker, have erred. I recognise that you have a tight situation on which to adjudicate in relation to legislation introduced by this Government, legislation which, by the method of its projection to the public and the way in which it has been responded to by members of both Houses and on both sides of politics, clearly is poorly framed and which has been badly handled in respect of the information it seeks to obtain from members.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to stray.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe that when you, Mr Speaker, and other members read the full record of the debate this afternoon you will find that you have erred in denying me the opportunity to put before the House and before the public of South Australia (because, after all, this is a public forum) certain facts associated with my question to the Minister of Housing. The second part of the question, which has not yet been answered, is based on the fact that the Attorney-General this afternoon in another place has said that he does not recollect any discussion with the Minister of Housing in respect of the advice the Minister had received from the Attorney-General's Department.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Mr Speaker, I oppose the motion to dissent from your ruling. This incident and the way it has arisen probably gives added weight to the very statesmanlike decision of Sir Billy Snedden, the former Federal Speaker, who retired immediately after his re-election, saying that he felt it was very difficult to have a former Speaker sitting in the House with a later one.

The member for Light has not chosen to follow that particular precedent, but I must admit that I would have given him greater credit for a knowledge of Standing Orders, and indeed on a number of occasions I have been on the record as saying that his discharge of the job of Speaker was very capable and was much appreciated by, I believe, the whole House in the course of his holding that office. Since taking his place on the Opposition benches he seems to have forgotten some of the precepts he laid down. When the Speaker contended, after examining the matter twice, that he was simply upholding the rulings of his predecessor, I think he was referring in this instance to, among others, the former holder of that office in the last Parliament, the member for Light himself.

What is all this nonsense about? I must say that in the 10-minute address we had from the honourable member you, Mr Speaker, were very tolerant indeed in letting him canvass some of the issues he raised. I imagine that anything he wanted to say by way of personal explanation may well have crept in, at least impliedly, in that address, so really we should have an end to the matter. The motion is before the House and has to be dealt with. I think it is a very ill-conceived and ill-judged motion, and its sheer triviality indicates the sterility of the Opposition at the moment in terms of the issues of the day. Why did the Speaker make his ruling? The honourable member was given leave to make

a personal explanation, and Standing Order 137 is quite clear that that explanation must relate to matters of a personal nature:

A member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the House.

Having said that that is what he wanted to do, the honourable member then embarked on questioning a ruling that had been made, debating whether or not he was in order and whether a point of order taken by the Deputy Premier was in fact right or wrong. What on earth has that to do with something of a personal nature to the honourable member?

The fact of the matter was that the Deputy Premier raised a couple of points of order, which were dealt with appropriately by the Chair. If the member for Light felt on that occasion that he objected to the Chair's ruling he in turn could have taken a point of order. He did not do so, because clearly he did not have to. In a sense, the ruling that you have given, Mr Speaker, allowed the answering of the question to continue. By so doing, the member for Light had no complaint, but so keen was he to get on the record, somehow or other, with the points that he really wanted to make that, despite the fact that you had not upheld that specific point of order taken by the Deputy Premier, he wanted to canvass the issue in this House. That has nothing to do with the Standing Order, and I contend that you were quite correct, Mr Speaker, in saying that that was so. It was not a personal explanation. Is it going to be the case that, if a member feels aggrieved by an interjection or a point of order, despite its being dealt with adequately at the time by the Chair, he is going to get to his feet and make personal explanations? I do not think that that should be the case unless there are exceptional circumstances.

Clearly, all that was happening in this case was that the member for Light wanted to try to refute what he felt was an implication in the point of order made by the Deputy Premier. It was irrelevant; it was not of a personal nature; it was to do with a debate, and the Standing Order makes completely clear that one is not allowed to debate a question in the course of a personal explanation. The member for Light well knows that, Mr Speaker. I guess that this motion has been engendered more by his annoyance at not being able to proceed in that vein by your quite proper ruling or perhaps by an attempt to somehow get before the House the matters he wanted to get before it. In either case, that is not a situation that this House should accept, and I urge members to vote against this fatuous motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PREMIER'S REMARKS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe that it is most unfortunate when a member must rise in his place to defend his previous experience in this place. Whilst I occupied the

Chair which you now occupy, Mr Speaker, I did so with the best interests of the Parliament in mind, as acknowledged by the Premier. It is most unfortunate that the Premier should stoop to such depths this afternoon and suggest that the former Speaker should have done what Billy Snedden did: leave the House. Secondly, I emphasise that whilst I remain a member of the House, regardless of what earlier experience I have had in this place, I am here to represent the people of Light, and I will do so in the best possible manner that I know.

At 3.33 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government be severely condemned for its failure to honour the undertaking the Prime Minister made prior to the Federal election to proceed with the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line as promised by the Fraser Government.

I move this motion because, like many members in this House, the people of South Australia clearly recall the Prime Minister speaking on a talk-back programme which was widely broadcast throughout the Iron Triangle. When a woman from Katherine phoned in and asked what the Prime Minister's attitude was towards the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, a precise and clear answer was given: whatever programme had been laid down by the Fraser Government, the incoming Labor Government would put into operation. A few months after that promise was made, the Federal Government was to put in train a course of action which it quite clearly knew would make it financially impossible for the Northern Territory Government to meet the financial obligations that the Federal Government was calling on it to meet for this project. I would like to refer to some of the history of this programme and to its benefits, especially to the Northern Territory, South Australia and the nation as a whole. Some time ago Paul Everingham sent a small card to all members which was rather significant and stated:

Over 70 years ago the Federal Government promised to build a railway from Adelaide to Darwin. The railway has been accepted as a project for Australia's Bicentennial to be completed by 1988. Let's get on with the job!

(Signed) Paul Everingham.

This matter has attracted the attention of many groups within the community. Before proceeding, I wish to refer to some newspaper articles and to point out to the House the widespread feeling that exists in relation to this project. In the *Transcontinental* of 7 September 1983 there was an article headed 'Council unhappy at Government's rail policy'. The article, referring to the Port Augusta City Council, states:

City Council has written to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Ralph Willis, to ask him to reconsider the Federal Government's attitude to the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway.

Council was disappointed at the reply the Minister gave to a previous request from council on the matter. That reply was tabled at the latest meeting of council when it was agreed that the response from Mr Willis was not satisfactory and that aspects of the railway's value, particularly to the defence of Australia, have been ignored.

Then there is a further article in the *Flinders News* of 30 August 1983, headed '76-year-old reminder on railway promise' and stating:

A petition tabled in Federal Parliament recently on the Darwin-Alice Springs railway reminded the Government of a 76-year-old pledge. The member for Grey, Mr Lloyd O'Neil, delivered the petition on behalf of residents of South Australia and the Northern Territory. It said the Commonwealth had entered into an agreement with State Governments on 7 December 1907, pledging it would build a north-south transcontinental railway. The railway was to be the link for further development of Australia.

There was another comment in relation to this matter in an editorial in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 28 July 1983, headed 'Rail project benefits' and stating:

Time is running out for the latest proposal to complete the 1911 vision of a transcontinental railway from Adelaide to Darwin. The Federal Government is nearing a commitment on a \$60 million upgrading of the Stuart Highway between Alice Springs and Darwin as an alternative to the \$545 million extension of the standard-gauge railway through the Northern Territory to the nation's northern port. The project has been stalled since the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating, announced in May that the Northern Territory Government would have to bear 40 per cent of the cost and the Northern Territory's National-Liberal Government rejected that costly proposition outright. Since then, there has been verbal warfare between Darwin, Canberra and Adelaide and no sign of a co-ordinated campaign to change the Federal Government's mind.

The Spencer Gulf Cities Association passed the following resolution, moved by Councillor Hill of the Whyalla Corporation and seconded by the then Mayor of Port Augusta Council, Councillor Naisbitt:

Alice Springs to Darwin Railway:

Resolved that this Association strongly requests that the Federal Government gives high priority to the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin Railway, for the following reasons:

that it is an important project for industrial development, particularly the tourism industry, which in the Northern Territory is expected to surpass both the mining and pastoral industries in the near future;

that it is a very important industry for South Australia, and most importantly for the Spencer Gulf cities as we strengthen our contact and trade with the Northern Territory;

that construction of the project alone will create many jobs, and also on-going employment opportunities and benefits;

that as a consumer project it will represent 20 per cent of the Whyalla steel works rail-line production for five years, and provide security and sales for that industry;

that it is not only a project that would provide many jobs, but security in the Northern Territory as it would have the capacity to transport high armaments, vehicles and equipment from the industrial south up to the northern shores of Australia in times of need—if we are serious in the defence of our country;

that the on-going employment potential places this project in very high priority—ahead of all the job creation schemes that are likely to be approved;

that this type of project is an investment in Australia—not a risk investment, and has on-going benefits, both for employment and trade;

and finally we should also remember that Darwin is rapidly developing as an import link between Australia and the Pacific basin;

and a copy of this resolution be supplied to the Northern Territory Local Government Association.

Then, on 18 August 1983, the Leader of the Opposition (the member for Rocky River) said:

The Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr Peacock, today confirmed the Liberal Party's commitment to full Commonwealth funding for the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. Mr Peacock confirmed that on return to office, a Federal Liberal Government will restore full Commonwealth funding for the project. A Federal Liberal Government will ensure that the railway is completed in the quickest possible time. The Liberal Party recognises the national needs and benefits which this railway will serve. It will also create immediate jobs in South Australia and in the long term, will greatly enhance our trade prospects.

Following that press statement, I saw fit to bring this motion into the Parliament. At this time when a great deal of emphasis has been placed on creating jobs and employment programmes and schemes, here we have a project which will be of lasting benefit to the people of this State, the Northern Territory and the nation: it is a bread and butter issue. It will require the production of 150 000 tonnes of

steel for steel railway sleepers. It will allow the production of concrete sleepers to continue in the Port Augusta area. Recently there has been a great deal of discussion in the newspapers in the Port Augusta area pointing out the difficult employment situation which has been created at the concrete sleeper plant at Port Augusta. If this project was given the go ahead, I understand that tenders could be called in the very near future for 30 or 40 kilometres of the line. If that takes place, there is nothing to stop the Commonwealth Government giving the go ahead to Australian National to put in an order for concrete sleepers, and that would help the sleeper plant maintain the 60 jobs at Stirling North which it appears will be lost in the near future if alternative orders cannot be found. That in itself could be a definite employment generating project. If one reads the *Transcontinental* of 7 September 1983, one will see the front-page article clearly explaining the problems which that industry is facing. They have approached Mr Hawke and Mr Morris, and Mr O'Neil sent the following telegram to Mr Morris:

Express the grave concern of this electorate at the imminent closure of Monier concrete sleeper plant in Port Augusta if no further contracts obtained in the near future. Request you to review AN funding arrangements as an urgent measure to provide for ongoing sleeper contracts to avert the closure of this plant with its resultant disastrous effects to this area. Invite you to visit Port Augusta at earliest possible moment to discuss this with employers and employees.

I think that that telegram clearly demonstrates the need for this contract to be let in the very near future. It would not only save those 60 jobs but also the amount of sleepers that would be required for the project would allow other people to be employed there. The Chamber of Commerce did a study and a cost benefit analysis of the project, and it is interesting to look at some of the history of this matter. The report states:

In 1911, with the passage of the Northern Territory Acceptance Act, the Commonwealth undertook to construct, or cause to be constructed, a railway line from Port Darwin southwards to a point on the northern boundary of South Australia proper (which railway to connect therewith would be referred to as the transcontinental railway). In February 1981, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Hon. R.J. Hunt) announced a proposal by the Commonwealth to construct a standard gauge railway from the Alice Springs terminus of the Central Australia Railway to the Port of Darwin in the Northern Territory. The Commonwealth undertook to establish the rail-link by 1990. On 14 January 1983, the Prime Minister, Mr J.M. Fraser, announced that his Government had decided to proceed with the construction of the 1 440 kilometre rail-link. It was announced at the same time that the Commonwealth Government planned to complete the rail-link by 1988 to coincide with the Australian Bi-centennial.

In May 1983, the Federal Treasurer, in his economic statement, made the following announcement:

Commonwealth assistance to the Northern Territory is very generous. In 1982-83 total per capita payments to the Northern Territory will be about \$5 600—about five times the average level of per capita payments to the six States. In the light of this, and the significance of the rail project to the Northern Territory, we believe the Northern Territory Government should share with us the cost of constructing the railway. We intend to proceed on the basis that the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory contribute 60 per cent and 40 per cent respectively to the construction costs. Part of the Commonwealth's contribution would be funded by transferring about \$60 million currently allocated to upgrading the Stuart Highway in the Northern Territory...

The study document further states:

The Northern Territory Government faced the prospect of taxing each of its residents an additional \$20 per week for a 50-year period to raise the \$216 million necessary to meet its share of the cost.

Because it would lose an additional \$60 million from its roads programme, it had no alternative but to reject the Commonwealth offer. I should give some of the history of the project and the railways in this part of the country, as follows:

1878—Commencement of narrow gauge railway north from Port Augusta, South Australia.

1882—Completion of railway between Port Augusta and Government Gums (now Farina), South Australia.

1883—Authorisation for construction of narrow gauge North Australia Railway (N.A.R.) south from Palmerston (now Darwin) to Pine Creek.

1888—First train travelled from Darwin to Adelaide River.

1889—Completion of North Australia Railway to Pine Creek.

1891—Completion of Central Australia Railway as far north as Oodnadatta in South Australia.

1910—Northern Territory Acceptance Act, 1910, was passed, transferring administration of the Northern Territory from the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth Government. This Act provided for the Commonwealth to take over the existing sections of railway and to undertake completion of the railway between Port Augusta and Port Darwin.

1917—Extension of North Australia Railway completed south from Pine Creek to Katherine.

1927—Extension of Central Australia Railway north from Oodnadatta commenced.

1928—North Australia Railway completed as far as Mataranka, Northern Territory.

1929—Central Australia Railway completed between Port Augusta and Alice Springs, Northern Territory; construction of North Australia Railway terminated at Birdum, due to financial problems.

1949—By the S.A. Rail Standardisation Agreement, the Commonwealth undertook to convert the existing Central Australia and North Australia Railways to standard gauge and to construct a standard gauge link for the remaining 1 000 km gap between Alice Springs and Birdum.

1957—Standard gauge link completed between Port Augusta and Marree.

1970—Commonwealth accepted proposal for construction of a new, standard gauge railway from Tarcoola to Alice Springs along a new, flood-free alignment.

1975—Construction of Tarcoola—Alice Springs Railway commenced.

1976—Services terminated on North Australia Railway.

That is the one from Darwin. The document continues:

1979—Joint Study Team established between Commonwealth and Northern Territory Governments to examine the feasibility of an Alice Springs—Darwin rail-link.

1980—Report of Joint Study Team completed; Prime Minister announced decision to complete the railway by 1990; completion of Tarcoola—Alice Springs railway.

1981—Finance provided for planning, survey and design studies, which have since proceeded.

14 January 1983—Prime Minister announced completion of the railway by 1988.

19 May 1983—Federal Government abandoned its responsibility to build the rail-link.

That is a brief account of what has taken place. I know that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would be concerned about this matter, as a person representing the steel city of Whyalla. I have referred to these matters so that people are made aware of the procrastination, inaction and lack of responsibility displayed by Governments since that agreement was made in 1910. In my judgment, there is no logical reason for the continued deferral of this project, particularly during a time of high unemployment and lack of economic expansion. The project would meet all the demands that the present Prime Minister was making to the Fraser Government in the lead up to the last election. I refer briefly to what some of the benefits would be, according to a study that was undertaken. The following statement was made:

Expenditure by the Federal Government of about \$340 million on the link over a six-year period would provide employment for about 2 000 people on construction of the link; accelerate development of agricultural, pastoral and tourism industries in the Northern Territory as well as increase mineral exploration and development; save Australia up to \$20 million a year in fuel imports at current costs; and reduce the level of economic support provided by the Federal Government to the Northern Territory Government. Australian National's most pessimistic forecast was that passenger traffic to Darwin following completion of the link would be about 60 000 passengers a year. A freight level of 600 000 tonnes a year could be expected by 1990, rising to about 700 000 tonnes closer to the year 2000. This did not include an estimated 1.3 million tonnes of coal a year from Queensland and South Australia which would be required by a power station being built in Darwin by 1989; an estimated 720 000 tonnes of ore

likely to be transhipped from the MacArthur River project 300 kilometres south-east of Darwin with a spur line connection; tourism, which was expected to treble with the line's completion; higher-than-expected population growth in the Northern Territory and the replacement of imported goods with Australian-produced goods.

I referred to those statements because I believe that the House and the people of this State should again be reminded of those pertinent figures. I believe that the House should be given the opportunity to express a point of view on this important project. I have spoken with a number of people in the electorate that I represent and in the Northern Territory in relation to this matter. I am surprised that the Commonwealth Government is still adopting its current attitude, because prior to the most recent Federal election the reference was made at great length about injecting funds into the public sector and into projects that would have long-term national benefits to the people of this State. Yet here we are at this stage when we had a project that was planned with many of the contracts for it ready to be let and ready to go, and the Federal Government has pulled the plug on it. An interesting passage in the report 'The Alice to Darwin Rail' (at page 36) states:

Traffic on the old narrow gaugeline from Marree to Alice Springs totalled 142 000 tonnes per year. Since the opening of the standard gauge route to Alice Springs, the traffic has increased by 230 per cent and now 310 000 tonnes are being conveyed to and from Alice Springs and Darwin annually. The main traffic is in road units conveyed by the 'piggyback' method.

That comment was made in December 1982 by the Assistant General Manager of Australian National. The report further refers to diagrams geographically illustrating the effects of the opening of a standard gauge link to Alice Springs. I think they are too difficult to incorporate in *Hansard*, but they are of interest to anyone concerned about the advantages that would flow from the project.

I do not think it is necessary for me to make any further comments in relation to this matter. The motion is clear and precise. It calls on all members to support the project. It will benefit the Iron Triangle cities; it will benefit South Australia and its steel industry. At Whyalla we have one of the most modern and up-to-date steel rail producing establishments. Anyone who has inspected that plant would know that it is efficient and modern and that it produces rail of a high standard. I believe that the plant is probably second to none in the South-East Asian region. At Stirling North we have the concrete railway sleeper plant, which, unfortunately, will have to start retrenching employees if it does not obtain new orders. That problem could be overcome. Many people involved in the construction industry have the equipment and the experience and could soon obtain suitable labour to commence earthworks on the project. Those three aspects would have a great deal of employment generating ability. In conclusion, I refer to a Liberal Party news release issued on Sunday 2 October, which is as follows:

Liberal Party endorses full Commonwealth funding for Alice Springs—Darwin railway. The Federal Council of the Liberal Party has unanimously supported a motion calling for full Commonwealth funding for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. The motion was proposed by the South Australian Division of the Liberal Party and moved at this weekend's annual meeting of the Federal Council by the Liberal Leader, Mr John Olsen. Mr Olsen said he had received a commitment from Mr Peacock that a Federal Liberal Government would reverse Mr Hawke's decision requiring the Northern Territory Government to provide 40 per cent of the cost of the project.

'The Liberal Party has recognised this railway as a project which will fulfil national needs and provide national benefits,' Mr Olsen said. 'As such, it must be fully funded by the Commonwealth in the same way as our other great national railways including the East-West line and the Tarcoola to Alice Springs link. South Australia has much to gain in terms of trade and tourism from an early completion of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. It will also immediately generate 2 000 jobs in South Australia and the Northern Territory. But the railway will also meet national priorities including defence needs and quicker access to Asian

markets through Darwin port. It will be important for South Australia to maintain pressure on the Hawke Government so that this railway is completed as soon as possible.'

Members on this side of the House have made a commitment. It is pleasing that the Premier strongly supported this project and that he has been involved in representations and negotiations with the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory (Mr Everingham). However, I believe that when the Deputy Premier went to Canberra and was talked into agreeing to another study, that was just an attempt by the Prime Minister to put off the project a little longer. It gave him a little more time to do a little more footwork. Obviously, the Commonwealth, having decided it is not too popular in the Northern Territory, has taken the view that it can write off that particular electorate, that it does not count. It has decided that it would be far better for it to invest those funds in other projects within national Labor seats in this country, although many of those projects will not provide long term benefits for Australia.

I commend the motion to the House. I ask all honourable members to support it so that an expression of opinion of members of this House about this matter can be conveyed to the Prime Minister and his Government at the earliest opportunity, because I believe that the motion is wholeheartedly supported by the overwhelming majority of South Australians. I look forward to honourable members supporting the motion.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): In supporting the motion I commend the member for Eyre for moving it. I support his comments. I just want to add two or three points. One point is the use of cement in Darwin. At the moment most of the cement used in Darwin is brought from New Zealand, which I think is an indictment of our country's transport system.

Only recently cement manufacturers in South Australia were thrilled to learn that the American authorities had at last removed an imposition placed on cement imported into America from this country. Up until a fortnight ago cement imported from South Australia had a penalty placed on it by the American authorities. We are cheering that decision at a time when the majority of cement used in Darwin is imported from New Zealand. I find that hard to understand and I cannot accept that situation. One of the main reasons for that situation is the lack of a railway line between Adelaide and Darwin. That railway line would be of benefit to the whole country as well as to this State. I find it strange that we can export cement to America but we cannot get enough cement from Adelaide to Darwin to meet its needs. We should also be conscious of the fact that the petroleum fuel used in Darwin is imported from Singapore. I have nothing against Singaporeans but surely we should be trying to promote our own industry.

Another cause for concern in South Australia is what has happened in the fruit and vegetable markets in Darwin. Until about five years ago most of the fresh fruit and vegetables for sale in Darwin was transported from Adelaide. However, in the last decade that trend has changed and now most of the fresh fruit and vegetables available in Darwin is sent from Queensland, New South Wales, and particularly Western Australia. As a result of that South Australia has lost a chance for employing people. Many members have raised the problems faced by market gardeners on the northern plains and the Riverland because they are not able to get a fair price for their produce. Part of that problem has been caused by the lack of a decent transport system from Adelaide to Darwin, and particularly the lack of a railway line. Therefore, the other States, particularly Queensland and Western Australia, even though they do not have a rail link with Darwin, have been able to get their produce to the Darwin market because they have

upgraded their roads. They have also improved the quality of their produce. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

URANIUM POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:

That this House urges the Government to do all in its power to change the Labor Party's uranium policy which allows some uranium mines to proceed and not others and which has led to increased unemployment in South Australia in the mining and supporting industries and has jeopardised the establishment of a multi-million dollar uranium enrichment and conversion industry in the State with the consequent loss of many permanent new jobs.

(Continued from 31 August. Page 646.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I rise to resume the remarks I was making to this motion. I will not repeat what I said earlier except to refer again to the completely hypocritical and irrational stance taken by the Labor Party in relation to the uranium issue, particularly in giving the green light to the Roxby Downs project but shutting down two lesser mines, which has led directly to unemployment.

Since I introduced this motion the Estimates Committees have met during which we had an opportunity to question the Minister at some length about the Government's uranium policy. In my remarks yesterday during the debate on the Estimates Committees' reports, I said that the Minister's performance was pathetic, not to put too strong a point on it. The Labor Party is in tatters absolutely in relation to its uranium policy. The Minister has nowhere to move; he is incapable of making a decision because he is waiting to find out what will happen in Canberra. Two days ago the Prime Minister was so sick that he had to cancel Cabinet discussion on the uranium report which was furnished by departmental officers.

Mr Lewis: He still had time to fly to Queensland.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That was the point I was coming to. The Prime Minister took himself from his sick bed and flew to Queensland to try to shore up the flagging fortunes of Mr Wright. Hope springs eternal in the human breast, and Mr Wright's breast has been heaving dramatically in the last day or so with false hope.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair finds it difficult to link up those remarks with the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe you did not hear what I said in introducing that matter, Sir, because the fact is that the Prime Minister was too sick to convene the Cabinet meeting scheduled for this week to make a decision on the departmental report which indicates that the Federal Government should face reality and give the green light to these uranium developments. I believe the Prime Minister is obviously stalling because of the turmoil within the Labor Party and, as I said, he was not too sick to fly to Queensland to try to bolster up his cohorts there. I do not want to traverse my earlier remarks any further.

I wish to turn now to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. During the Committee stages in June last year the Minister said that some of the yellowcake from Roxby Downs would find its way into bombs. That was a direct quote from the report which is in the Parliamentary record. Both he and the Minister for Environment and Planning signed that dissenting report in June. They both said that some of the yellowcake would find its way into bombs, but within a month or two they had got over their inhibitions in relation to that view and the Minister said that we now have a new Federal Government. Of course, we did not have a Labor Federal Government when they changed their policy last October.

Questioned further, he said, 'The world situation is changing.' The world situation is indeed changing: the demand for uranium is increasing yet here the Labor Party on the one hand says that the markets are not there but, on the other hand, that the world demand is increasing and that such a need for uranium justifies Roxby. That is a completely irrational stance.

A report entitled 'Uranium power and the proliferation of nuclear weapons' has been produced by the Special Committee on Nuclear Weapons and Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. The authors of the report, which is a discussion of the effect of the supply by the United States of uranium for peaceful purposes to nuclear power facilities for electricity generation on the proliferation of weapons are a highly regarded scientific group, include the following: Chauncey Starr, Chairman of the Electric Power Research Institute; Vincent S. Boyer, Philadelphia Electric Company; Melvin J. Feldman, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Edward J. Hennelly, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Company; Myron Kratzer, International Energy Associates, Ltd; A. David Rossin, Electric Power Research Institute; Gerald F. Tape, Associates Universities; and John J. Taylor, Electric Power Research Institute. Under the heading 'Contribution to peace and stability' the report states:

It should be pointed out to those who would do away with civilian uranium power on nuclear weapons proliferation grounds that such a course would be counter productive in terms of their own objectives. The basic contributions that uranium power makes to international peace and stability include the following:

(1) Uranium power offers to the developing world significant help in escaping from the highly destabilising bondage of fossil fuels. Nature has been capricious in its distribution of fossil energy sources. This fact has already produced severe international tensions as nations vie with each other to ensure adequate oil supplies. Fiction writers and military strategists have postulated scenarios in which attempts to secure oilfields by use of conventional weapons could escalate into a nuclear holocaust. Even a modest uranium power programme can result in an appreciable lessening of the tensions that accompany the quest for oil.

(2) A second contribution of uranium power to international peace and stability relates to the N.P.T. This treaty, which has now been signed by 117 nations, involves as an important element a bargain struck on a global scale between three signatory nuclear-weapon states on the one hand, and a much larger number of non-weapon states on the other. The essence is that the non-weapon states agreed to forgo nuclear weapons in return for two undertakings by the signatory nuclear-weapon states: to enter into serious arms control negotiations; and to provide technical assistance to the non-weapon states, particularly the less developed ones, with respect to the peaceful uses of uranium energy. With regard to this latter obligation of the N.P.T. it should be recognised that if, in response to political concern about weapons proliferation, the industrial nations should be forced in the future to dismantle their domestic uranium power programmes, and thus their reliability as fuel, equipment, and technology suppliers, their ability to provide support to the developing countries and to enforce safeguards would be seriously diminished. Such circumstances would actually encourage the spread of those facilities we seek to minimise.

(3) A third benefit of uranium power to international peace and stability relates to environmental effects. The emissions from the world-wide combustion of fossil fuels are a matter of continuing concern because their alteration of the natural ecological chemistry crosses national boundaries and may affect natural habitats throughout the world.

An interesting report in the daily press, either yesterday or today, indicates that a large body of eminent scientists is concerned about the greenhouse effect: that is, the warming of the earth's atmosphere and the consequent effects on the climate of the whole globe. Indeed, the report states that the temperature of New York would be raised by 10 degrees by the year 2000 A.D.: that is within the lifetime of some members, and certainly within the lifetime of our children. The report continues:

More uncertain in its potential long-term global effect is the growing accumulation of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which theoretical speculation indicates might cause world-wide increases in temperature and major climatic changes. Uranium power offers

a means of providing electricity without contributing to these environmental risks.

CONCLUSIONS:

It must be emphasised that diminishing the motivation for weapons acquisition is the most important long-term objective for U.S. policy. Immediately important, however, would be a co-ordinated effort by the international community of nations to strengthen the economic and political barriers which inhibit additional countries from undertaking weapons acquisition programmes. Clearly, the abandonment of co-operation in peaceful uses of uranium power would encourage uncontrolled and unguarded national programmes.

In summation, therefore, the common international policy of the reactor supplying states should be to (1) assist the developing countries in an efficient expansion and management of their uranium power plant capacity; (2) provide a system for an assured supply of fuel for these plants and for the handling of spent fuel; and (3) strengthen the international safeguarding system of civilian activities in order to discourage diversion of material for military use. Turning to the issues raised in the preface to this paper, the following conclusions are drawn:

(1) International trade in uranium power equipment and fuels will grow and will not be diminished by restrictive U.S. domestic activities or U.S. foreign policies.

That applies with equal force to Australia. The conclusions of the report continue:

(2) The reduction of U.S. activities in uranium power systems also diminishes U.S. influence in achieving prudent and appropriate international non-proliferation controls.

That, too, applies with equal force to Australia. If Australia wishes to have a say in non-proliferation on a global scale, the sooner Australia becomes a major supplier of this commodity, under strict safeguards, the better. That is the point made in this report in respect of the United States of America. The conclusions continue:

(3) The world-wide expansion of uranium power reactors has not been and will not in the future be an influential factor in determining whether additional nations will choose to become nuclear weapons states. Even in the absence of uranium power, the nuclear weapons potential would remain.

(4) If any nation decides to embark on nuclear weapons acquisition, it is most likely to follow the route of a dedicated military facility, rather than diversion from civilian power systems.

An eminent overseas authority who spoke last year during the Roxby debate indicated that T.N.T. could be made from a chocolate factory: that is, all the ingredients of T.N.T. are used in the input to a chocolate factory. However, the authority could not think of a less convenient way of making T.N.T. Likewise, a nuclear weapon could be made from a civilian power programme, but he could not think of a more inconvenient way of making a nuclear weapon. The statement by that authority simply reinforces the point made in these conclusions: that, if States are hell bent on developing nuclear weapons, they will not produce them in a civil nuclear power programme. The fifth conclusion is as follows:

(5) The several benefits of uranium power are evident to developing nations, and the resulting reduction in energy resource importation and consequent enhancement of economic and internal stability and national security will contribute to a substantial reduction in conflict issues between nations.

In other words, by supplying uranium for power programmes conflict will be reduced in terms of energy competition. It is clear that nuclear weapons proliferation is primarily a political issue related only marginally to uranium power development. I will not say any more about nuclear proliferation.

There is a tendency at the moment with the peace marchers and others around the world to try to confuse the peace movement with a domestic uranium power programme, to blur the edges. That is unfortunate. The question of nuclear missiles is divorced from other matters, as I have indicated from the quotes from that paper, and I believe the conclusions are valid. That is a separate question. There are enough nuclear weapons in the world at the moment to blow us all up about 400 times, and domestic nuclear power electricity programme will not influence that one jot.

The other matter that I did not deal with when speaking to the resolution earlier was the cost to South Australia of the Government's policy in terms of down-stream developments. Not only is there a primary loss in mining exploration activity, there is a major down-turn in exploration and the employment that that generates. The light aircraft people had the seat out of their pants a few years ago before we cranked up exploration in this State. The people who operate drill rigs generate employment. This is a result of the down-turn in exploration and the uranium policy which has led to this down-turn. Some of the information in Questions on Notice indicates quite clearly that that has resulted in unemployment.

The closure of Beverley and Honeymoon mines, and the \$500 million investment in Beverley, has led to unemployment. Also the down-stream developments which this State in my view was within an ace of capturing are also lost. In answer to questions during the Estimates Committee the Minister said that the companies involved in uranium conversion studies at Port Pirie have now suspended operations for 12 months. This is an industry which has been keenly sought by the City of Port Pirie. The Mayor, Bill Jones, stated to the Electoral Commission—and he is a Labor man but his Labor affiliations do not confuse him on the uranium question—that he and all his council keenly seek this industry for Port Pirie, because Port Pirie is ailing in relation to employment opportunities for its school-leavers, or indeed for anybody.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, know that the same scene applies at Whyalla, the electorate that you represent. The declining numbers in Whyalla have been only too apparent as a result of electoral redistribution, where now your district encompasses the whole town and surrounding countryside—Iron Knob and Iron Baron—which indicated to me when I saw the map just what is happening in that electorate. There has been a decline in population in the Iron Triangle and Whyalla as a result of this down-turn in activity. All these developments will be a major boost to the Iron Triangle. The down-stream refining developments in uranium conversion would have been a big thing for Port Pirie. That was recognised by the citizens of Port Pirie, and unanimously by the council and the Mayor, most of whom are not supporters of the Liberal Party. But, that industry is lost. It is in limbo. If decisions are not made nationally and in this State in the near future, they could be lost for all time.

The other area, of course, is in relation to uranium enrichment. Let me quote from a bulletin put out by the joint venturers at Roxby Downs in relation to uranium enrichment. This is what they say in information released in September 1983. I will give a couple of other quotes, because they are pertinent to what I have been saying. The first is as follows:

A number of countries are obliged to source uranium from South Africa, Namibia and other African countries and this incurs for them some political and supply security risks which could be avoided if Australian uranium was freely available. The main disadvantage under which intending Australian producers find themselves at present is the uncertain posture of the Federal Government as to its uranium policies. The people in the uranium industry, however, believe that if government provides a supportive framework for its development and commercial activities then inquiries that are being received at present could be converted into satisfactory contracts.

Under the heading 'Enrichment', the joint venturers say this:

The Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia (UEGA), comprising a group of Australian companies, last reported to the Federal Government in September 1982. This report was later tabled in Federal Parliament. UEGA had selected centrifuge technology developed by the British/Dutch/German organisation Urenco as the basis for a feasibility study into prospects for a commercial enrichment plant in Australia. UEGA has suspended

its planned studies until Government policy on enrichment is clarified.

As I say, not only had UEGA selected the technology but it had narrowed the sites in Australia down to South Australia or Queensland. I believe quite firmly that South Australia could have won this billion dollar industry for the State. That is in limbo; that is suspended. The report states that UEGA has suspended its planned studies until Government policy on enrichment is clarified.

The Urenco group called to see Premier Bannon three or four months ago. They came and saw the Leader of the Opposition in the afternoon. They said they were encouraged by what they heard from Mr Bannon. We showed them a press release which either he or his officers had put out shortly after they left the office. They read it and said it was a very sad document, because it said that we did not need uranium enrichment in South Australia. That is a tragedy for South Australia, because if we do not grasp the opportunities that we have I do not believe there is any hope for the State. If the present Government does not grasp firmly with both hands the opportunities as they present themselves, South Australia will not develop into the large resource State that I believe we certainly could. Uranium would have to be a significant part of that. Hydrocarbons and uranium development are the two areas where South Australia can become the leader in Australia, to our very great advantage.

There are others who wish to take up some matters this afternoon, but in concluding these remarks let me say that the Labor Party just cannot go on in the way it is. It has to break one way or the other—either the Duncans of this world who are signing advertisements to stop Roxby, who really are taking a stance which is understandable, albeit misguided, will win or the uranium industry will be opened up in this nation. If the Duncans of this world win then this nation will lose a very great opportunity.

If the member for Elizabeth and his colleagues win then there is precious little hope of our becoming world leaders in this field. People overseas, if that was to happen, would believe that we are nothing short of idiots, because these developments are world wide. Nuclear power is world wide. Not only is it widespread in the Western world, it is widespread in the communist world, in the satellite countries, which are well to the fore. In fact, Russia claims quite openly in the publications that come to us that the Russians have been leaders since 1956, and they would not have made anything like the economic progress (nor would the satellite countries) if they did not have available reliable cheap energy via nuclear power. If the honourable member for Elizabeth and his cohorts around Australia have the numbers, and if the Labor Party toughens up the uranium policy, then in my view this country and this State will be very much the poorer, for no valid reason at all.

If, however, common sense prevails maybe we can reserve some of these developments for South Australia. Prime Minister Hawke has always understood the morality of the situation in relation to uranium, and it has been perfectly obvious from everything he has said during the whole of his career even before he came into Parliament. If there is a commonsense approach by Hawke, Keating and others have a realistic approach, as well as other former Labor Ministers of Mines to whom I spoke from time to time when we were in Government, perhaps we can get some of these developments.

If it does not, then we are very much the poorer. We have lost ground as a result of this procrastination. We have lost opportunities, we have lost jobs, we have lost revenues to the State, and we have lost exploration activity and in relation to the latter we have to wipe the ledger off. That has been lost as a result of the election of Labor Govern-

ments. If we are to recover the situation at all, then the Labor Party must clarify its policy sensibly. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House considers the road blocks operated by the Department of Agriculture to be a significant barrier against the introduction of fruit fly into South Australia and calls on the Government to maintain the inspection facilities at or above the present level.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 985.)

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I have had some discussion with my colleague the Minister of Agriculture in another place about this motion, and I have some comments which he has asked me to pass on to the House, which I am pleased to do now. My colleague advised me that his Department has reviewed the current situation very carefully and can give an undertaking that there will be no changes to the current policy in this regard: in other words, road blocks will be maintained. Whilst the review that has been mentioned was under way I understand that the State of Victoria withdrew all of its road blocks, which left South Australia in the difficult position of having to reassess the total programme. It is the view of the Department and the Minister of Agriculture that it will take two to three years to assess the impact of the Victorian decision and that road blocks will be maintained during that time. So, that is a significant period of time in which we can have a proper opportunity to determine whether or not the Victorian decision is in the best interests of monitoring fruit fly.

As to the purpose of road blocks, it is the view of the Minister and the Department that they are in fact a physical presence and present evidence to passing motorists and others that the State Government does have a concern. They also help to reflect a community concern that there should not be an introduction of fruit fly into the State. As to whether or not they are very effective technically, it is not absolutely convincing that road blocks do present a technically effective way of preventing fruit fly.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It is its presence on the road.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is right; it is more the perceived effectiveness on those who pass by, and the honourable member is quite correct. It is a difficult thing to assess short of interviewing fruit flies coming through and asking them whether they are deterred by the road block. There are two different sorts of fruit fly that we have to watch out for. One is from Western Australia and the other from the Eastern States, and it is the Department's desire to make sure that both are kept out of South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The Mediterranean and Queensland fruit fly.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I take the advice of the honourable member on that. We do not have any preference to either; we do not want either to be introduced into South Australia. That is in brief the comments the Minister has made available to me. It indicates that there will be no change to the present policy. In other words, we will be maintaining inspection facilities that presently exist in regard to fruit fly.

The first part of the motion indicates that this House should consider road blocks operated by the Department to be a significant barrier against the introduction of fruit fly.

I mention the point that I suppose there is the feeling by the Minister and the Department that the road blocks do represent evidence of concern and a statement of belief by the Government that in fact road blocks are a physical presence and a barrier. However, of course they are not believed to be technically necessarily effective but we want to assess the situation, and we would ask honourable members to support the efforts by the Department to assess the situation over the next two to three years as the impact of the Victorian decision is taken into account.

Clearly, one of the things to which we need to pay attention is the matter of community responsibility in areas such as this, and I certainly think that one of the points that all of us would agree with is that it is important that all individuals recognise that they have a responsibility to maintain the well-being of our natural economy in South Australia and that, while it is certainly possible to smuggle plants, fruit and vegetables easily across State borders, it should certainly be incumbent upon individuals not to want to do so. The philosophy that one plant or one apple or one pear will not make any difference is the wrong sort of philosophy, because it could be the one pear or piece of fruit that could make all the difference in the world.

That is a community education attitude and as Minister of Education I have said on a number of occasions that we need to build in that kind of civic responsibility, belief and attitude in people in a number of areas, and this is one of them. If one constantly relies on some kind of arbitrary enforcement procedure to achieve all of these things and pay no attention to the community education side, the effectiveness of the campaign will be reduced.

Certainly, I fully support any efforts by my colleague's Department to promote community education programmes, to make people aware that they individually have a responsibility to help make the system work. With those comments I repeat the point that there will be no change to the current policy: road blocks will be maintained. The Department has an ongoing review of the situation and will be doing so over the next two to three years. The Department has a commitment to make sure that fruit fly is not introduced and that every effort is taken to prevent its introduction or to prevent its spread from other States into South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am extremely pleased that the Government has seen fit to make the statement in the House that there will be no change in the present arrangement for intercepting fruit fly in South Australia. As the Minister has said, it is difficult to assess just how effective road blocks are but, by the same token, it is also difficult to assess what the implications would be if that barrier were to be dropped. South Australia has had very stringent rules in relation to the importation into South Australia of plant material and vines. The Phylloxera Act has been in existence since the last century and South Australia has managed, as a principal wine producing area of Australia, to keep phylloxera out of the State. I believe that that is very much due to what is laid down in the Phylloxera Act, which has been policed very vigorously by the Phylloxera Board over that time. I can only reiterate that I am very pleased with the statement that the Government has made.

Motion carried.

WATER AND DRAINAGE RATES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House condemns the Government for its irresponsible increase of 28 per cent in water and drainage rates in Government irrigation areas, especially at a time when unemployment in the

Riverland has risen by 100 per cent over the past year and grower returns are at an all-time low, and calls on the Government to:

- (a) rescind the 28 per cent increase in water and drainage rates;
- (b) instruct the Director of State Development to determine what increase in rates, if any, the irrigation industry can withstand; and
- (c) limit an increase only to a level which the Government can clearly demonstrate that the irrigators can sustain.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 989.)

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): Certainly I do not support the motion, but not because I do not have some degree of sympathy with the problem of growers in the Riverland. However, one must be realistic in assessing the responsibility that the Government and I, as the Minister, have not only to the Riverland but to the overall community in the State. The rationale for the increases in irrigation and drainage rates is really necessary to curtail the large and increasing deficits incurred by Government over the past four years. From 1979-80 to 1982-83 the deficits on irrigation and drainage amounted to \$29.6 million. Even with the increase of 28 per cent, irrigators are being asked to pay only 26 per cent of the total cost of services provided. Subsidies to irrigators have been increasing annually not only in absolute terms but also as a percentage of the total cost of providing irrigation and drainage.

One might then reasonably ask whether this increase in subsidy can be justified. The member for Chaffey has claimed that the Riverland is economically disadvantaged. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures in 1980-81 showed that Riverland irrigator household incomes were on average a little higher (not much) than those in the average Adelaide statistical division. Since then, conditions may have worsened in the Riverland but, unfortunately, they have also worsened elsewhere and I think that it must be remembered that—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: We are talking about the irrigators, not the total figures?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The point I am making is that stated irrigator household incomes in the A.B.S. figures understate the actual incomes themselves, because irrigators in some cases are able to record consumption expenses as costs and, indeed, on occasions because of the existence of a cash economy some receipts are not recorded at all.

Mr Lewis: You aren't calling those blokes liars, are you?
The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, I am making statements which are based on obvious facts. Indeed, there is a possibility of income splitting and other tax concessions. The average tax paid by an irrigator in the Riverland is less than half the tax paid by a city wage earner with the same pre-tax income. All in all, I do not think that we can reasonably claim that the irrigators are worse off on average than is the rest of the population. Therefore, we must consider whether it is equitable for the rest of the State to support those irrigators to the extent that it does at present.

I might also point out that unemployment figures are not available on a regional basis, so I suggest that the claim made by the member for Chaffey that unemployment in the Riverland had risen by 100 per cent is only his personal judgment. The action taken by this Government in increasing the rates by 28 per cent is consistent also with the recommendations of the Tonkin Government. In the Budget review set up by the Tonkin Government when forming the 1982-83 Budget, the following recommendation was made:

... the Department should not take any action in 1982-83 which would have the effect of increasing its overall impact on the Consolidated Revenue.

Over the past three years, increases made by the previous Government were in aggregate—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It's 15 per cent.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, in aggregate it is 46.6 per cent, and one might say quite seriously (and this is a claim

by the honourable member) that there ought to be a survey by the Government in regard to the ability of irrigators to pay.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Are you frightened of what that survey might show?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, I am coming to that shortly. If you will be patient, I will come to that, because I have had a reply from the Premier in relation to the request for a deputation. I will reply in a few days to those concerned. However, I might ask whether the previous Minister undertook such a survey to ascertain whether the growers had the ability to pay. As he says, the average was 15 per cent: the total over the three years was 46.6 per cent. Of course, the problems in the Riverland are not based on only one factor: they stem from a number of causes. One of them, which is basic, is the over-supply in the face of falling demand.

Low water prices that do not reflect the cost of supply slow down the structural changes made necessary by changes in the marketing environment for the produce of those irrigators. Irrigation water bills could probably be somewhat reduced, no doubt in some cases substantially, by better water practices. The Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Department of Agriculture through their extension services can provide information to irrigators on more efficient water practices. Therefore, I believe that the onus is on the growers to justify their claims that the water subsidy is in excess of the 74 per cent already granted, and it might be of interest to note that a survey shows that 31 per cent of growers are independent of farm incomes. For the information of the member for Chaffey and the House, I will reply to the representatives of the deputation from the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association in relation to the discussions we held some time ago.

I have had a reply from the Premier in relation to the request by that deputation as suggested by the member for Chaffey to ask the Premier to have the Director of State Development determine what increases in rates irrigation areas can stand. At this stage I can tell the honourable member that the Government proposes to assess not only the water charges but all the other factors which play a significant part in affecting the viability of the Riverland.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Are you going to assess the Government's operation and the efficiency of the Government's operation?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, that will all be part of the proposal. To this end it is the Government's intention to establish a Riverland development council which will be convened by the Department of State Development. It is proposed to fully assess and investigate all the relevant matters, including irrigation and drainage charges which have an impact on the general viability of the Riverland and indeed the growers in particular. One of the prime functions of the council would be to provide assistance for those irrigators in financial difficulty and to provide adjustment advice, and I believe that this is the most effective means of assistance since, despite the fact that subsidies have been increasing annually, the growers situation, has not improved. I think the member for Chaffey would agree with me on that. We must look at the whole situation in general rather than just from the point of view of the growers.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: In comparing the Renmark Irrigation Trust operation with the Government operation, it should be remembered that the Government operates with a board.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That could be the case.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member had an opportunity to express his opinion when he put the motion to the House, and I am now making a response. It may be that overall the development council will address that question. It may be that the Renmark Irrigation Trust, for example, could be a more efficient and effective body for conducting such activities in the Riverland. That matter has to be assessed. I am not suggesting, as the member for Chaffey is suggesting, that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is inefficient and ineffective.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Cost inefficient.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not agree with that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not agree with the number of interjections being made.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is a matter of judgment, and I do not agree that that is the case: I think the E. & W.S. Department is a very effective and efficient department. I am rather surprised about the member for Chaffey's suggesting this as he was the Minister in charge of that Department for the past three years. I think he is casting a reflection on not only the Department but himself in particular. Water authorities overseas as well as in Australia are recognising that charging realistic water prices is the best way to prevent water wastage and to promote more efficient and more effective use of water. This is particularly relevant to South Australia where water is our most valuable natural resource. No South Australian needs reminding that water is a scarce and vital commodity.

Already the Government has studied at some length a range of issues in view of the increased deficits associated with operations in the Government irrigation areas, while at the same time the viability of some of the irrigators has continued to be questioned. The problem of viability of certain irrigators is not new: it was recognised in an Industries Assistance Commission Report in 1976, and certain readjustment mechanisms were proposed. However, since that time, sadly, some of those issues seem to have been put in the too-hard basket. One thing is definite: it is absolutely clear that assistance to those irrigators who cannot make ends meet should not be by means of providing low irrigation and drainage rates to all concerned. The assistance should be directed at those who really need it. In fact, the Government is endeavouring to introduce an overall package to help solve this problem once and for all. I have already foreshadowed the development authority concept and the need for appropriate public involvement.

I want to make absolutely clear that the Government takes very seriously the future of the Riverland, and it is currently working on a number of fronts to resolve issues associated with that area. It will not be easy to find a solution. I do not suggest that the problems will be solved in a year or in two years. The matter of finding a long-term solution needs to be tackled immediately. I shall be replying in writing to the member for Chaffey, as well as to the members of the deputation who called on me recently, wherein I shall set out the Government's intentions. We have certainly gone part of the way concerning the suggestion that the honourable member made about undertaking an overall assessment and review of the problems associated with the Riverland.

I do not support the motion, although, as I said in the first instance, I have a degree of sympathy for those experiencing problems in the area. I have given a very general outline of proposals that we need to implement, and I would hope that in due course they can assist in resolving difficulties faced by those in the area. The problems are caused by a combination of factors. We cannot simply isolate the matter of water charges. I understand that water charges to growers comprise a small part of their overall costs.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That's not the case.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I believe that water charges comprise something like 7 per cent or 8 per cent of a grower's total costs. Therefore, there are plenty of other factors that need assessing and determining in regard to the viability of the area. I oppose the motion.

Mr MAYES secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:

That this House condemns the Government for its policy of compulsory unionism under the guise of preference to unionists and requires the Government to withdraw all instructions designed to give effect to their compulsory unionism policy.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 991.)

Mr MAYES (Unley): I oppose the motion.

Mr Lewis: Go on!

Mr MAYES: That might surprise the member for Mallee. This tired old war horse has been dragged out constantly by members of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAYES: Statements made by members opposite on this matter of preference to unionists indicate their lack of understanding of the industrial relations system. Few members opposite, if any, have had any real experience in the real world of industrial relations. I can stand here and say that with a very clear conscience, because the times that I have had dealings with members opposite—

Mr Lewis: You've learnt to shave since then!

Mr MAYES: At the time when I had dealings with members opposite on these matters the member for Davenport was the then Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Mr Lewis: A very good Minister, too.

Mr MAYES: That might be the member for Mallee's opinion, but it was not mine.

Members interjecting:

Mr MAYES: If the member for Mallee wants to interject, why did the former Minister nick off with copies of the Cawthorne Report, a report for which he called? He was not prepared to release it to the community and yet the community paid for it. But let us not get down to tin tacks yet: let us talk about the issue before us, because quite frankly the member for Davenport in my opinion left a lot to be desired as the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The debate was dragged up by the Deputy Leader on 21 September. He said nothing new, and we had the same tired old conservative knee-jerk reaction that we have had for years.

The Opposition is easily confused and endeavouring to confuse the public about this issue it is trying to say that preference to unionists is in fact compulsory unionism. In saying that, members opposite are showing that they know nothing about industrial relations. For seven years I worked in an organisation that worked with preference to unionists and not once during that time was there a major problem about the rights of individuals. Not once during that time did I hear criticism about the policy.

Mr Oswald: You got rid of the non-unionists and had only unionists as employees.

Mr MAYES: Now we have the chemist shop routine from the back bench. They are experts in cyclamates, and now they are experts in industrial relations. I respect their expertise: they should respect mine.

Mr Oswald: We're not scaremongers, either.

Mr MAYES: The honourable member has taken the words out of my mouth, because that is exactly what the Deputy Leader is trying to do: he is trying to scaremonger and create a false impression in the minds of the public about this Government's policies on unionism. They are policies that work and they are operated democratically. Joining a union is a democratic process. Each member of a union has a vote, and unions are the most regulated of any organisation, because they are required to comply with the law of the State and of the Commonwealth.

Members opposite interpret preference to unionists as being compulsory unionism. Never have they been so far from the truth, although they try desperately to go further on many topics. The Deputy Leader kept grinding the point about compulsory unionism in an attempt to get the message across to the public. As I have said before, every time I went out into the community (and I was out there for a good many years before the last election) I found that any time the Deputy Leader came out to speak on any issue—mining or anything else; he often broadened his portfolios, coming in during the education dispute to give advice to the then Minister of Education and, on another occasion, to the then Minister of Industrial Affairs—I had people telephoning and asking me what he was talking about. They said that every time they heard the Deputy Premier (as he was then) they had doubts about what he was saying. He is now trying to drag out this tired old workhorse of compulsory unionism and turning it around from being preference to unionists.

I would like to refer now to what our Deputy Premier said on 10 November 1976 in his speech about this policy which has been with us for a long time. I would have thought that members opposite would speak to a few of their colleagues in companies in industry to find out the facts of life and how the policy actually operates.

Mr Lewis: We have.

Mr MAYES: I am surprised because the statements by honourable members opposite do not reflect what occurs in the real world. Preference to unionists has operated in Commonwealth awards since the early 1960s, and many major awards in Australia, including those covering the oil industry and the airlines, contain such provisions. The policy of preference to unionists has succeeded in producing greater harmony in the whole industrial situation. The policy of the Australian Labor Party was enunciated by the present Deputy Premier when, as Minister of Labour and Industry, he said, on 10 November 1976 in this place:

Our policy is preference for unionists in engaging people for employment. In the present economic situation . . . there are so many good, dedicated unionists out of a job, men and women with no blemishes on their character, with undoubted qualifications, that this policy would in all cases ensure that the vacancies will go to union men and women. We are prepared to include those who are willing to join the appropriate union, even if they are not unionists at the time of engagement. Even this can be seen as a concession. Whatever we do, a large number of unionists . . . will remain out of work.

Obviously, that is the situation in which we find ourselves today with the high level of unemployment. When a person applies for a position and is interviewed, he or she is asked to join the appropriate union and, all other things being equal, few people object to that request. However, if such persons object, a certain course of action is available to them. Members opposite are not aware of the provisions in respect of this matter and they have not had the opportunity to see them operating. I have seen them work and only once in over 12 years in the industrial relations area have I seen that provision taken advantage of.

Preference to unionists has worked well, as evidenced by statements in the report prepared at the behest of the previous Government by Industrial Magistrate Frank Cawthorne,

who has had long experience in the industrial relations field. Indeed, Mr Cawthorne is one of the most eminent magistrates in this field. At page 29 of his report, he refers to this matter under the heading 'Union Security: Preference to Unionists and the Objection to Union Membership'. This report was presented to the Minister of Industrial Affairs in the Tonkin Government after interested parties had been invited to submit requests and suggestions and later to comment on the working papers prepared before the actual report was published. Mr Cawthorne submitted the report to the Minister, but it disappeared.

Mr Groom: How much did it cost to prepare?

Mr MAYES: At least \$100 000.

Mr Hamilton: It must have been for the former Minister's private use.

Mr MAYES: From my experience of the former Minister, I would say that he needed it. Regarding preference to unionists, Mr Cawthorne stated:

The essential strategy of my proposals on this topic was to recognise that trade unions are essential for the proper function of Australian industrial relations systems and the consequent desirability that persons as a rule should belong to an appropriate union.

That is a great chunk that members opposite will find hard to digest. I remember the remarks made by the member for Bragg when he ran for the district of Albert Park, but I will not drag up those old war horses. Perhaps the member for Albert Park will remind the member for Bragg of what he said. I would not like the honourable member to attend a meeting and present a case for trade unionism. When dealing with this matter, the conservative members on the other side of the Chamber oppose trade unionism as a knee-jerk reaction.

Mr Hamilton: They would go well in Queensland.

Mr MAYES: Possibly they are all looking for an invitation to go up there and support Joh. Mr Cawthorne's report continues:

Consistent with this approach I suggested that it would be appropriate for the Commission to have power to award preference to unionists in a meaningful form.

Mr Cawthorne understands, after many years as an industrial magistrate, what preference to unionists means: it does not mean 'compulsory unionism'. A closed shop is a work place where there is an agreement between the union and the employer. If members opposite want to bitch about a closed shop, they should bitch to their supporters who enjoy such an agreement. Indeed, many large organisations have closed-shop agreements.

Mr Lewis: They are a plague on the economy.

Mr MAYES: The honourable member should know, because in this place we are constantly plagued with his comments. Mr Cawthorne's report continues:

I adhere to the view originally expressed in the discussion paper that there is a case for allowing the Commission a discretion to award preference to unionists in appropriate cases.

This report supports the view of this Government. Preference to unionists works in practice and it should continue because it produces harmony in industrial relations. This is a system that members opposite must recognise exists, though it is something that most of those members find difficult to accept in our current industrial relations system.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That, in the opinion of the House, all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and

those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust which charge at a greater rate than any other country area be placed on the same charging schedule as metropolitan Adelaide.

(Continued from 14 September. Page 842.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to say one or two things in relation to the motion. I do not intend to conclude my remarks, because the Minister has advised me that if I conclude them next week he will respond. I am looking forward to his response. However, under the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act, 1962-1965, the South Australian Government provides subsidies to enable reduced tariffs to be made available to consumers supplied by independently owned and operated country electricity undertakings in areas where costs of supply, particularly from local diesel power stations, are high. The payment of subsidies is administered by the Trust.

During the year electricity undertakings at Glendambo and Penong, owned by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, were approved for admission to the subsidy scheme. Subsidies paid to country undertakings during the past five financial years are as follows: year ended June 1979—1 809 000; 1980—1 920 000; 1981—2 503 000; 1982—2 584 000; 1983—2 919 000. There has been a gradual increase in the amount of money to subsidise this scheme. At the same time the increase in subsidy to the metropolitan Adelaide system would have increased at a far greater rate than has the subsidy under the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act.

Mr Lewis: That does not make it right.

Mr GUNN: That does not make it right. Also, the amount of money required to subsidise the Festival Theatre Trust would have increased considerably. I have the sets of schedules for the supply of power in my electorate. The first one is the Penong rate, which I will say something about, and the second one is for Ceduna. They are statistical, and I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

PENONG TARIFFS

DOMESTIC TARIFF

For the first 80 kW.hs per quarter	15.04 c/kw.h
For the next 220 kW.hs per quarter	9.27 c/kw.h
For the next 1 000 kW.hs per quarter	7.16 c/kw.h
For the next 1 000 kW.hs per quarter	13.00 c/kw.h
For the next 1 000 kW.hs per quarter	16.80 c/kw.h
For each additional kW.h per quarter	22.40 c/kw.h

GENERAL PURPOSE AND INDUSTRIAL TARIFF

For the first 450 kW.hs per quarter	18.54 c/kw.h
For the next 3 000 kW.hs per quarter	15.13 c/kw.h
For the next 4 500 kW.hs per quarter	10.64 c/kw.h
For the next 10 000 kW.hs per quarter	13.00 c/kw.h
For the next 35 000 kW.hs per quarter	16.80 c/kw.h
For each additional kW.h per quarter	22.40 c/kw.h
There will be a minimum charge of \$7.26 per quarter.	

CEDUNA TARIFFS

(Applicable to independent electricity undertakings who charge Electricity Trust rates plus 10 per cent.)

Tariffs which will apply to electricity used after the first normal reading on or after 1 December 1982.

DOMESTIC (M)	Cents
The first 80 kW.h per quarter	15.04
The next 220 kW.h per quarter	9.27
Next 2 700 kW.h per quarter	7.16
All additional consumption per quarter	7.98

INDUSTRIAL (P)

The first 450 kW.h per quarter	18.54
The next 3 000 kW.h per quarter	15.13
The next 4 500 kW.h per quarter	10.60
The next 150 000 kW.h per quarter	8.46
The next 750 000 kW.h per quarter	6.96
Additional consumption	6.72

FARM (R)

The first 900 kW.h per quarter	15.68
The next 3 600 kW.h per quarter	10.78
The next 150 000 kW.h per quarter	8.10
Additional consumption	6.91

GENERAL PURPOSE (S)

The first 450 kW.h per quarter	18.54
The next 3 000 kW.h per quarter	15.13
The next 4 500 kW.h per quarter	10.64
The next 150 000 kW.h per quarter	8.79
The next 750 000 kW.h per quarter	6.97
Additional consumption	6.72

OFF-PEAK (J) AND SUPPLEMENTARY OFF-PEAK WATER HEATING (K)

First 3 000 kW.h per quarter	3.95
All additional consumption	4.36

MINIMUM CHARGE

\$7.26 per quarter
(\$5.94 per quarter for Supplementary Off-Peak Water Heating i.e. used in conjunction with a solar or slow combustion heater etc.)

Mr GUNN: To highlight what I have said over the past few weeks when I indicated on one occasion that it would cost up to \$2 000 a year for a household at Coober Pedy, I ask members to listen to some accounts I have here from Penong. This is only the second lot of accounts these people have had to pay. In a 57-day period for an ordinary house the first account was for \$274 and the next account was for a 90-day period at \$479. We have an instance of a 56-day period in the main street of Penong at \$479 and a 90-day period \$583. We have one in the township of Penong for a 90-day period at \$442 and for 104 days, \$844. If one multiplies that by three it exceeds what the people of Coober Pedy are paying.

It clearly demonstrates that if there was any justice in this place everyone in South Australia should be charged on the same basis. If we can subsidise other operations, there is absolutely no reason why my constituents should be penalised. Probably some of the people in the member for Mallee's district would also be penalised. Let us look at another one. For 104 days the account was \$349. We have one for an ordinary very small business with a home in the main street of Penong where for 104 days the electricity account was \$665. Bear in mind that those people also have to supply their own water, they have limited television reception, and although they have the Eyre Highway going through the town the secondary school children have to be taken by bus into Ceduna, and these people are paying for living in an isolated community. I do not believe they should be discriminated against in this fashion. I have another account for 104 days at \$592 for a farm just out of Penong. A small hotel had an account for 104 days at \$1 639.

Such accounts clearly demonstrate the kinds of problems that my constituents in that part of South Australia are facing in relation to power charges. There have been reports and inquiries and various other comments made, but it has obviously been put in the 'too hard basket' for too long. I will not be satisfied in this place until I see my constituents getting some justice. Recently, it has been necessary for me to raise this particular matter, the problems of water, and various other matters in this House, to try to get some justice for the isolated communities. I will not let up on these matters until I see some justice. It is fairly obvious

that in the near future I will have to go through the Auditor-General's Report and start to highlight some of the scandalous waste of taxpayers' money as far as my constituents are concerned. Government funds are spent on areas for which there is no justification whatsoever. I will have to list those at great length if the Government will not come to the party.

As well as at Penong there are problems at Marla Bore, where charges are far too high. We are running the risk of making that operation unviable. I know of a person who has had to revert to using his own generator because of the high cost of electricity. We have had much nonsense talked about supporting the tourist industry, yet there is that example of a person being badly affected in that way. We have also had the situation in the Flinders Ranges at Arkaroola. I am saying to the Minister of Tourism that we have had much talk about tourism but we make nonsense of it if people will be affected in such a way because their tariffs will have to be increased to meet the cost of supplying electricity, which is essential in motels.

There is the problem concerning the people at Arkaroola who are providing extra facilities at a very high cost and the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom, reduced the subsidy that they could receive on diesel oil for generating electricity. That is difficult to understand. They do not have the benefit of being connected to the grid system. I have the problem in another tourist area of Blinman and those adjoining properties and at Wilpena where those people want to be connected and, for some unknown reason which is beyond my understanding as to why they have had to wait so long, they cannot get connected. It is not a fair go. So, in view of the fact that the Minister is not here to respond (he has other matters to attend to today) he has assured me that he will respond next week. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 September. Page 842.)

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I will not be very long this afternoon. I wish to finish my remarks that I had leave to continue on a previous occasion. I have already spoken at length about this tragic, ill-conceived Bill which emanates from the member for Murray. I wish to deal briefly with clause 3 of the Bill, which concerns section 68 of the principal Act. That section presently empowers any member of the Police Force to stop, search, or detain a motor vehicle or a person with a reasonable suspicion of the presence of stolen goods. Stolen goods cover goods obtained by a felony or a misdemeanour. It appears that this section has never been amended since the commencement of the Police Offences Act in 1953. The Bill tends to take the situation quite a deal further. First, it inserts in new subparagraph (ii) of subclause (1) (a) and also in new subparagraph (ii) of subclause (1) (b) of section 68 the word 'offence'. Of course, offence has a very wide meaning. It is not only limited to felony or misdemeanour or indictable or non-indictable offences. It can catch breaches of quarantine laws or in fact any other breach of any regulation or Act of Parliament. The Mitchell Committee, and certainly the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No. 2 on criminal investigation, recommended that this section be limited to serious offences, because if it is in terms of just an offence in general terms it can catch such things as breaches of quarantine regulations.

People who have crossed the border from Victoria to South Australia with some forbidden fruit can invite the application of this new section 68 in which the police can stop people, detain them for two hours and then get an extension of time. I do not suggest that the police would be silly enough to do that, but my purpose in amplifying this sort of situation indicates that the Opposition has gone much further than I believe perhaps it intends. I would ask that it seriously reflects on the drafting of this section and, at the very least, limits the operation of section 68 or give consideration to limiting it to a serious offence. I cannot understand why it has not done that in terms of the Law Reform Commission Report and the Mitchell Committee recommendations. So, it is far too wide and can amount to quite a serious infringement on the ordinary comings and goings of people. I do not think that the police want to be put into a situation where they are using these type of powers for very minor, trifling offences. That is my first criticism of the way in which the legislation is drafted.

Dealing with the new subsection (3), the Mitchell Committee recommended that any detention period be authorised by a special magistrate and not a justice, because that can mean any justice of the peace who might not necessarily be a legally qualified person. In addition, the Mitchell Committee recommended that the maximum period of detention be set at 12 hours. The manner in which the member for Murray has drafted this legislation is really unlimited so that a person can for example be apprehended on suspicion, and quite rightly so by the police, but that person might find not only is he in custody for some two hours but could be in custody for a further two hours, and a further two hours, and a further two hours. In other words, if a justice is accommodating enough, one could really misuse this section and in the worst possible circumstances, say in a time of crisis, although not necessarily even in a time of crisis.

Imagine the manner in which the Queensland Government could utilise a section such as this. It could utilise it in such a way as to bring about a very serious infringement of basic civil liberties. Once again the Opposition has not sought to balance the legislation with elementary checks and balances. Where is the right for the person to seek some legal advice during this detention period? Where is that person's right to be heard on any extension? It was these considerations that led the Mitchell Committee to setting a fixed time, and that was a period of 12 hours. After that, if one does not have the evidence, the person has to be allowed to go. Surely, 12 hours is a reasonable sort of recommendation that emanated from the Mitchell Committee, but oh no, the Opposition parade as Liberals but when it comes down to legislation, one finds that their legislation is some of the most extreme right-wing legislation one could ever imagine, and this is an example of it.

I do not want to be repetitive and go over the same matters I covered when dealing with the new section 78, but the Bill is a gross infringement of civil liberties without adequate checks and balances. I have asked some of the members opposite to get up and justify this type of legislation. I would like to hear from the member for Glenelg, as I challenged him last time, to justify the way in which his constituents, himself or indeed any South Australian or any person passing through South Australia, can be apprehended *ad infinitum* under this type of legislation without any proper checks and balances.

I have said right from the outset that the police do need to be clothed with adequate powers. They do have some genuine grievances in relation to the present laws but there is a process for amending laws in a rational manner where people are consulted. We know from the way in which this Bill was rushed that it was done for some sort of political

gain and political capital; there has not been adequate thought given to it. The drafting of clause 3 reflects again what I have said: it is completely unlimited. It is a law on a par with the South African type of laws and we can only imagine—

An honourable member interjecting.

Mr GROOM: I think the honourable member ought to look at some of the laws that have been passed in South Africa. His legislation is on fours with that. It is the type of law that one would expect, particularly some of the problems associated with section 78, to find in countries like the Philippines. But no, we find them being sought to be foisted on the people of South Australia. That is all I want to say about clause 3. It is just as badly drafted and badly thought through as clause 5.

There is only a small matter I would like to raise in relation to clause 7. It deals with photographs and fingerprints of persons, but I would tend to think that, if the police are to be eventually clothed with the power in similar terms to clause 7 or be it the new section 68, the provision ought to cover copies and other methods of recording such information. For example, the Bill states:

Where photographs or fingerprints are taken of a person under this section, or he supplies a sample of his handwriting under this section, and the charge against him is subsequently withdrawn or he is not convicted upon that charge, then all such photographs, fingerprints and samples of handwriting shall be destroyed.

It does not say what happens with the copies. I do not think that that is necessarily a major matter, but it is a matter that ought to be included, because the originals might be destroyed but there might still be all the copies floating around, and again I draw the member for Murray's attention to that omission in his legislation. I do not propose to elaborate on what I said when I spoke at length in dealing with section 78. It is a very bad piece of legislation: it is seriously deficient, and I urge the member for Murray to reconsider his position and withdraw the legislation.

I do not think that that is necessarily a major matter, but it is a matter that ought to be included, because the originals might be destroyed but there might still be all the copies floating around, and again I draw the member for Murray's attention to that omission in his legislation. I do not propose to elaborate on what I said when I spoke at length in dealing with section 78. It is a very bad piece of legislation: it is seriously deficient, and I urge the member for Murray to reconsider his position and withdraw the legislation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): It is my intention to speak only briefly on this occasion and to seek leave to continue my remarks. However, at the outset I want to say how extremely disappointed I am in the Government's attitude to this legislation. I find it quite incredible that the Chief Secretary has not taken the opportunity even to speak in this debate. He interjects and says that he has his own legislation. It is rather incredible that the Government, which has been in office for 12 months, on various occasions when I have questioned the Chief Secretary in this House or made reference to the legislation during debate, has made no mention, nor has the Chief Secretary, of that legislation. It was only when the legislation was introduced that there was a bit of a flurry on the other side and we learned that they were racing around and consulting with people, trying to work out exactly in which direction they were heading in relation to this legislation. Again, I say that it is very disappointing indeed that the Chief Secretary has not taken the opportunity to speak in the debate. I believe that he has been in the Chamber on most occasions when it has been debated.

Mr Mathwin: He has ducked for cover.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I agree with my colleague the member for Glenelg: he has ducked for cover, and the new Chief Secretary—the member for Hartley up the back—is the one who seems to have the front running. The member for Hartley, who has just resumed his seat, has suggested in something of a frivolous manner that the police in this State do not want this legislation. I can assure him that the police in this State do want this legislation and have made it quite clear, publicly and privately, that they are looking for it to be introduced into this House and to be implemented. It was also suggested that we have rushed into the situation in which we have introduced this legislation. The member should know: if he does not, the Chief Secretary should know; and if he does not, his Government should know that very similar legislation was prepared during the time of the previous Liberal Government and was almost ready to be introduced when we left office.

There was a great deal of consultation with the police and members, as well as other interested members of the community, regarding this legislation. So it is quite stupid for the member for Hartley to try to make some political capital out of the situation and suggest that we have only rushed into seeing the necessity to introduce this legislation. It is well thought out legislation, and when I speak next in this House on this legislation I will explain exactly some of the so-called problems that the member for Hartley has in relation to it. However, I would suggest that the Government needs to get its act together because, if it intends to vote against the Bill, I can assure members opposite that the police in this State, whom I would hope that the Chief Secretary would want to support, will be vitally disappointed in the Government. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NATURAL DEATH BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September. Page 845.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support this Bill. In my view, it is quite an interesting but fairly hypothetical Bill, and I was mildly surprised that it was introduced at all, because the care provided in hospitals today in South Australia to the terminally ill is so good and caring on the part of the nursing staff is also such that this type of legislation is probably not necessary. However, it has been designed for a purpose, and that is to formalise probably what goes on at present. The nursing staff involved in the care of the terminally ill are very highly qualified people who are used to dealing with the problems associated with the last days of one's life on this earth, and dealing with the next of kin.

The Bill will be the subject of a conscience vote on the part of the members of the Opposition. It is designed to allow a patient to give to his doctor at a time when he was fully conscious and in full control of his mental faculties clear directions against prolonging the dying process. I think that it is an aspect of the termination of one's own life in which everyone should have a say if that be his wish. A patient may direct his doctor that, if death is imminent or inevitable (and I use carefully this choice of words), a life support system be not used or, if it is being used, he can direct that it be terminated. I think that we should be very clear that this Bill does not in any way infer that euthanasia will exist. It specifically excludes euthanasia, and I think that it is worth while to look at the definition of euthanasia so that it is clear in everyone's mind that the Bill cannot be mistaken for a euthanasia Bill.

The definition of euthanasia is: the painless killing of people while suffering from an incurable or painful disease. For those members who are perhaps not too clear about it, 'painless killing' is a case where it may be decided to give an overdose of some type of drug which could bring about a cardiac arrest or by some other means bring life to a conclusion. This Bill specifically excludes that, as I will show. I refer to clause 7 (2), which specifically states:

Nothing in this Act authorises an act that causes or accelerates death as distinct from an act that permits the dying process to take its natural course.

I think that it is very evident from that that there is no way that this Bill could be misconstrued in any manner as being a Bill for euthanasia. Members may wish to take into account several matters in exercising their conscience vote on this matter. A terminal illness is specifically defined in the Bill as follows:

any illness, injury or degeneration of mental or physical faculties such that death would, if extraordinary measures were not undertaken, be imminent [and] from which there is no reasonable prospect of a temporary or permanent recovery even if extraordinary measures were undertaken.

The key words are death being 'imminent', and there being 'no reasonable prospect of temporary or permanent recovery'. It is very easy for a layman to say that a terminal illness could be any illness which inevitably will lead to death. There must be a very clear demarcation in definition here: what is meant in the Bill and what the medical profession will mean when it refers to a terminal illness. It is interesting to note that already incorporated in the law is a provision specifying that an adult patient has the absolute right to refuse treatment. There is no doctor in this State who will give treatment to a patient who has said to that doctor that he does not want that treatment.

However, if a patient is unconscious or heavily sedated on drugs and the end is drawing nigh, then the onus is thrown back on the shoulders of the medical practitioner who must decide what to do. Under the circumstances it should be possible for a doctor to be given clear directions by the patient. This Bill provides a mechanism whereby a patient can advise a doctor of his or her wishes in the event of his or her having a terminal illness (and I refer specifically to the definition given for terminal illness). It also relieves the doctor, and particularly the next of kin, of having to make what is on many occasions a very traumatic decision on whether a life support system should or should not be terminated.

During the last session we passed in this House a Bill which gave legal recognition to brain death. I have been advised by various doctors with whom I have discussed this Bill that in the past there could easily have been patients who had been dead, by brain death definition, but who were artificially sustained on respirators which doctors were reluctant to turn off, thereby withdrawing any extraordinary treatment, lest they transgressed some technicality. Also, there are the theological and ethical reasons that are put forward, whereby certain doctors have expressed an anxiety that the procedure of withdrawing a life support system would in actual fact be killing a human being. Perhaps that question should be addressed. In my view, this ethical opinion avoids the crucial issue in this Bill, namely, that eventually every human being will die of natural causes. All that is happening by this Bill is that the right is being given to a patient to go to a doctor and say 'If I reach that stage where it is absolutely hopeless, a life support system should be terminated and then I will be allowed to die of natural causes.' That is the crux of the Bill.

It should be remembered that it is the doctor who decides, after carrying out the appropriate tests, when a system should be terminated or when the patient has reached that

crucial point. Once it has been decided by clinical means that death is imminent and that there is no prospect of any temporary or permanent recovery, even if extraordinary measures were implemented by putting a patient on a machine, if a patient has expressed a desire while conscious, fully competent and understanding what he or she was saying, to have a support system terminated, then, under this Bill, the wishes of that patient can be met.

I urge honourable members to support this Bill. I refer back to my opening remarks that at the moment in this State nursing care is such that virtually all aspects covered by this Bill are taken into account by nursing staff, medical specialists and nursing specialists who understand the last few days of a person's life, and they are already catering for the needs of people at this time. In closing, I refer to the remarks made by the Hon. Frank Blevins, in another place, who introduced the Bill originally. I think his remarks in summing up put the matter in a nutshell. He said:

The Bill allows people who are about to die a say in their own dying process, not if they are going to die, not when they are going to die, but how they are going to die.

It is everyone's right to decide how they are going to die, if it is within the realms of possibility. I ask honourable members to support this Bill.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That—

- (a) a Select Committee be established to inquire into and report upon all aspects of the guarantees given to the Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows councils in respect of South Australian Local Government Grants commission funds, and alternative sources of funds, and all aspects of assistance given to councils involved in earlier amalgamation arrangements;
- (b) the committee be so structured as to be chaired by the Premier or, alternatively, the most senior House of Assembly Minister available and comprising the Leader of the Opposition or his most senior shadow Minister available in the House of Assembly, and three other members in accordance with practice, but excluding any member who served on the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows;
- (c) the members of that Select Committee be required to attend as witnesses if so requested to by this committee; and
- (d) the Select Committee be required to report on the likely consequence of any future local government amalgamations or adjustments being able to succeed without there being a clear undertaking that the abnormal costs associated with the particular Parliamentary directions will be provided from Grants Commission or Department of Local Government funds.

(Continued from 21 September. Page 994.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I oppose the motion. There is absolutely no need for a Select Committee to investigate this matter. Members of this House should be well aware of the circumstances surrounding the need to reassess the boundaries of the District Council of Meadows, and I do not intend to relate this information again today. However, I wish to deal with the circumstances which led to the supplying of incorrect figures to the District Councils of Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows, following the conclusion of the Select Committee which created new boundaries for the District Council of Meadows.

After the final determination by Parliament, it was necessary to complete arrangements with the councils involved

to transfer assets, liabilities and personnel to the District Councils of Strathalbyn and Mount Barker from the District Council of Meadows. The Local Government Advisory Commission was requested to report on the disposition of assets and liabilities and the Department of Local Government was asked to report on the transfer of personnel between the councils and the conditions to apply to such transfers.

It was during the course of these negotiations that the District Councils of Mount Barker and Strathalbyn said that it would be an advantage if they had some indication of their allocations from the Grants Commission for the coming year. As a result of this request, the wrong figures were provided; in fact, the figures given were future estimates which may have been realised during the next two or three years.

These figures should not have been released and, as such represent a form of misinformation, which it can be argued might have led the councils into making budget decisions that might have created serious financial difficulties. As I have previously stated in this place, the full Commission was not aware of these figures, nor was I as Minister. The figures provided were: District Council of Mount Barker, \$362 000; District Council of Strathalbyn, \$214 000; and Corporation of the Town of Meadows, \$580 000.

I have also clearly indicated during debate on this issue that these figures were not provided as an inducement to the councils concerned to accept the boundary changes. They were supplied on a confidential basis so that the councils could make budget decisions to cater for increases in staff members that would result from the transfer. However, there is no doubt that the expectations of the councils were raised unrealistically.

On Tuesday 23 August 1983, I received the Grants Commission allocations for the 1983-84 financial year. The allocation will be: for the District Council of Mount Barker, \$255 000; for the District Council of Strathalbyn, \$180 000; and the Corporation of the Town of Meadows, \$530 000. These figures represent increases of 17 per cent to Mount Barker, 17.6 per cent to Strathalbyn, and 10 per cent to Meadows. This compares with a State-wide average increase of 8.2 per cent. I then indicated to the House that officers of my Department would carry out an investigation of the councils' financial positions and assess the impact of the short-falls of the councils' budgets. My principal concern in carrying out this investigation was to ascertain what assistance should be given to overcome any immediate and serious budgetary problems resulting from the wrong figures being used.

This investigation has now been completed, and the Government has examined the results of my officers' assessments. The District Council of Mount Barker made a number of decisions using these figures which it may not have made otherwise. These have been identified as engaging a part-time clerical worker, proceeding with a new computer installation, and forgoing a rate increase in the annexed Meadows Ward. In view of these decisions, I have approved an *ex gratia* payment of \$60 200 to the Mount Barker Council to enable it to meet these commitments. The District Council of Strathalbyn, although the council was provided with a figure of \$214 000, budgeted for \$180 000, and indeed received that amount from the Grants Commission.

My officers have told me that the Strathalbyn Council had not been seriously affected by the wrong figures and will be able to meet its commitments under existing funding arrangements. Similarly, the Corporation of the Town of Meadows, although that council was supplied with a figure of \$580 000, budgeted for an allocation of \$512 000 and received from the Grants Commission an allocation of \$530 000. Therefore, the Meadows Council, too, has not

been seriously affected and would be able to meet existing commitments. I have, however, approved setting up grants of \$5 000 to the District Councils of Strathalbyn and Mount Barker to assist these two councils with expenses involved with integrating the additional areas into their operations. This brings Mount Barker's total payment to \$65 200. Further, I have asked the District Council of Strathalbyn to provide me with another report in three months time on further costs associated with the boundary changes. I have told it that I shall be pleased to consider additional financial assistance following that submission. I have personally discussed the Government's position with the councils involved and I believe each of the councils has accepted the results of the assessment and the decision on compensation.

I stress to the House that all Grants Commission allocations have been made in the appropriate independent way. As I have previously stated in this place, there is an established Grants Commission policy in relation to council boundary changes which states 'Changes in grant levels arising from boundary changes will be introduced accordingly over three years'. In other words, the effects of the boundary changes on funding for the councils will be reflected in future years in the allocations from the Commission. I have assessed the effects of the provision of wrong information to the councils and made assistance available to ensure that any commitments resulting from the supply of this information can be met. In closing, I inform the House that considerable effort has been made to resolve this difficult situation to the satisfaction of those involved, an effort which has been acknowledged with appreciation by all councils concerned.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I find the Minister's statement disgusting. What an incredible performance! It seems to me that the Minister's Freudian preoccupation with information about which he has been dreaming is returning to him and making it impossible for him to see the motion in its real literal perspective. The motion moved by the member for Light is in four parts, the first of which seeks to establish a Select Committee to inquire into and report on all aspects of the guarantees given to the Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows Councils in respect of South Australian Local Government Grants Commission funds. In his speech the Minister of Local Government referred to the proposed Select Committee inquiry, but he did not canvass the matter fully as regards the three district councils, the investigation of certain grants, the alternative sources of funds and all aspects of assistance given to councils involved in earlier amalgamation arrangements, which is the burden of the first part of the motion.

The second part of the motion refers to the composition of the Select Committee, but the Minister did not address that part of the motion. He has ignored the capacity of a Select Committee to clarify the issues that the Minister thinks he has put to rest by making the statements that he has made. Clearly, he wishes members to accept his version of what has happened when, in fact, various people have told us several conflicting versions of what has happened. I am not satisfied that he has managed to do that, and I do not think that any other member in this place should be satisfied on that point. Members of the Select Committee that investigated certain aspects of this matter should be required to appear before the Select Committee that is proposed to be set up by the motion.

The third part of the motion, therefore, provides that members of the previous Select Committee shall be required to attend as witnesses if so requested by this Committee. The fourth part requires the proposed Select Committee to report on the likely consequences of any future amalgamations or adjustments to boundaries, so that we will not have

to go through again what we have had to go through on this occasion.

So, the Minister has seen this motion in a paranoid fashion. He has ignored completely what the member for Light has sought to do: to provide the Parliament with an insight into what has happened on this occasion, to establish the facts beyond dispute, and to ensure that procedures will be laid down for the future by the proposed Select Committee so that certain events will not recur. Why cannot the Minister understand that? I wonder! It makes me worry even more now that his version is just that, a version, and whereas I would have expected it to be something of the truth, it does not appear to be the truth. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

STATUTES REPEAL (HEALTH) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Health Commission has been reviewing Statutes in the health area with a view to recommending repeal of those which are no longer necessary. This Bill aims to repeal those Acts so far identified as anachronistic and inappropriate to retain on the Statute books.

1. Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947:

Earlier this century local councils were responsible for the treatment, care and custody of persons suffering from infectious diseases. Councils were required to pay the daily average cost of caring for such patients in what were then public hospitals, notably the Royal Adelaide Hospital. When the cost to the councils rose the councils claimed they could probably look after their patients more cheaply themselves and so built a hospital—The Infectious Diseases Hospital at Northfield. However, by the mid-1940s with improved public health measures and resulting low bed occupancy, the Councils found that the cost of running their own hospital had become too high and they sought to have it taken over by the Government. The Government took over responsibility for the Hospital by means of the Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947, under which the Hospital became the Northfield Wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Royal Adelaide Hospital (including the Northfield Wards) is now an incorporated hospital under the South Australian Health Commission Act. It is obvious that the Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947, is no longer relevant and can be repealed.

2. Mental Institutions Benefits Act, 1948:

The purpose of this Act was to enable the State Government to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government under which that Government paid a daily mental institution benefit to the State Government in respect of each qualified patient bed day. Under this arrangement the State Government agreed not to impose a means test on or charge fees to any patient in respect of whom the benefit was payable. The agreement ceased to have any effect over 15 years ago. The State Government now charges fees for long-term patients on the basis of a means tested

assessment of ability to pay. The Act is therefore redundant and can be repealed.

3. Tuberculosis (Commonwealth Arrangement) Act, 1949:

At a conference of Commonwealth and State Health Ministers in Canberra in August 1948, it was agreed that the Commonwealth and State Governments should participate in a campaign to reduce the incidence of tuberculosis in Australia and to provide adequate facilities for the diagnosis, treatment and control of that disease. The Tuberculosis (Commonwealth Arrangement) Act, 1949, was enacted to enable the State Government to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government which related to hospital treatment costs of tuberculosis patients, public health investigations and surveys and the capital and operating costs of these services. This arrangement, in so far as it related to hospital treatment costs, was superseded by the Commonwealth/State Hospital Cost-Sharing Agreement as from 1 July 1975.

There was provision for the arrangement to be terminated subject to six months notice by either party of intention to withdraw. The Governor-General on behalf of the Commonwealth terminated the arrangement with the States, on 31 December 1976. The Commonwealth Government's view at the time was that, since tuberculosis had been effectively controlled, there was no further need for a specific campaign. It is considered, therefore, that there is no need to retain the Act and its repeal is recommended.

4. Vaccination Act, 1936:

The original Vaccination Act has been in operation since 1882. In 1936 that Act and several other Acts relating to vaccination passed between 1882 and 1917 were consolidated. The consolidated Act has not been amended since, and remains on the Statute books. The Act provides basically for vaccination against smallpox. It includes a power to require vaccination in cases of outbreak of smallpox in this or any other State and the keeping of records in relation to vaccination. Smallpox has now been eradicated as a human disease, and the only known stocks of the virus are held in high security laboratories overseas for scientific purposes only. Also, the Commonwealth Quarantine Act now contains broad powers to deal with outbreaks of disease, and smallpox is defined as a quarantinable disease under that Act. The Vaccination Act therefore no longer has any operation and can be repealed.

5. Whyalla Hospital (Vesting) Act, 1969:

This Act was introduced in light of administrative difficulties being experienced at the time in relation to the hospital at Whyalla. The Hospital was originally operated by an association known as the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated. The Government of the day decided that it should be taken over and operated as a public hospital under the Hospitals Act. To effect that transfer, an Act of Parliament was necessary. The Act provided for a corporate body to supersede the association and provided for that corporate body to have the rights and obligations of the association. Any payments due to the corporate body were to be paid to the treasurer to the credit of general revenue and any sums payable by the corporate body were to be paid by the treasurer. In addition, provision was made for the treasurer to approve arrangements between the City of Whyalla Commission and the corporate body for repayments due by the previous association to that Commission.

The hospital was incorporated as the Whyalla and District Hospital Incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act on 19 April 1979. Under that Act, any prior incorporation of the Hospital, or any body by which it was administered, is dissolved upon incorporation, and the rights and liabilities of any body whose incorporation is dissolved are vested in the incorporated hospital. Treasury has advised the Government that the repeal of this Act will

have no repercussions in relation to arrangements involving Treasury. Accordingly, it is clear that this Act can be repealed. The Health Commission is continuing to review legislation in the health area to ensure that it is relevant and appropriate to today's health needs.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Acts set out in the schedule.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1117.)

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I address myself tonight to two things that have come from the State Budget and, particularly, from the Estimates Committees. In dealing with the first of those, which is in regard to teacher numbers in the Education Department, I wish to draw the House's attention to an article that appeared in the 5 October edition of the *South Australian Teachers Journal*. On the front page of that issue there is an article entitled '1 000 jobs to go under Liberals'. I want to say at this stage that this is a scurrilous article and in my opinion it does nothing to enhance the credibility of the South Australian Teachers Institute. I wish to deal with some of the points made in that article, and I will answer them afterwards. The article states:

Under a State Liberal Government 600 teaching jobs would go in 1984 and 1 000 in 1985. A Liberal Government would mean increased class sizes, more contract teaching, a narrower curriculum choice and less teacher relieving time. In an address to Parliament, Opposition Leader Mr Olsen confirmed that the Liberals were committed to a strategy of education cuts.

He said the Tonkin Government had budgeted to reduce the size of the public sector by 740 positions in the last financial year at a saving of \$10 million. Similar reductions during each of the following three years would save another \$70 million. If a Liberal Government pursues this policy it will mean no less than 1 000 teacher and teaching aide jobs will be lost.

As I said, that is a scurrilous article. It is written by a Mr Stewart Sweeney, who I understand is a research officer at the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

Mr Olsen: He's in Unley Young Labor.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As the Leader says he is in Unley Young Labor.

Mr Olsen: Mr Stewart Sweeney.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Leader of the Opposition will refrain from interjecting out of his place.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Stewart Sweeney also made some points on the current state of the education budget in the previous edition of the journal, and I will have something to say about that in a minute. But I want to point out again that I believe that the printing of this article brings about in the education community a loss of credibility as far as the leadership of the South Australian Institute of Teachers is concerned. I cannot say for certain whether Mr Stewart Sweeney wrote this article without the knowledge of the President, Ms Ebert, and the Vice-Presidents, Mr Tonkin and Ms McCarthy, or even the formal executive. I cannot say for certain whether they knew anything about this article going in the journal, but I would be very surprised if at least one of them did not know what was going to appear on the front page of the *Teachers Journal*.

The Hon. B. C. Eastick: Are they showing any remorse about it?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: That is a question I will get to in a minute. But I would be very surprised if one of those three, the President or the two Vice-Presidents, did not know that that article was going to be on the front page of the journal. Members will know that I am not one to malign people without hard and fast evidence but, nevertheless, it is extremely important that this article be answered and, indeed, I hope that the Institute will print the response by the Leader of the Opposition in the next edition of the *Teachers Journal*.

Mr Meier: Let's us hope that they put it on page 1.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed; let us hope that they are fair and place it on page 1 of the next issue.

The Hon. B. C. Eastick: With equal emphasis and headlines.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, indeed. If we can just look at some of the points made in that article: the main one is the headline, '1 000 jobs to go under the Liberals'. What is the basis for saying that? What is the basis for Mr Sweeney's accusation that 1 000 jobs will go? He says it is the Leader of the Opposition's speech in opening the Budget debate in this Parliament. Let us just look at part of that speech as it refers to this matter, and let us try to find how Mr Sweeney was able to draw this inference from it. First, I point out that the Leader's speech was an excellent one, which I believe for the first time for some years (at least four years) gave an alternative Budget strategy that was creditable; obviously the homework had been done. Let us look at what the Leader said, in part, as follows:

I propose an alternative economic strategy which would limit Government spending increases this financial year to 1 per cent in real terms rather than the 4 per cent proposed by the Government.

Let us look at the budget for the Education Department this financial year. We find that there is a percentage increase over last year of 8.61 per cent in that budget, and I have already given these figures to the House in an earlier speech. If we accept the Premier's Financial Statement in which he places inflation at 7.5 per cent in the next financial year, however optimistic that may be (he is using Mr Keating's figures), we find in this year's Education Department budget of the present Government that there is a 1 per cent increase in real terms.

That is the figure that the Leader of the Opposition said the Liberal Government would apply, certainly over the whole of Government, but a 1 per cent increase in real terms. When one looks at that statement, how does Mr Sweeney say that 1 000 jobs will go under the Liberals, when in fact the Leader has put up virtually the same budgetary allocation as the Premier has for education? Let us go on and see what else the Leader had to say in his speech. I said it was over the whole of Government, but let us get more specific. The Leader said:

We would have kept departmental spending within stricter limits than those proposed by this Government. A real increase in recurrent spending of about 1 per cent rather than the Government's plan for an increase of almost 4 per cent—

the member for Unley may start to smile at that statement and say that there is a flaw in the argument, but let us go on and see what the Leader says—

would have saved an extra \$36 million this financial year.

This is the crux of the Leader's speech in relation to this matter:

Our spending policies would have reflected current needs in education, health, community welfare and other priorities in areas of important services through seeking savings in greater efficiency in other departments. That is the Government's responsibility, to establish priorities as the community needs are identified at the time.

How can Mr Sweeney say when he reads that (and presumably he read the Leader's speech, because he wrote this

article)—and when the Leader says special consideration would be given to education and health—that 1 000 jobs would go under the Liberals? The member for Unley thinks this is funny. It seems that Mr Sweeney is a member of Unley Young Labor, and maybe the member for Unley knows him well. I would hope the honourable member would take the opportunity to put Mr Sweeney on the right track and teach him how to read the whole of the Leader's Budget speech in future and not use it selectively. I wish to make those points, because it is extremely important, and it gives the lie to what is contained in this front page article in the *South Australian Teachers Journal*.

There is another point that Mr Sweeney has not mentioned. In comparing the Budgets no mention is made in this article that after the last Budget brought in by the Liberal Government my colleague the member for Mount Gambier, who was then Minister of Education, announced an extra \$1 million for the half year to be added for the bringing on staff of an additional 100 teachers. I point out that \$1 million in a half year is \$2 million a year, and that is about 50 teachers to \$1 million: 100 extra teachers. That was announced after the last State Budget. No mention is made of those extra 100 teachers in this article, so if Mr Sweeney was looking at the past record how could he have come to the conclusion that 1 000 teachers would go if the Liberal Government was in power at this time? It is obvious that it is a complete distortion of the truth. When in Government the Liberal Party allocated more money for education than ever before and, in fact, the percentage of the State Budget allocated to education has dropped under this Government. As I have said before, I do not make too much of that point, but it has decreased.

There are members opposite, as well as Mr Sweeney, who are fond of using comparative statistics, but they can be misleading. Nevertheless, I point out that the percentage of the State Budget allocated to education has now dropped. As I said before, I believe that this article printed on the front page of the journal will bring about among the education community a lack of credibility in the leadership of the Institute of Teachers. I think that is sad, because it is a very important organisation. It has a very important job to do in arguing for better conditions for teachers and better education for the children in this State.

I now wish to move to another matter, discussed during the Estimates Committee, which I brought up in the education estimates. It concerns the question of the priority projects division of the Education Department. That division was brought about in this State by the Commonwealth Government's disadvantaged schools programme, under which schools in disadvantaged areas are allocated as a priority project school. I find that there are problems in the priority projects area. As I said in the Estimates Committee—and I am having a great deal of trouble in even hearing myself speak, because of the chatter that is going on opposite—

The SPEAKER: Order! Up to this point I have taken the view that the honourable member for Torrens normally dealt with interjections as they came. If he feels harrassed in any way, then he need feel harrassed no longer. I call for order and ask the honourable member for Torrens to continue.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. It is actually a very serious subject that I want to canvass at this stage. I would hope that the member for Unley would be as interested in the subject as I am and indeed as his Minister is. As I mentioned, many schools in this State are allocated as priority project schools, because they are in disadvantaged areas. Additional teaching staff are allocated to priority project schools by the priority project task force and these teachers can operate in various

areas. One of the areas in which priority projects teachers operate is in the field of home-school liaison. Home-school liaison is extremely important among disadvantaged schools, because it obviously deals with the liaison between the teachers and the parents in such schools, which are in severely disadvantaged areas. A home-school liaison teacher, for instance, is allocated to a school for, say, three years, where that particular teacher will institute a home-school liaison programme and then, at the end of three years, the teacher is taken away and allocated to another school. Obviously the other school is worthy of having such a teacher, but the teacher is taken away and the staff at the school which has lost the teacher are expected to pick up the home-school liaison programme.

The Minister admitted in the Estimates Committee that there were transitional difficulties in the system, and indeed there are. However, I suggest that the difficulties go far further than in the transition because the point has been made to me that the teachers cannot pick up the programme after the home-school liaison teacher leaves the school. The Premier will be very interested in this example, because at the recent SAASSO conference I was approached by two members of the school council at the Kilburn Primary School, one being a teacher member of the council and the other a parent member. These people pointed out to me how upset they were that the Kilburn Primary School was to lose its home-school liaison teacher.

They told me when I questioned them that, when that teacher leaves the school, they believe it will be impossible for the school to pick up the programme. I made this point to the Minister in the Estimates Committee and, to give him credit, he was sympathetic. However, two days after that Estimates Committee, I visited Elizabeth West Primary School, and I have to say that it makes one wonder, when one sees what a tremendous job those teachers are doing at that school and what tremendous difficulties they face in that particular area. It tends to make one feel very humble.

I point out that 70 per cent of the students at Elizabeth West Primary School are Government assisted scholars, and I think far greater than 50 per cent of the parents are single parents. This is a very serious situation, as indeed it is at Kilburn Primary School, and it has been mentioned to me by other schools as well. However, these are the two schools with which I recently have had contact. Elizabeth West Primary School is to lose its home-school liaison officer, or community liaison officer I think she is called at that school, at the end of this year.

That officer has been at that school for three years, and the Principals of both Elizabeth West Primary and Junior Primary Schools told me that it would be absolutely impossible for the rest of the staff, and in particular the Principals themselves, to pick up the home-school liaison programme when the teacher leaves. I believe that they have been offered a drama teacher under priority projects. If I were Principal of a school, I would be delighted to be able to get an extra drama or language/arts teacher, but not at the expense of home-school liaison, and that is the point I wish to make. I take this opportunity of asking the Minister again to investigate very fully the question whether these teachers should be placed in a school for two or three years and then taken away, thus leaving a vacuum that the rest of the staff cannot fill.

I am more concerned to tell the House that I have heard a rumour that the home-school liaison programme is under threat, and that it may be done away with in the future. That would be a serious retrograde step, and I am sure that the Minister of Housing, who represents an area where there are schools of this type, would agree with me: that home-school liaison would be one of the most vital components

of the teaching staff in a school such as those I have mentioned.

I believe that both matters I have mentioned are very important. I conclude by once again saying that I hope the Minister of Education takes a great deal of interest in the priority projects division of his Department. There is a serious lack of evaluation procedures in priority projects. I would be extremely concerned if home-school liaison were to be done away with. I am very glad that the Premier has been able to listen to the remarks that I have made about the Kilburn Primary School, because I know that he was concerned about that school, which is in his electorate, and I commend the home-school liaison programme to both the Premier and the Minister of Education.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): During the examination of the transport portfolio in the Estimates Committee, it became apparent to members of the Committee that the decision to axe the north-south corridor was taken by Cabinet on political grounds, and that it did not have regard to the official Highways Department surveys on population projections for the southern suburbs. Tonight I would like members to cast their minds back on some of the history of the Labor Party transport promises to the southern regions. I suggest that we start with the A.L.P. election promise for the southern region which, as I recall, was to give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern suburbs of Adelaide. In hindsight we find that that policy had already started to come adrift. As early as December 1982, the Labor Government had commenced to back-pedal on its support for transport matters involving the problems that we are experiencing in the south-western and southern suburbs.

I would like to refer to a letter that the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation wrote to the Premier on 17 December, at a time not long after the election, and following a letter it had received from the Premier in which he had set out the Government's policies regarding the southern regions. The letter states:

Thank you for your letter of 27 October which clarifies your Party's policies in regard to a number of issues identified by this region.

Further on it states:

The region welcomed your Party's willingness to consult with local government prior to the election and the attention given to the views of the region about local needs. We look forward to regular and close consultation with your Government during its term in this regard.

That involved a promise from the region's point of view, I suppose, in the future negotiations with the Government that it would receive appropriate correspondence from the Premier. However, the letter went on:

May I now make a number of points on specific issues.

The letter pointed out to the Premier some of the deficiencies that existed then in the transport portfolio, and the letter is a genuine attempt, in the form of an appeal, to the Government of the day to update its policies and make them more realistic for the people in the southern area. The letter continues:

Your southern policy statement makes a general and welcome commitment to 'give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern area of Adelaide'. Apart from the previously announced agreement to the upgrading of Flagstaff Road and Reservoir Drive, however, the policy lacks specific detail on how this is to be achieved. A re-examination of the north-south corridor is proposed, as is a 'review of public transport needs in the south' and of options for upgrading the Darlington intersection. The region will be pleased to assist in ensuring these reviews are achieved speedily so that decisions can be made and projects proceed without undue delay. In general we believe the necessary background work has been done by the transport agencies and by the Southern Areas Transport and Land Issues Working Party and that the proposed reviews need not be lengthy or complex.

Further on it states:

We are concerned, however, about the very necessary widening of South Road.

It continues on and talks at length about the necessity to widen South Road, and then states:

The region further welcomes your support for grade separation at the Hove crossing indicated in the southern policy document and hopes that the review of priorities between Hove, Oaklands and Ovingham proposed in the transport policy statement recognises the importance of Hove in achieving a second alternative arterial route from the southern areas.

Later, it states:

Your policy indicates a general support for extension of rail lines.

It is hoped that through consultation this will all come about. The letter further states:

There are a number of other matters of detail which we will be taking up with the Minister of Transport.

That meeting subsequently took place and I think it is interesting to see how the ground from December onwards slowly started to shift where this Government started immediately to back-pedal on its approach to the southern regions. It is exactly the same as what happened in the policy speech in regard to its economic policy. It made promises to the public. We all recall the policies in the Budget: the Government was not going to increase taxes and charges or use them as a form of backdoor taxation, but it immediately back-pedalled.

I now refer to a press release issued on 3 March by the council, which was at this stage becoming concerned that the Government was starting to back-pedal. The member for Brighton should not get too upset because she will be vitally concerned with what is going on there at present because her electorate is on the line, I would say, considering the way that the Government is treating the people in the south-western suburbs around the Brighton area. The press statement to which I referred states:

Southern councils believe the State Government is neglecting the transport needs of southern areas, and is not implementing its own transport policies for the South as announced during the election campaign.

What a shift, only from March! The election was in November: we are now talking about March, and the councils down there have realised that they have been deceived just as members of the public have been deceived ever since this Government got to the Treasury benches. The press statement continues:

The Minister of Transport outlined the Government's transport programme for the next five to 10 years at a recent meeting of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation which represents Marion, Brighton, Noarlunga, Meadows and Willunga councils. Chairman of the Southern Region, Meadows Mayor, Geoff Simpson, said, 'The list outlined by the Minister contains nothing new. All of the projects listed are part of the current programme of the S.T.A. and Highways Department.'

In other words, they trotted out everything that was on their books of the Highways Department and they thought that, in the wisdom of the mayors in the southern region, they would accept that as A.L.P. policy initiatives. Of course, that is utter rubbish: they were not A.L.P. initiatives at all.

During May 1983, the Minister again met with mayors of the southern region and outlined a number of other policy initiatives. I am trying to build up a case of where the Minister slowly backed off to the extent now of almost total inactivity. I quote once again from the southern transport press release, as follows:

The Minister of Transport (Roy Abbott) outlined a number of transport proposals for the southern areas at a meeting recently with the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation . . . The Minister told the meeting that the Government fully recognised the transport needs in the south and intends to honour its election commitments to the area.

Once again, that is a good public relations statement. The Minister went there and said, 'We support you. We are sticking by our policy.' We know now in hindsight, having been through the Estimates Committee, exactly where the Minister is going.

Mr Mathwin: Nowhere.

Mr OSWALD: Exactly. In fact, he is pushing all the priorities down the track. The roads that we were expecting in one or two years are now going five years down the track, and that is the way that this Government is operating. The Minister further stated:

The Government's election policy is to 'give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern areas of Adelaide'.

This is prior to the announcement that the Government was to axe the corridor, and I emphasise the fact that it is nothing but a public relations exercise when this Minister went down and addressed the southern regions. I would submit that he probably was told to go there by the Premier because he knew that he had problems on his hands. The press release further stated:

The Minister said the Government was giving priority to the South but was severely restrained by the Government's current financial situation.

The people in the southern region know this. All they are looking for is a firm positive commitment, and that is not too much to ask of a Government which does not seem capable of making firm commitments. It further stated:

He said the Government generally supports the programme put forward by the Regional Organisation and accepts the need for an overall strategy which establishes a list of priorities between projects.

I can see the Minister getting up and saying that. The press release further stated:

The Minister further told the region that a number of reviews were currently being carried out, which he expected would establish the basis for other future transport improvements.

Once again, I can imagine the Minister saying that: I can hear him on Tapleys Hill Road saying that. We are on about the fourth review into the projected road widening of Tapleys Hill Road in Glenelg North (in my district). The press release further stated:

These included: a Highways Department review of all road projects in the southern areas. The review would involve full consultation with the Regional Organisation.

Full consultation! We now know in hindsight once again that consultation did not take place, and to say that it did was utter nonsense. It was once again a public relations exercise when the Minister was told to placate the southern regional councils and to stop them making political waves which could affect the Government in power. So much for full-time consultation with the council! I say that it should be full-time consultation, because the Minister himself does not have to be there: he has officers who can give attention to the region. It is now history that without any consultation Cabinet announced on its own initiative to scrap the corridor on 20 June.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members opposite are trying to ask, what is my policy? I am putting to the Government, and to the Minister in particular, the frustration of the people down south, who want some plans to be announced now. It is the Government which is selling off the land: it was not us. Our policy was not to sell off that land: it was the new policy that the Government announced on 20 June to sell off land which has been acquired over 20 years, and it knew damn well that it cannot be replaced. The costs involved in replacing that would be astronomical. It is a wrong decision and members opposite know that it is a wrong decision. However, they have to wear it because the Cabinet has said so—the Cabinet which has matched the wisdom of its 13 members against the 12 regional councils which

are closer to the people. Of course, the member for Ascot Park is happy as a sand boy because he has now managed to get the freeway out of his area, as his predecessor (Hon. G.T. Virgo) was also keen to get it out.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! The member for Morphet is making this speech.

Mr OSWALD: I remind honourable members that there are 12 councils opposing this, and I will run through them: Willunga, Noarlunga, Meadows, Marion, Brighton, Unley, Mitcham, Prospect, Enfield, Woodville, Munno Para, and Salisbury councils.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Morphet must be given a fair go.

Mr OSWALD: I do not need your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. I am quite happy tonight, but there is widespread anger outside. There may be hilarity and mirth amongst members opposite because they think that the transport problems in relation to the southern corridor are one great joke. I am surprised that the member for Ascot Park thinks that it is such a joke when he has to confront the Marion council. Obviously, some of the other members are not affected because they come from the northern side of town. However, I assure you that it is no joke down our side of town: it is a very real problem.

The problem is highlighted by the Executive of the Local Government Association which went out of its way in support of the local councils. It passed a resolution on 18 August, as follows:

That the State Government be informed that this Association:

- (a) deplores the absence of consultation that was promised prior to a decision on the future of the north-south transport corridor;
- (b) is gravely concerned that a decision has been made to dispose of the corridor concept;
- (c) believes that an additional north-south road facility will be needed and that a suitable route should be retained on the development plan; and
- (d) requests that, as a matter of urgency and before a supplementary development plan is prepared, the Government and those councils involved jointly evaluate alternative treatments to cope with future traffic growth.

I think that covers the entire ambit of local government operations from the Local Government Association down to some 13 councils that are matching their knowledge of what the local people want as against the wisdom of local councillors and what they think.

Members opposite are holding up a paper, but my eyesight is not so good as to enable me to read it from that distance, so I shall let that pass. Prior to the Estimates Committee debates we were led to believe that the Minister and the Government made the decision based on new figures available to them. However, I shall outline what came out of the Estimates Committee, which is interesting, if members opposite would like to listen to it. It was revealed that the latest figures that the Minister of Transport was working on were those released back in March 1982 and that those figures were used in March 1983 in the report on the widening of South Road. All the time the Government has been saying to the people that it had new information, new figures, that it had some knowledge that it was not going to impart (and we could not get it out of the Minister during the Estimates Committee, who claimed that he has reports), and yet the Minister then admitted that the figures he is using are 1982 figures, which show quite clearly that there will be massive increases in population and traffic movement in the southern region. It is totally incorrect for the Government to say otherwise.

I shall now refer to some of these figures. The population projections indicate that the existing road system, even with improvements, will not be able to handle the traffic load

after 1990 in the Darlington area and after 1992 on the Anzac Highway. Of course, that matter is of vital concern to the residents that I represent who live in the Glenelg area. This is only seven and nine years respectively away.

The population projections show that between 1981 and 1991 the population of the southern suburbs of Adelaide in the area that was proposed to be serviced by the transport corridor will increase by 46 per cent, in contrast to Adelaide's total population which is expected to rise by 8.9 per cent. On a former occasion I cited these population projections and was told that I was wrong and that they were old hat, that the Government does not go by them anymore and that it had further knowledge that I was not privy to, and that those figures did not apply. Of course, we now know from the Estimates Committee debates that that was totally wrong and that the Minister is operating on March 1982 figures.

These population projections were released by the Department of Environment and Planning in March, 1982. They are the figures used by the Highways Department in determining last year that the north-south transport corridor was needed. The figures show increases in population for specific councils in the southern area. For example, it is anticipated that the population of part of Marion will increase from 5 850 in 1981 to 15 600 in 1991, by almost as much as 200 per cent. So much for the Minister and the Government's trying to tell us that there will not be an appreciable increase in that area. The population of parts of Meadows will increase from 19 900 in 1981 to 31 300 in 1991, an increase of some 57 per cent. The population in the Noarlunga Council will increase from 59 000 in 1981 to 76 000 in 1991, an increase of 28.7 per cent.

These figures released by the Department of Environment and Planning were confirmed by the Minister of Transport in the House during the Estimates Committee proceedings. Quite clearly, the figures do not support the political decision made by the Government to axe the corridor. It was certainly a political decision, and members cannot get away from that fact. It was not based on any sound, clinical data. In June the Minister released a press statement claiming that recent reviews had shown that it was possible to cater for any likely traffic growth within the next 15 years by improvement to the existing system. What utter rot! The figures from his own Department indicate that the system will be unable to handle the growth. The Minister is talking in terms of 15 years away: I submit that in seven years the system will be in diabolical trouble. However, the Minister is saying that the Government will do some road widening here and there to knock the place into shape and that things will be all right for the next 15 years. That is utter nonsense. Fortunately, I know that members opposite have enough sense to know that what I am saying is correct.

In June this year following the announcement of the Cabinet's decision to axe the corridor south of Anzac Highway (which is what I believe to be a disastrous decision), the Southern Region of Councils again wrote to the Premier. The letter, on the Southern Region of Councils letterhead and dated 28 July, stated:

Dear Premier,

You may be aware that the five councils of the southern region have expressed severe disappointment with aspects of the Government's decision to axe the north-south transportation corridor. Our view is that in the light of anticipated population and traffic growth in the southern region additional north-south road capacity will be required before the end of the century.

They are not wrong: they are quite correct, as that is the situation. The letter continues as follows:

May I make it quite clear however that our concern is with the section of the corridor south of Anzac Highway and more particularly that area between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road.

A Highways Department report of March, 1982, clearly demonstrates that the currently proposed widening of South Road will not meet anticipated traffic growth over the next 15 years.

That was established during the Estimates Committee. The letter continues:

Failure to provide additional capacity between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road will result in further congestion on Unley, Goodwood and Marion Roads and on a number of essentially residential streets such as Winston Avenue, leading to further deterioration in the residential environment in these inner suburban areas. As well the region is concerned that failure to provide an adequate road system will adversely affect the industrial and commercial development of the southern region compared with better serviced areas.

During the Estimates Committee debates a question was raised as to why the Government did not think that there would be an increase in numbers in the region. Various reasons were given. The Opposition made the point that until such time as an adequate transport system is provided for the southern region we cannot expect potential employers, industrialists, to build plants and equipment in the area. I refer to a response given by, I think, the Director-General to a question from the Hon. Dean Brown, who then said:

This afternoon we had the Director-General of Transport admit that they could not get job opportunities down there. I put forward the argument that the main reason is the transport difficulties that already exist.

There is a catch 22 situation down there. The Highways Department maintains that there is not sufficient population in the region to warrant putting the freeway through. However, unless that freeway is constructed industrialists will not build factories in the area. I now refer to a statement that was prepared following a meeting with the Premier on 16 August. By this stage frustration had built up amongst those in the community. The statement to the Premier is as follows:

This delegation calls on the Government to review its decision to axe the north-south transportation corridor and to retain that section of the corridor south of Anzac Highway. We believe the corridor should be retained in the Development Plan and that properties should continue to be acquired as they become available.

It goes on:

As representatives of all seven councils south of the city, an area with a population of 260 000, we believe the Government's decision to delete the north-south transportation corridor from the Development Plan seriously jeopardises longer term transport planning for our areas. The decision will further disadvantage the economic development of areas south of Darlington, ensure growing levels of traffic congestion on existing north-south arterial roads, and lead to a further deterioration in the residential environment of inner suburban areas.

The net result of the deputation to the Premier by the councils concerned, which was a courteous appeal to the Government to change its view, was a press statement which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 17 August 1983. Under the heading 'Freeway Talks Fruitless', the report states:

A meeting yesterday between seven southern metropolitan mayors and the Premier, Mr Bannon, had been 'fruitless', the mayor of Meadows, Mr Geoff Simpson, said last night. He said Mr Bannon had told mayors the State Government had reviewed its decision to axe the north-south freeway and had not changed its mind.

Mr Simpson is Chairman of the Southern Region Metropolitan Council Area. A further highlight that shows the shoddy treatment handed out by the State Government to the southern region is referred to in the *Southern Region News* of September 1983, under the heading 'Government dumps transport commitment'. All members, especially those from this area, will be interested in this report. Indeed, I am sure that the member for Brighton has received a copy of the document and I hope that she has handed it to the Minister so that he may know that the councils in the southern region are being deceived by this deceptive Government. The report states:

The Labor Government has a transport policy which promises to 'give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected

southern areas of Adelaide'. This commitment was the result of several years of examination by the department and the southern region. Since the election, the various departments have been examining projects presumably with a view to implementing the upgrading. But now the Minister of Transport has told the region that it was all a mistake.

What a remarkable statement coming from the Southern Regional Councils Organisation! The organisation has concluded that the Minister of Transport, representing the Labor Government, which came in on a platform of deception in all areas, is now deceiving in the transport area.

As it is now 12 months since last year's election, it is clear that the Minister is not competent to discharge the duties of his portfolio. The report continues:

Their review has shown little need to upgrade southern roads for many years. The 'indicative' programme sees no need for major investment within five years, and makes no mention of previous commitment to such projects as Hove overpass. But the south can take heart by the budget commitment that the O-Bahn busway to the north-east will be completed by 1986 and that there will be further significant road spending at Golden Grove.

That is a disgrace. We are being told that the residents down south have been sold out in the interests of north-eastern residents, because it is in the north-east that the Government sees the possibility of gaining more votes to win an extra seat or two. The southern areas have now got the measure of this Government. The Minister has said that it was a mistake. He was backing off as hard as he could go. The Government knew that policy statements made off the top of the head were wrong. The Government deliberately embarked on that exercise prior to last year's election to win votes. Before last year's election we had headlines promising everything to the southern region, but now that the Government is in power it has abandoned that area. The Government instigates review after review but, when it is finally nailed down, we find that the 1982 figures were used and that the facts put to us were an utter fabrication. It is deplorable that a Government should adopt this attitude. For the benefit of the western, south-western and southern suburbs, the Government must reverse its decision on the north-south corridor. The Premier has claimed that this is the best decision he has made since he came into office, but for the people in the south it is an absolute disaster that must be reversed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: (Murray) Before getting on to some other issues, may I add to what my colleague the member for Morphett has had to say about the north-south corridor. Since this announcement was made by the Premier, I have wondered how my previous Department (Department of Environment and Planning) feels about this decision and how much input the Development Management Division of that Department has had, because I remember that one of the first meetings I had with senior members of the old Department of Urban and Regional Affairs related to the importance of such a corridor. I also remember the then Director-General of that Department having discussions with me, with the then Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson), and with the Director of the Department of Transport. It was felt strongly that the corridor was really needed. I have heard on the grape vine that officers in the Department of Environment and Planning are concerned about the decision that has been made and about the fact that there has been little consultation with them on the matter. So, I should be interested to learn from the Minister for Environment and Planning how much consultation took place with the officers of his Department prior to taking that decision.

I wish to refer to some matters relating to the areas in respect of which I represent the Liberal Party. First, I am concerned about the lack of information available from the present Government by way of replies to Questions on

Notice. It is not just the lack of information, but also the time taken to receive replies. I have had some questions on the Notice Paper for about eight weeks, and there is no excuse for such a delay. As a Minister in the previous Government, I know that that Government saw it as its responsibility to provide adequate information promptly. There is no reason why the Ministers in the present Government should sit back and believe that information in reply to questions is not important to other members.

As an example, I refer to a couple of replies I received yesterday. Some weeks ago I asked the Chief Secretary a question about the terms and conditions of Mr Maslen's appointment as Superintendent of Yatala Labour Prison. I wished to know whether Mr Maslen had been appointed under the Public Service Act. Of course he was, and that information was provided. However, the Chief Secretary said that the terms and conditions of the appointment were applicable to section 108 of the Public Service Act. The Chief Secretary knows that that was not the information I required. I am not stupid and I know that that would be the situation. However, I have been led to believe that Mr Maslen was appointed Superintendent (or Manager) of Yatala Labour Prison on the basis of a four-day week, working from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. I should like that matter to be clarified because, if they were the terms of the contract relating to Mr Maslen's appointment, such a contract leaves much to be desired.

With a position as important as that one, with the problems that exist about which we all know within that institution at Yatala, it is certainly not a nine-to-five job four days a week, Monday to Thursday. I have the highest respect for Mr Maslen. I said that at the time of his appointment, and I expressed my disappointment when he resigned, because I believe that he carried out his responsibility very well indeed in his previous position. I would have hoped for his sake and for the sake of the Correctional Services Department that he would have been able to do well in the position at Yatala, but I would have found it very hard to understand how he would be able to do so under those conditions.

So, the information provided by the Minister was information that I already knew, and there was nothing more forthcoming. I asked about seven weeks ago what extra senior executive appointments and secondments had been made in the Department of Correctional Services in the past two years; what were the responsibilities of each; and what was the increase in the total number of staff achieved in the past two years. I would not have thought that would have taken a great deal of working out. It would not mean a great deal of time and effort to provide that information. But, I have received no answer at all.

Likewise, at the same time I asked the policy of the Government regarding contact visits in South Australian prisons and what percentage of prisoners received contact visits in Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison respectively. Again, there has been no information forthcoming from the Chief Secretary. Only in the past week we have recognised that some problems that have occurred with prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol have resulted from the lack of action, and obviously the lack of policy, of the present Government regarding contact visits. It is important. The Chief Secretary, while in Opposition, had all the answers to the problems within our Correctional Services institutions. He knew all the answers, so he said, but the situation has deteriorated rather than improved since the present Government came to office. This is a simple matter of Government policy and I would have thought that the Chief Secretary would be able to make that information available, but we have not heard anything about that.

It is not just the Chief Secretary. The same can be said for the Minister for Environment and Planning because,

around the time that I asked those questions of the Chief Secretary, I asked the Minister about the legislation proposed to control air pollution. I asked when the Government was going to introduce it, what stage had been reached with its preparation, which organisations or interest groups had been consulted with regard to it, when did the consultation commence, and when was it intended to be introduced into Parliament. The Minister tried to bypass the system of Questions on Notice so he organised—or I would not be at all surprised if it was not organised—a Dorothy Dix question from one of his back-bench members making inquiries similar to those that I had outlined in this question about the proposed legislation. It was only following the taking of a point of order that he was not able to proceed with the answer at that stage. That goes back, I suppose, three weeks. Only yesterday I received an answer, if it can be described as an answer. The information that I received from the Minister was this:

Yes.

(a) The basis for a Clean Air Bill has been endorsed by Cabinet and a Bill is to be prepared by Parliament.

Again, we knew that from the Governor's Speech. He went on to say:

(b) Consultation has taken place with many organisations, both formally and informally. Extensive discussions took place . . . from 1978 onwards to provide for compatibility with other States. Discussions with other Government departments took place from 1980 onwards, particularly with respect to policy and health aspects. Formal consultation followed with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Local Government Association and Councils.

We know that because we were the Government and I was the Minister who carried out that consultation. We had extensive consultation which led to our introducing legislation. The present Government thought that that legislation was not appropriate and indicated soon after coming into Government that it would not proceed with that legislation but would draw up its own Bill and have it brought into the House during the current session. Again, it would seem that the Government is in chaos as far as this is concerned. It does not know where it is going because we have heard so much about the need for this legislation.

When I was Minister I was constantly being asked by the then Opposition where the legislation was and why I was not doing something about introducing it. We introduced it, now the present Government has had the opportunity to do something about it and is not doing anything about it at all. Obviously from what was provided in that information it certainly had not got to the stage of consulting with anybody, because all the consultation referred to there took place while we were in Government and prior to our coming to Government.

Mr Ashenden: The only initiative they have shown is in raising taxes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They have certainly proved that they are very good at that, particularly, as has been said by many of my colleagues on this side of the House in recent months when they made so many of these promises that unfortunately people were gullible enough to believe at the time, that there would be no increase in State taxes or charges as a result of this Government's coming into office. Of course, we know what has happened about that promise as well as many others that have been broken. Another question I asked of the Minister for Environment and Planning was this:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1979, or to repeal that Act and introduce new legislation and, if so, which, what stage has been reached, and which organisations or interest groups have been consulted in the preparation of legislation, and when did the consultation commence, and when is it intended to introduce this legislation into the Parliament?

That question was asked about six weeks ago and I have seen no sign of an answer. Again we have read in the Governor's Speech that it is to be introduced into this session of Parliament. We constantly read in the media that it is to be introduced, but we see very little positive action being taken by the Government in this regard.

On a fairly regular basis we also read in the media the concern expressed by a number of people about the amount of vandalism that has taken place on significant Aboriginal sites in various parts of the State. A report to which my colleague the member for Chaffey referred was conducted by a consultant company in South Australia, and brought to our notice much of the vandalism that has taken place in various parts of the State. It also brought to our notice and recommended once again the construction of the \$6.58 million secondary treatment works to treat Mount Gambier sewage and effluent which flows into the sea at Finger Point, another project that was scrapped by this Government. Much concern is being expressed about that as well. Again, we introduced the legislation after much consultation. I do not suggest that it is easy to formulate such legislation. It is a very complex matter. I spent a considerable amount of time, as Minister, consulting with all the interested groups, as so often is the case in the portfolio of environment and planning.

There is a considerable need for appropriate consultation. That consultation took place and as a result of it we introduced legislation. Once again, the present Government indicated that it was not satisfied with that legislation, but would withdraw it and bring down its own legislation. Again, we have seen very little positive action in the 12 months that the Government has been in office.

On a more positive note, I refer to a document which I have only recently been able to obtain. It is the field management policy document relating to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I refer to this document, because it is an initiative which has resulted from the previous Government. As Minister, I was particularly anxious that such a document should be produced, and now that it has been produced I am sure it will be very valuable indeed, because the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service has such a widespread responsibility for implementing Government policies on land management, and on the conservation of native flora and fauna, that its procedures and activities interact with most sections of the community. This interaction is probably most evident in the service's relationship with the rural sector, the tourist industry, with local government, and specialised organisations with conservation and recreational interests.

I am sure that this document will be a very useful vehicle for public information and comment about the service of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and its standards and procedures. I understand that it is intended that this document will be updated on an annual basis, and I hope that any comment forthcoming from interested individuals and organisations will be included in future editions. Only last year the National Parks and Wildlife Service achieved 10 years as a service, and it was felt that on such an anniversary it was fitting that the service should have such a document. Many people congratulated the service on its commitment to strengthening its management framework and maximising community involvement in the process. As Minister I was pleased to be able to help in achieving that.

On at least three or four occasions in this House, and on more occasions outside publicly, I have referred to the totally irresponsible attitude of the Government, and particularly of the Minister for Environment and Planning, in refusing to ensure the availability of adequate building allotments for development in this State, and particularly in the metropolitan area. I have referred to the disastrous effects

that the lack of action on the part of the Government was having on the new home builder and the housing and development industry in South Australia. On a number of occasions I have referred to the fact that, since the beginning of the year, the development industry in this State has been asking the Government to rezone broadacres in order to alleviate what has become an acute shortage of building allotments. Many people in the industry have referred to this serious matter. Only last week we received comment from the South Australian Real Estate Institute, which called for the State Government to prepare a study of land needs to avoid further home shortages.

I was interested to read in an article in the *News* on 16 October that the Minister for Environment and Planning, Dr Hopgood, denied that the Government was doing nothing. He said that his Department had been monitoring the Adelaide land situation for several years. Of course, it has been doing that and it does an excellent job in monitoring, but that is not going to provide housing blocks or overcome the present problems.

The past President and Real Estate Institute spokesman, Mr Cliff Hawkins, said that there is no doubt that a land shortage was looming. He stated that the shortage would occur because of the delay in converting land to residential allotments (in other words, the lack of rezoning, to which I referred earlier). He said:

I don't think the Government has analysed to any great degree what the requirements are for the future. It was relying on records that indicated there was vacant land in the metropolitan area, but that land is not necessarily for sale.

He was also critical of delays in subdivision procedures that are being experienced. He indicated, as has been pointed out to me by other people, that there are delays of up to 12 months in some subdivision approvals. That concerns me, because in Government we introduced the new planning Act and one of our hopes in regard to that legislation was that it would simplify and streamline the procedures that could be adopted in regard to subdivision approval.

Over the past six to nine months we have been hearing from the Minister for Environment and Planning about the review team that he set up to look into some of the teething problems with the new planning legislation. It was appropriate that that review committee should have been set up. If I had been Minister, I would have done the same thing. I have asked two or three Questions on Notice and a couple in the House of the Minister to try to ascertain exactly where is the report of that review team. I was able to ask the Minister during the debate in the Estimates Committee and I was told that the report was about to be provided to the Minister for Environment and Planning. I hope that is the case, because previously I have been told that the report was about to be made available to the Minister and that he would be taking some action soon.

The situation is now quite serious. We have had 12 months in which to test the legislation and determine the teething problems. It is vitally important that we see some action on the part of the Minister in regard to introducing amendments to overcome any of those problems. When I introduced the legislation, while we were still in office, I said that, because of the complexity of the legislation and the fact that it is major legislation, we felt that there was sure to be some teething problems that we would hope to rectify as soon as possible. Some of those problems are coming to light, and it is important that there be adequate consultation and that the Government take action to rectify those problems, so that we have legislation that does simplify and speed up those procedures.

As a result of some needling, in the past week or so the Minister has announced that the Government at last will do something about the Golden Grove development. I have some concern about which direction the Minister is going to take in relation to that development.

He said that both public and private development would be taking place within the overall Golden Grove development, but I have some concerns that we might see more public development than was originally intended, and more than we would want to see in the future of that development. In fact, it has been put to me that we might be looking at a situation where we have up to 30 per cent of the area of the development under public housing. If that is to happen, (and I will put this in the form of a question to the Minister for Environment and Planning), I ask him to indicate to the House what percentage of the development is to come under public housing.

Mr Ashenden: The Tea Tree Gully Council has been told 50 per cent.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If it is 50 per cent that makes it even worse. While in Government we were looking at a very small percentage under public housing; it was to have been a major private housing development. My colleague the member for Todd has indicated that he has heard that the Tea Tree Gully Council has been told that it is to be 50 per cent: I have heard that it is about 30 per cent; so it is now up to the Minister for Environment and Planning to clarify that situation so that we know the true situation.

On occasions I have referred to the lack of action on the part of the Minister for Environment and Planning concerning the hills face zone report. While in Government we had a supplementary report on the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone carried out by Judge Roder. It was finalised during my term as Minister and delivered to me just before I left that office. I have asked questions on this matter from very early in the present Government's term. I think that I asked the first about 10 months ago, and the Minister then said:

As the honourable member is aware this is a complex matter and one which was inherited from the former Minister. It is intended however to deal with the matter expeditiously and all of those people who made supplementary submissions may have an answer as soon as possible.

Of course it is a complex matter. We recognised its complexity when we had the initial inquiry carried out. We promptly, on receiving the report from Judge Roder, took action and introduced legislation so that the recommendations of the report could be implemented. It is just as important that the present Government should take similar action, because many people want to know what is happening. Either the Minister will do this publicly, and let people know what the situation is, or he will do it through the back door, and I will be very concerned if that was the case. In closing, I ask that the Minister for Environment and Planning at least should let the community in this State know what is happening with that report, particularly the people who are vitally affected as a result of its recommendations.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address myself to a number of issues of vital importance to the electorate of Todd. The first I wish to address myself—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Done any door-knocking in Windsor Gardens yet?

Mr ASHENDEN: Perhaps the Minister might like to tell us about Cobbs Restaurant, rather than Windsor Gardens. However, I intend to address myself to a number of issues of importance in my district, and the first relates to an area in Houghton. Submissions have been made to me by residents in Houghton in relation to their concern that the

present Government is to allow mining developments in what are now residential areas. I refer specifically to a proposed mining development at Inglewood, one at Houghton, and one at Paracombe. For the benefit of the House I point out that the first of these developments at Paracombe has been disallowed by a court after a number of court hearings. Although that occurred, the present Government has recently given permission for two other mining developments within that district. This is despite the fact that the residents are totally opposed to those developments, and despite the fact that certainly, in relation to the proposed mining development at Houghton, the clays under question are not required for at least the next 15 years.

Approximately 12 months ago residents approached me expressing concern that they believed that applications were to be made for the development of clay mining adjacent to Range Road South, Houghton. That road is the boundary of the Anstey Hill Conservation Park. On the western side of Range Road South we have the conservation park, and on the eastern side there is a quite heavily developed residential area. Application was made for a clay mining development to proceed on the eastern side of Range Road South, at the southern end.

I made representations on behalf of my constituents for this to be refused, and the reasons were numerous. First, it is a residential area. Secondly, it is immediately adjacent to a conservation park, although I am extremely concerned that today, when I addressed a question on this park to the Minister for Environment and Planning, he could not advise me whether or not that park is to be handed over to the Department of Recreation and Sport for the development of facilities such as a BMX track and also for off-road motor cycles. At the moment we have a delightful national park at Anstey Hill on one side of the road, on the other we have a residential development, with in one section no actual residential development but an application by a mining company for that area to be mined for the removal of clay.

I have been advised that that clay is not required by the mining company for at least 15 years, but despite that fact, despite the representations that I have made to the Minister for Environment and Planning, and despite the fact that a petition with more than 300 signatures has been presented to the Minister for Environment and Planning, this Government has recently decided that that development can proceed. I have written a number of letters to the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister for Environment and Planning asking the Government's intentions on this matter, and asking that I be advised, prior to any decision, whether I could have input to the Government on behalf of my residents.

I would now like to explain how this Government treats local members on issues of such importance. Approximately three months ago, the Minister for Environment and Planning arranged for a meeting, which I had requested, between his officers, officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and local residents, which was to be held in his offices. That meeting was arranged, but I was not advised of it. However, local residents rang me and said, 'We are going to attend a meeting with officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and officers of the Department of Environment and Planning, as you requested for us. Where would you like us to meet you?' I said, 'Well, I am sorry, I do not know what you are talking about.'

That was the first I knew that the Minister, rather than coming back to the member who had made the representations, went directly to the local residents to arrange this meeting. Incidentally, perhaps I can digress a little and point out that the resident through whom the Minister was working was none other than Mr Steven Wright, and I think that all members opposite would be very well aware of who Mr

Wright is. We could put it politely and say that he was a lacky of the previous Premier, Mr Dunstan.

Mr Trainer: Can't you get it right?

Mr ASHENDEN: I thank the member for his interjection. His Minister chose to work through a member of the Labor Party rather than through the local member. Be that as it may, local residents advised me that this meeting was on, so I immediately contacted the Minister's office and asked whether it was correct that such a meeting had been arranged and, if so, why had not the courtesy been extended to me to at least let me know of the meeting, even if the Minister did not want me to attend. The meeting went ahead. My residents put to the Minister's officers that they were totally opposed to such a development in their area, and they advanced some very cogent reasons indeed.

They pointed out that this area is residential and that it cannot bear the additional heavy traffic that this mining development will allow. They put many other reasons to the Minister's officers. At the end of that meeting they were assured that their representations would be considered and that further discussions would be held: that is what they were told. The next thing that happened (and I repeat that I had been making representations for months on this matter) was that on 11 October residents in the Paracombe, Houghton and Inglewood area received a letter from the Minister of Mines and Energy. I have yet to receive any official notification, whether in writing, by telephone or by conversation, that a decision has been made. I have not even been told that a decision has been made. I was assured that I could be involved in the discussions, as were residents in my district. However, on 11 October my constituents received a letter signed by the Minister of Mines and Energy which states, in part:

You were one of the signatories to a recent petition circulated by the Paracombe, Houghton and Inglewood Residents Group.

Incidentally, the residents group comprised Mr Steven Wright and a couple of his cohorts. However, despite the fact that members of their own Party were opposed to the mining development (at least I will give Mr Wright the benefit of stating that he agreed with the local residents that such a development should not proceed). This Government has decided to proceed with the development without consultation, and I was extremely concerned on being provided with this letter to learn that a decision had been made that the mining development was to proceed, and that is all there was to it. I was also concerned to read the following:

Dr Hopgood, the Minister for Environment and Planning and I—

that is, the Minister of Mines and Energy—made an inspection of these sites in July and had discussions with representatives of the residents group.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I presume that they advised you as the local member?

Mr ASHENDEN: They certainly did not even have the courtesy to let me know as the local member that they were going to visit my electorate to look at specific areas about which I had made representations and that they would discuss this matter with my constituents. The only person to whom I can determine they spoke was to Mr Steven Wright. Yet this letter has gone out to constituents, making it seem as though these Ministers actually spoke with residents. Let me point out that Mr Steven Wright would live three miles from the development about which I was making representations. Therefore, purely and simply for his own political ends, Mr Wright was trying to work in an area in which he has absolutely no reason to be working.

He is a public servant, an employee within the Department of Community Welfare, and here he is not only trying to usurp the role of a local member but also obviously being

strongly supported by two Ministers in this Government. Let me assure the Ministers of this Government that this has not gone unnoticed in the Paracombe, Houghton and Inglewood area. The residents are absolutely furious to have received this letter. I have had a number of telephone calls from residents asking why I was not advised of the meeting to which these Ministers were coming. All I could do was advise them that I was not aware that the Ministers were coming into my electorate or that they were to discuss this matter with my constituents. In fact, all I could determine was that these two Ministers came into my electorate and spoke to one or two constituents who did not live near the development that was proposed, anyway. Therefore, how on earth could residents point out any true interests about which my constituents were concerned? Let me point out that this is not an isolated incident. In fact, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Education are the only two Ministers who have the courtesy to let me know that they are coming to my electorate. I have had visits from other Ministers, including the Minister of Health, without notification.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Do they have to get a permit?

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister for Cobbs Restaurant comes out again. I point out to him that it is normal courtesy that, when a Minister is coming into a member's electorate, he lets the member know that he is coming. I again stress the point for the Minister's benefit that I have written a number of letters to both Ministers and contacted their offices on this matter, and I have been assured that I would be involved in discussions. My constituents have been assured that before any decision was made they would be involved in discussions, but the first they knew that the Ministers had been in the area was when they received this letter.

The only constituents advised that these Ministers were coming into the electorate of Todd were members of the Labor Party. It is obvious that the Ministers did not want the local residents to have an opportunity to make representations directly to them, and that they knew that the decision they were going to make was the wrong decision. That is the only connotation I can place on the fact that my constituents have been so roughly dealt with by this Government, and it will not go unnoticed, although I suppose that the Ministers, in their cynical approach to politics, would have said, 'They are residents who had the gall to vote 75 per cent for Scott Ashenden in the last election, so it is obvious that we can treat them in any way that we desire because they were stupid enough not to vote for the Government.' I can give a number of examples of the way in which this Government has punished electorates, and districts within electorates, that dared not to vote for the Government in the last election. Then this Government has the gall to say that it believes in democracy. The letter to which I have already referred further states:

Before approving the proposal the Authority considered the possibility of alternative clay deposits, the economics of using material from further afield and the consequences for the cost of bricks, together with environmental considerations and rehabilitation plans.

I have it on good authority from a mining company and a company which manufactures bricks that the deposits that are about to be mined are not required for at least 15 years. The only reason that this Government has given permission for this mine to go ahead now is that it knows full well that in 15 years there is no way that this mine will be allowed to be developed. Members will know that, under the mining legislation, once a mine has been operated, provided it is operated once a year, it can continue *ad infinitum*. Therefore, the interests of my constituents have been completely over-

ridden. The clay is not required. My constituents were given no opportunity to have input, nor was the local member.

Now we come to the absolute *coup de grace*: would you believe that, before this decision was made, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister for Environment and Planning approached the State Council of the Labor Party to determine whether they could proceed! That is incredible. It was not the elected Government that made that decision; it actually went to the State Council of the Labor Party, whose approval was sought for this development to proceed. In other words, it is not the elected Government of this State that is running South Australia: it is the State Council of the Labor Party together with the Trades and Labor Council. The Minister of Mines and Energy stated:

There are reservations about the proposal. It is adjacent to a scenic road; it is in the Mount Lofty watershed; there will be some visual impact.

Despite those facts, a mining development is being allowed to proceed. I am glad that the Minister of Water Resources is in the House at the moment: he refused applications from residents for a water supply to be connected to their properties because, he says, the properties are in the watershed. What that has to do with any relevant matters, I would like to know. Residents in the electorate that I represent are being told that they cannot have a water supply because they are in the watershed area, and yet the Government is going to allow a mining development to proceed. Where is the logic of that? The Minister went on to say that he had approved the proposal. I find the entire situation that has occurred absolutely incredible and I can assure the Government that this incident will not be forgotten by the residents of Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood, particularly bearing in mind it would appear from an answer I received from the Minister for Environment and Planning that the present Anstey Hill Conservation Park is to be handed over to the Department of Recreation and Sport for the development of recreation and sporting facilities.

The Anstey Hill area is one of the most attractive natural bushland areas that exists in the vicinity; it is an area that still contains large sections in which Australian native orchids can be found growing in their natural state. It is an area that separates the metropolitan area from the rural area. Anyone who has ever been there would know just how attractive the area is. I have been advised on very good authority that it is the intention of the present Government to allow the area to be developed as a bicycle race track, as an off-road area for motor cyclists and used for various other activities totally unsuited to that area. I invite the Minister of Recreation and Sport to visit the area on a Sunday afternoon and to take note of how many cars are parked adjacent to the area and the number of adults and children walking through the natural bushland enjoying this natural environment which his Government intends to destroy.

While I am on this subject, I would also like to take up a matter which I have raised with the Minister of Water Resources. Since February this year I have raised with the Minister the problem that occurred during the disastrous bushfires of Ash Wednesday 2. The Minister well knows that I have written to him many times.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Twice.

Mr ASHENDEN: Rubbish! I have contacted the Minister's office many times. During the recent Budget Estimates Committees I again raised the matter relating to the fires that occurred in the north-eastern area. I have pointed out to the Minister that Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood are serviced by a water supply that is entirely dependent on electric power. The area involved is above the normal water reticulation supply area, and the only way that water can be supplied is for electric pumps to pump water into tanks

from which it flows to Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood, in which areas the disastrous fires of Ash Wednesday 2 occurred and where power lines were burnt out. As a result, there was no electric power and therefore all the residents of Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood were not only without power but totally without a water supply.

They pointed out to me that in many instances they could have saved their homes and other parts of their property if a water supply had been available to them. So, they asked me on their behalf to approach the Government with a request that either diesel or petrol motors be installed alongside the electric motors so that, should a power failure occur, immediately the other motors could start up and continue to pump water, thereby ensuring that water is always available. I would point out to the Minister that diesel and petrol motors are available that will switch on automatically in the event of a power failure. The Minister tried to raise a red herring in the Estimates Committee proceedings by saying that it would not be possible to get someone up there to start those motors: I would point out to the Minister that the motors that would be used are designed to start automatically should electric power failure occur, in which event water supply would be maintained to the entire area. I made representations to the Minister in February. I have written to the Minister several times and have raised the matter in the House during Question Time. I also raised this matter during the Estimates Committee that was in progress only two weeks ago, and despite assurances from the Minister—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Perhaps the Minister could listen to what I am saying. Months ago the Minister told me that I would be given an answer about this well before now. That answer has not been forthcoming, and in fact during the Budget Estimates Committee the Minister said to me that it would be still some weeks before the report would even be in his hands. This matter was first raised in February. The Minister is so inefficient that still he does not even have a report from his officers. He said that even after he had obtained that report it would be weeks before he could make a decision.

In the meantime, we are now entering into the next bushfire season, and yet the Minister had the gall tell me that I should be patient. He said that I should wait. How does he think the residents of Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood feel when they are told that they should be patient and wait for the Government to look at the matter when they have grass that is already six feet high? The Minister has already indicated that it is unlikely that the Government will meet the request, anyway. The point is that hundreds of residents are without adequate fire protection and are waiting for the Government to make a decision, while the Minister says that they should be patient.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That is true.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister acknowledges that: here we are on 19 October, my having first raised this matter eight months ago. The Minister has not even received a report, which he told me in writing not only that he would have in his hands weeks ago but that he would be able to give me a reply weeks ago. That is in writing and yet the Minister, despite his assurances that I would have an answer weeks ago, is now asking me to be patient for further weeks. He is asking the residents in the area that I represent to be patient. Does the Minister really think that my constituents believe that this Government has their interests at heart, when previous assurances he has given me have been totally smashed to the ground?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What assurances—

Mr ASHENDEN: Did the Minister say 'What a shame'? I would like that recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I said 'What assurances did I give you?'

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister gave me assurances in writing, and he acknowledges that he told me that I would be given these answers. They are still not in my possession, and my constituents are being asked to continue to be patient. Is it any wonder that the residents of Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood believe that this Government has absolutely no interest in their welfare? I have already raised the matter of the completely new mineral development which is not required but which the Government has allowed to proceed. However, fire protection is not being provided although it would cost only about \$30 000 to install the necessary pumps. The thing is that \$30 000 is not even half the cost of one house in that area.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Even if it costs \$60 000, that is only equivalent to the cost of one house. I point out to the Minister that millions of dollars of damage occurred in my electorate during those disastrous fires in February. Do not tell me that a few pumps will cost millions of dollars. I am appalled at the Minister's attitude to the welfare of my constituents.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Will his remarks impress your constituents?

Mr ASHENDEN: Nothing could be further from the truth. Turning to other matters affecting my district, I have received a letter from the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Ms Ebert) regarding staffing in schools in my district. No member would accuse Ms Ebert of being on the side of the Liberal Party, but on this occasion she has expressed concern privately to me by way of letter (unlike her practice, when our Party was in power, of publicly criticising the Government for alleged deficiencies in education, even though we could point out that every year in which the Tonkin Government was in power the education budget was greater in real terms than it had been in the preceding year, despite declining enrolments. Indeed, our provision for education was far greater than the Dunstan Government had made in any year in its term of office). Yet, in those circumstances, Ms Ebert had no qualms in publicly attacking an extremely responsible Government for what it allegedly was not doing for education.

Be that as it may, Ms Ebert has pointed out in a letter to me that she is concerned that in the District of Todd, five of my schools are to suffer staff reductions in 1984 and that these reductions will be up to as many as eight staff members from one school. I am extremely concerned on two counts to hear this. First, this Government said in its pre-election promises (and I point out that the Government obviously attaches no importance to such promises because, although the Premier said that there would be no new taxes or charges and no increases in existing taxes and charges in the life of this Government, we have seen what the Government has done in this area) that additional staff would be provided for South Australian schools. Indeed, the present Minister of Education, when Opposition spokesman on education, gave many assurances to that effect.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That was before the election.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, but Ms Ebert now tells me that five of my schools will suffer a reduction in staff, including a reduction of eight in one school. I am extremely concerned about this reduction because, since I was elected to Parliament, I have fought for the schools in my district. I am extremely concerned that the standard of education in the District of Todd will be severely affected during 1984. Ms Ebert's statement has been confirmed by principals of schools in my district who have informed me that some of their staff are to be removed. One of these schools is in an area that desperately needs special assistance: it serves an area

in which there are children with specific learning difficulties, as well as children from disadvantaged homes. Despite that circumstance, that school is to lose not only permanent teaching staff but also specialist staff who have been appointed purely and simply to provide help for those children who are in desperate need.

I have also been approached by a constituent who has given me specific information as to the fact that previously his child could enjoy assistance towards the cost of transport to and from school but that this Government had removed that assistance. Unfortunately, I cannot now refer to some other adverse effects that this Government has had on my constituents, but I make the point that this Government has no conscience when it comes to considering the welfare of people in the District of Todd.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to address three areas arising from the Budget Estimates programme that we have been reviewing over the past three weeks. At the outset I record my appreciation of the opportunity to review line by line the expenditure items of the Government. This practice gives members having no previous Parliamentary experience the ability to see how much money is being spent and where it is being spent. I participated in two Estimates Committees: the Committee dealing with expenditure controlled by the Premier and Treasurer, and that dealing with expenditure controlled by the Minister for Environment and Planning. In this regard, I consider that both the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning were competent and extremely cordial, going out of their way to provide answers. They have an adequate knowledge of their portfolios in most areas.

First, however, one of my grave concerns was the Premier's inability to understand debt structuring, which in this State is critical because the Loan funds must be repaid. Those Loan funds that are made available to various wings of Government and used by the various authorities come under the auspices of the State for funding. I was disappointed that there was little understanding shown by the Premier of the relationship between interest rates, repayment dates and the total debt situation of the State.

There is a critical relationship between capital and recurrent expenditure. Obviously, if we vote massive amounts of capital expenditure over a period of time they will impinge on future Budgets as they are doing today. The situation is such that every year we face a larger and larger debt, and I was disappointed that the Premier showed such little understanding of what is happening with regard to two of his lines involving debt structuring.

I noted that, when we were looking at the environment and planning portfolio, we discussed capital fund items such as the various heritage funds. I can only assume that under this line the money spent will one day have to be repaid. I was also disappointed at not getting an explanation of how those special funds were allied to the restructuring of interest rates that has been carried out by the Treasurer. I shall be pursuing that matter further, because it has a fundamental influence on the way we spend funds. I gained the impression that those funds involved special privileges and that their interest rates were far lower than the average demanded in respect of the general capital fund.

We have already seen that the Electricity Trust of South Australia has had its interest rates increased upwards to the average. If, in fact, these funds have not been affected, it

seems that strange accounting methods are being used within the State Government and that there will be a substantial element of cross-subsidisation of the various authorities if some areas are excluded from the averaging of interest rates as opposed to those bearing the full impact of the average rate.

Of course, the superannuation fund was mentioned. It was previously promised that there would be a triennial review of the Superannuation Fund. No detail could be provided by the Premier or anyone else as to what the long-term state of the fund was until this triennial review had been undertaken. Yet, there was an increase of 12.3 per cent in the pensions payable linked to the consumer price index. This has taken place before the triennial review is completed, so that if the fund is bankrupt we have made it more bankrupt.

I would have thought the Premier who had undertaken not to discuss the superannuation issue until the triennial review had been completed would at least have had the consistency and sense to delay any increase in the pensions payable until such time as that triennial review had been completed. It could well be that the consumer price index at 12.3 per cent could have a further crippling effect on that fund, particularly when it is remembered that the wage and salary earners of Australia have recently received 4.3 per cent which relates to a full year. It concerns me that this particular decision was made in the absence of any hard data as to the future of the fund. The Premier can be assured that we will be looking at that particular issue when it does come before the Parliament in the shape of the review report.

The second item with which I was disappointed came from the Minister for Environment and Planning. That related to his abysmal knowledge of the lands, services and supply portfolio. That portfolio, particularly the Department of Lands, Services and Supply, used up \$32 million of the State Budget. In the questioning of the Minister on his portfolio on only one or two occasions could he answer questions relating to those areas. On most occasions he had to rely on his departmental advisers to provide answers. Many of those answers were quite unsatisfactory. Whilst the Minister for Environment and Planning showed quite an adequate knowledge of one of his hobby horses, namely, environment and planning, he showed an abysmal lack of it when it came to an area which in fact spends 50 per cent more funds. I have mentioned before in this House the way the Government operates. The ability of Government to operate and save in those areas where savings should be made and beef up those areas where demand requires means that every Minister must have a firm grasp of his portfolio.

As I said, unfortunately the Minister for Environment and Planning had no idea whatsoever what was happening in the lands, repatriation, services and supply areas, which eat up \$32 million. It is a massive funding and it includes such areas as E.D.P., disposal of Government land, administration of the Crown Lands Act—some very vital areas and some areas in which I know there has been massive wastage of funds over the years. There will be continued massive wastage of funds in those areas.

The departments concerned have still not over the past 25 years of which I am aware made significant gains in the way in which they operate. They are the forgotten areas of Government. To Ministers they may in fact appear quite pedestrian. That has to change. The Minister for Environment and Planning has to sort out his portfolio and spend a lot more time looking at the electronic and automatic data processing areas. He has to spend a lot more time finding out where his reserves belong. He has to spend more time understanding where the equipment is and how it is handled under services and supply. Those were the disap-

pointing aspects of the performance of the two particular people in the Estimates area. I would hope that their inability to answer questions would be a salutary lesson to them and that they will at least make the attempt to catch up on those particular areas.

The second item I wish to address tonight is the Public Service Association. It is a shame, of course, that the member for Unley is not here now because that is an area quite dear to his heart. Prior to the last election the Public Service Association used the funds of the members to provide one of the most scurrilous campaigns ever directed at State Governments. Those funds were used for political purposes. At the declaration of my poll in Mitcham I mentioned the fact that we were seeing the first signs of a breakdown in the nexus between the Government and the Executive, which is the Public Service and Parliament. We had had some differences of opinion before. We have had areas in which public sector employees were upset by various policies and they made the public aware of them. But, this was the first concerted campaign by the Public Service Association.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Party political.

Mr BAKER: It was Party political. I can understand why it was because the member for Unley was perhaps using it as part of the process of gaining a seat. Perhaps there were some promises made at the time. I do not know. It was very clear that the Public Service Association placed a great deal of funds into advertising to elect the Labor Government in South Australia. As I said, it is the first time that I have had a genuine concern about the future of the Public Service and its identity, its ability to service Governments, in an objective and non-political way.

That was the first nail in the coffin. The second nail is about to be belted over this weekend. That is, of course, if the conference goes ahead. There is a resolution before the Public Service Association to be debated about joining the United Trades and Labor Council and the ACTU. As members on both sides are well aware, both of those organisations contribute directly to the Australian Labor Party. Members, of whatever political persuasion, are required to place money in the hands of the Labor Party whether they like it or do not like it. For the second time, I believe that we are placing the Public Service at risk at a time when there needs to be a much closer relationship between the Executive and the public sector.

Mr Mayes: You're a bit off the mark, mate.

Mr Ferguson: You're producing wrong information.

Mr BAKER: One of the great difficulties that I see is that it aligns the members of the Association with the particular political Party to which funds are paid. We compromise the independence of the Public Service; we in fact comprise the position of the union. The Public Service Act makes reference to the non-political nature of the Public Service. Here we have resolutions which are being voted on, which could take the Public Service into the arms of the A.L.P. I believe that is dangerous and I believe it is also going to cause long-term problems if the Public Service cannot be divorced entirely from political Parties. That does not mean to say that political Parties are not free of criticism from the unions concerned, because they will be. However, it does mean that, if the resolution should pass and the membership should be agreed to, any future Liberal Government will have grave difficulty in dealing with a union and a membership which has an association with the Labor Party and in fact contributes to its success or otherwise.

Mr Mayes: What about all the companies that contribute to the Liberal Party?

Mr BAKER: We are talking about the public sector and the public sector funding. The honourable member knows there is a difference. There is a wide gulf between the billion-dollar wages bill which is paid by the taxpayers and the

private sector which employs people because of its own efficiency.

Mr Mayes: I would like to see the honourable member explain that situation.

Mr BAKER: Do you have a little time available?

Mr Mayes: Less than 14 minutes.

Mr BAKER: Quite simply, if the honourable member cannot recognise the difference between the two, given his own platforms and his own recognition of the difference, if he looks through his own articles of association he will find specific reference to them there. He talks about a number of issues which say that he wants a bigger Government sector. Quite clearly, there is a difference. He has defined it in his own terms. He is completely wrong in his assessment of the ability of Australia to support a large public sector, but he has identified the difference. What I am saying is that the people have to pay for the difference; they have to pay for the public sector directly out of taxation.

Mr Ferguson: Some of the public sector is productive; they are producing goods for sale.

Mr BAKER: Yes, I know. Which part of the public sector is productive?

Mr Ferguson: The printing industry.

Mr BAKER: Well, I think we will leave that subject. There is a startling lack of knowledge on the other side of the House as to who pays the bill of the public sector. Who pays the salaries of the private sector? It always comes back to the consumer.

Mr Mayes: The community.

Mr BAKER: Of course they do, but the community pays taxes directly to support the public sector.

Mr Ferguson: What about the subsidies?

Mr BAKER: I would have thought a billion-dollar subsidy for the wages bill of public servants was the most massive subsidy available. We will go on to the next subject, which is very, very close to the hearts of members opposite and also involves the public sector in the form of our friends in the State Transport Authority and particularly the bus drivers who recently went on strike. They struck with a vengeance. These people, again subsidised by the taxpayer, have a disgraceful disregard for their fellow human beings. I do not know any member opposite who supports the strike action of those people in the transport sector. Would anybody wish to condone their action?

Mr Gregory: The Estimates—

Mr BAKER: The Estimates is a very good item, because we spent \$115.5 million on our buses and trams and trains. Of course, there was a massive \$75 million deficit on operations, so the public sector employee is again being subsidised. There must be some element—

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: The simple explanation, if members would like to be silent for just one minute, is that the public is paying for the privilege and the service of buses and they should therefore expect to be provided with that service without encumbrances, without strike action. It is absolutely disgraceful. Each of you has members in your electorate who have been affected by those strikes.

Mr Groom: How would you have handled it?

Mr BAKER: I am not talking about how I would have handled it. I am talking about the simple proposition that a number of people in my electorate, schoolchildren who were left stranded, and old people with no money in their pockets, were left at bus stops waiting for a bus driver to get off his backside and deliver a bus which never arrived.

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: I think the bus drivers could be clearly identified. They did not have the decency to inform the public they would not be available.

Mr Groom: How would you solve the strike?

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order. The member for Hartley is interjecting out of his seat.

The SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr BAKER: Perhaps the member for Hartley should have been on a bus with 20 cents in his pocket hoping to get home and the bus suddenly stopped and the bus driver said, 'All off and we go no further.' Perhaps a Parliamentarian should occasionally get on a bus.

Mr Groom: I work on a credit card.

Mr BAKER: Unfortunately, some of my constituents did not have credit cards.

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: The travelling public wants certainty of movement. Apparently, the Minister cannot handle it and cannot put forward a statement, 'We are going to operate fully and provide the service we have a duty to provide. If you cannot provide that service, you are no longer employed by the State Transport Authority.' If he could say that, we may in fact then get back to some sanity, but if members opposite condone the irresponsible action of the bus drivers—

Mr Ferguson: Reagan tactics.

Mr BAKER: If they condone the irresponsible action of those bus drivers, and I know the member for Unley does not really care about the people in his electorate who are affected—

Members interjecting:

Mr BAKER: It is obvious he does not. We have a problem. There may be ways of solving the problem. I am pointing to an anomaly in the system. Obviously, after a first time, we do not expect it to happen a second time, but it did. Therefore, the ground rules have to be laid down. If those ground rules are not laid down by the Minister, then the Minister has to give up his portfolio.

I now wish to talk about public ownership of land. There is a massive amount of land in the hands of the public sector. The major owners are the South Australian Housing Trust, the Department of Education and the Highways Department. Many of those particular authorities have not sufficient resources to keep those properties up to standard.

This causes great distress to a number of people who live adjacent to those properties. I would like to see, as a policy of this Government, that it look at the possibility of allowing councils to maintain properties in public ownership, when the people concerned are unable to do so, and that the State refund those councils on the basis of the maintenance provided. It is not sufficient to allow weeds to overrun properties or fences fall down: this detracts from the area and causes a great deal of concern to residents. I would like to see the various Ministers pay some attention to this area because, as I said, it has caused some concern in my electorate. Even though the Minister of Transport has responded very adequately to my requests it remains a problem, constantly necessitating a request that some piece of land be upgraded.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Estimates Committee system is still not working as I believe it should be in helping members obtain necessary information. It is not working, and it is not being used to the best advantage of this House. I have no fault with the system of appointing the two Committees (Committee A and Committee B) but from there on I think it fails. I found that I was often frustrated when we were in Government because Government members had to be on Committees almost every day. Indeed, sometimes it worked out that most of us were working on a Committee every day. However, when in Opposition, that opportunity is severely restricted and I found that I sat on only two Committees. Whilst one may be allowed to attend every Committee hearing, one relies on chance in regard to receiving the opportunity to ask questions. To me, the

system is not all that satisfactory. I have never supported the system of a shadow Cabinet, and I do not know why the Labor Party introduced it some years ago: whether it was an egotistical situation or not, I do not know, and I do not particularly care, but I think that is the greatest myth in our Parliamentary system that has been allowed to develop.

The administration of political Parties is a matter for the internal operations of those Parties, but members of Parliament, back-benchers or others, must have equal opportunity and equal rights to question a Minister and, through our Estimates Committee system, question public servants on how the taxpayers' money is being spent. So, I do not think that the system is working, and I personally believe that the Ministers of both the previous Government and this Government are making sure that it does not work. Both major political Parties have a lot to answer for to the taxpayers of this State.

It would be better to have the Estimates Committees away from the Chambers of the Parliament. We would be better off if we went to a committee room rather than sitting in the House of Assembly or in the other place, because I believe that that, for a start, detracts from what the Estimates Committees are all about. We should be able to sit around a table and, whilst it may otherwise be formal, we should be able more informally to ascertain what is happening with the moneys that are allocated to the various lines. To sit here formally in the Chamber and carry on like a star chamber performance is destroying the whole system and certainly detracting from its purpose. The Ministers of both this Government and the previous Government set out to make sure that the system did not work; it is not working, and I believe that Parliament is the worse for that. I do not believe that the Parliament is fully informed on what is happening concerning the Budget documents.

As I said in the earlier Budget debate, the Budget as presented had little in it, because all the good news and all the bad news had been announced before it was brought to Parliament anyway. So, Parliament had been by-passed by the system that we have come to accept over the years. This has resulted in a total breakdown of the Parliamentary tradition, and if it is to be allowed to continue it will only serve to reinforce the view that Parliament is dictated to by the Executive. Whether in Opposition or as a back-bench member of the Government, members will have little chance to say anything or to question what is really happening within our own State as far as the Budgets are concerned.

I know that the member for Alexandra gets very testy after 6 o'clock, and particularly after sundown. He said during his contribution yesterday afternoon that he believes that Parliament should not sit in the evening. I have news for the member for Alexandra: I do not care whether it sits at night and into the early hours of the morning. Some of us can take the pace and work longer hours than do those on Kangaroo Island. Perhaps the wind does not blow sufficient fresh air. We have to start early down on my side of the city, because the jets come in at 6 a.m. and wake us up, and the last jets leave at 11 p.m. So, we have only seven hours in which to sleep. Perhaps on Kangaroo Island, where there is a lack of electric light and central heating, they go to bed at sundown and rise at sun-up.

In the metropolitan western suburbs our lifestyle is governed by that damn airport. It is the only airport in the city. I recently had the good fortune to visit Leigh Creek. We landed at Port Augusta and then Leigh Creek South, and I was suddenly reminded that there are several airports throughout South Australia, not one of which is built or established in a country town. The majority are four to six miles out of the town, and the same applies on Kangaroo Island. I ask the member for Alexandra why the major town

on Kangaroo Island is not built around an airport or why the airport is not built in the town.

If one asks the Department of Civil Aviation or anyone else in South Australia, the reason that airports are located miles away from a local town involves safety and noise factors. Yet, here we are in the western suburbs, being inflicted with this horrible jet noise from 6 a.m. until 11 p.m. Then we have to put up with the blessed smaller jets taking off at 3 or 4 a.m. to take computer documents around Australia. We are living in a modern computerised society and we have to put up with the banks and commercial organisations flying jets—these Ward cargo jets carrying computer paper—from one end of the country to the other, landing at all of these airports. Why not handle this matter by telex or by some other means?

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Was the airport there when you moved into your house?

Mr BECKER: When the airport was proposed and established there was propellor driven aircraft. Jet aircraft were never considered for an airport in the western suburbs, nor for Parafield, because mainly intrastate and light aircraft operators were involved. Adelaide Airport was established as a short-term venture for propellor driven aircraft and mainly intrastate aircraft: the Royal Flying Doctor Service, Ansett Airlines (as they are now known) and a few other charter operations. It is not a parking bay for private operators to fly into Adelaide, to do their shopping at David Jones, hop on the aircraft and go back to the farm. Let me remind the people in the country of that! They can land at Parafield. Some land down on the south coast in a paddock.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Are you suggesting they are noisier than the Fokker Friendships?

Mr BECKER: The way that some people operate them I do not believe that they stick strictly to the regulations issued by the control tower. No-one can explain to me how some clown has been flying down the Patawalonga, through Glenelg, and landing on the main runway. That is not the way to approach the Adelaide Airport. One comes up the gulf three miles out to sea, take one's point in, and comes in on the main runway. Let us remind those who pushed for an international airport of the rules and regulations concerning the take-off of commercial jet aircraft from Adelaide Airport. I do not want to frighten anyone.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: You won't: not the way you are going!

Mr BECKER: Then why was the asbestos fence built at the end of the main runway on Tapleys Hill Road? Is it because the lights of the cars on Tapleys Hill Road play up with the landing and take-off operations of the 747 jets? What happened to a 747 that took off some months ago, hit an air pocket before it reached the treatment works, and scared the living daylights out of everyone? Fortunately, it had enough thrust to get over the treatment works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson must not be harassed.

Mr BECKER: If the 747 had landed on top of the treatment works or hit a severe air pocket in the region of the Patawalonga Basin, which can occur (and wait until we get a decent series of really hot days and south-westerlies), I believe that the take-off conditions at Adelaide Airport can be very dangerous indeed.

The international airport has not been operating long enough, and international 747 jets cannot take off at Adelaide Airport fully loaded with fuel any more. Because of that scare, I believe that they have dropped their fuel load by approximately 650 gallons. They have reduced their fuel load and further precautions have now been insisted on. It is extremely dangerous, and anyone who believes that the Adelaide Airport is on an ideal site is selfish and is being

extremely foolish. If moves are not taken now to resite the international airport in the interests of safety, if there is a disaster, let it be on the heads of those who support what is going on there now. It is absolutely disgraceful! We must now select a site. The Mallala District Council has had many applications for development in that area.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: They won't allow it to occur: they have a proof range.

Mr BECKER: The Commonwealth Government has to get its act together, too. Here is the opportunity to spend \$500 million to build an international airport which will operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Here is the opportunity to reserve sufficient land—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That was our Party in Government.

Mr BECKER: We said that we would reserve the land. However, I cannot see the tests being done in that area for wind velocity and wind direction which need to be done before one starts siting and building a runway. This must be done: it should have been done years ago, and we should be doing this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson must not be harassed.

Mr BECKER: We must start within the near vicinity of the metropolitan area of Adelaide: whether it be Monarto, along the south coast, or in the Two Wells area is immaterial as far as I am concerned. However, these tests must be done. The land must be reserved so that no-one will build within coo-ee of the international airport. However, the work that would be created on a \$500 million capital project is what this country desperately needs. This State needs major capital works. We have to create jobs. It will take 15 years to build a good sound international airport, and by the time it is finished, who knows? The population may increase. We will establish South Australia as a major tourist centre and create many more permanent jobs involved with the international airport. It must create employment, so one has to take the risk and the calculated risk of spending capital money to create employment. That has been the economic disaster in this country for the past five years: insufficient capital money was directed into major works.

The whole economy of this country started to turn down internally when the Snowy River project started to wind down. What should have happened in those days was that, half-way through that project, another major capital works project should have been drawn and ready to commence as soon as the gangs had finished in the Snowy Mountains and could move on to the next project. This country has to develop its projects, whether they be digging canals through northern Queensland or looking for further oil, gas and natural resources, working in the solar energy field, or whatever. We should be opening up the opportunities to develop this country because we have the scientific brains and technology to do it. However, we did not do it, because we are too damned conservative.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: I refer to the experience I gained from the Estimates Committee, particularly that of operating for the first time with the Minister of Health: that is something that I shall never forget. I think that each member of the House must have the opportunity to deal with some of the Ministers in the Government. The Minister of Health is the one who surprised me, and I do not believe that any Minister in the Government should perform and continue to carry on as he has, because I bring to question the credibility of the person who is charged with the responsibility for looking after what I consider one of the most important portfolios of any Government: the health services.

It is easy to stand by and criticise the amount of money that is allocated towards looking after many of the human resource areas, whether it be education, community welfare or health.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Are you going to go the full half hour?

Mr BECKER: If the member for Alexandra is concerned that I will go for the full half-hour, I shall continue to go for another half-hour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to come to order.

Mr BECKER: Human resources are the most valuable asset we have in this State and, whilst we may want to insist on cost effectiveness for our educational services, health and welfare services, there comes a time when the cost—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am sorry if I woke up the member for Glenelg, but it proves how important it is for one to get his message through at this time of the evening. We thank the member for Alexandra for that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is definitely out of order and there are numerous members on the Government side of the House who are also out of order.

Mr BECKER: The most important area of the work of the Government is to ensure the good health of young people and comfort for our ageing population, and to ensure that the disabled in the community are given the opportunity to share in the best medical services that the State can provide. I do not think that anyone could object to the amount of money allocated to those areas. I do not think that anyone really objects to the amount of money that can be allocated to our education services, either, because it is important.

That is an area of investment by the State for our young people to ensure that they are given every opportunity to obtain a first-class education. It is paramount that at the same time children's health is protected and that, if it requires any attention, treatment be commenced at an early age. I was also on the Committee that examined the Department for Community Welfare Budget lines, and I can say that I was quite satisfied and quite impressed by the Minister of Community Welfare and his Department. Having regard to the economic situation at present, and from my own observations of the conditions under which officers work, I believe the Community Welfare Department is doing a good job. It is very hard indeed to satisfy all the Department's clients. Some of the social workers and other members of the staff are working under tremendous difficulties and for extremely long hours and they need support and back-up services. Unfortunately, the Government is unable to provide sufficient finance for that, which is a tragedy. That is where the voluntary organisations and agencies must come to its assistance and help the Department so that services are co-ordinated in an endeavour to assist those who need it.

In the health area, I cannot understand the attitude of the Minister of Health, because at times I gained the impression during the proceedings of the Committee that he was almost paranoid, that he felt that he was being unduly criticised, that no-one but he could be responsible for what was happening. I wish to draw to the attention of members of the House the proceedings of the Estimates Committee B on 27 September 1983, because several interesting subjects were raised. All the way through, the Minister kept referring to the Sax Inquiry, saying that he had appointed Dr Sax to investigate the health services in South Australia. There is no doubt that it was a smart move to bring in someone from interstate, to set up a team to look at the whole area

of health services, and to then bring down a report. Of course, it is wise to do that in the very early days of accepting responsibility for a portfolio. In this case that is exactly what happened. Whether the Minister realises what has come from this Report of the Inquiry into Hospital Services in South Australia, I do not know. But I find that some of the recommendations and the findings are going to cause the Minister and the Government quite a lot of headaches.

I was very disturbed to read the recommendations and the suggestion that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital reduce by 200 the number of its beds. To reduce the number of beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from 700 to just on 500 in my opinion would be an absolute tragedy for those living in the north-western suburbs and the central region. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is our hospital, and, as the Minister reminded me during the Estimates Committee, it is his hospital. It is a hospital that my constituents have come to respect, and one from which we have come to demand much. We receive very good services from that hospital, which can provide excellent services. It is a very busy hospital. One has only to go down to the out-patient clinics on any day to see the activity at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

In my opinion, a reduction of 200 beds would place that hospital and the services it provides in great difficulty. It is something that we could not accept, and I am not prepared to accept that. I think that the people living in the central western region or the north-western suburbs of Adelaide will now have to stand up and try to preserve those 200 beds. It can be envisaged what will happen; they will be taken away from that hospital and put somewhere else. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has many centres of excellence. I was surprised about one of the findings in the Sax Report dealing with neurosurgical services. At page 160 of the report, Dr Sax states:

Neurological disorders include disorders of the head, spine and peripheral nerves, and they are major contributors to death and disability at all age levels. The equipment, staff training and expertise needed to maintain neurological and neurosurgical services make it essential that specialised staff and facilities be co-ordinated with research, teaching and neuropathology services in one centre. The service should be organised to provide high quality acute care, rehabilitation and extended care to all who need these services.

I agree with those sentiments. Dr Sax continues as follows:

While specialised neurological diagnostic, surgical and acute care services must be centralised because of the requirement for specialised facilities and expertise, basic services can be provided in other major centres provided there are formal links with the major service centre in order to ensure continuity of care and the maintenance of optimal standards for all levels of care.

The South Australian Neurosurgical Service provides South Australia with a co-ordinated and integrated adult neurosurgical service. The service is based at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and supported by four staff specialist neurosurgeons. One appointee has a joint appointment at the Flinders Medical Centre enabling a closely integrated service between the two hospitals.

The neurology departments at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre provide both in-patient and out-patient services and work in close co-operation with the South Australian Neurosurgical Service.

Tertiary level paediatric neurology and neurosurgical services are provided at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Many children with primary and secondary level neurological disorders can be treated at secondary level paediatric services in regional hospitals providing paediatric neurology consultation is readily available.

I am surprised that Dr Sax did not refer to the neurosurgical services provided by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital: whether that means that he was satisfied with what is being provided or whether insufficient attention was given to what is being achieved there, I do not know. I speak with some personal experience over about 15 years, and I will fight very strongly any intention to interfere with the services provided by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Its neurological services provide

a very high quality standard of care, and I understand that at present a considerable amount of work on brain tumours is being undertaken within the relevant clinic, involving a major research project using phototherapy.

It is one of few such projects in the world, and clearly demonstrates the excellence of the service that we have come to expect. There are not always sufficient beds in Ward 5C at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It amazed me to read Dr Sax's comment in the report that the bed occupancy rate ratio at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is about 70 per cent. The annual report indicated that it was 74 per cent in 1982, and I think it was 76 per cent in 1981. However, the statistics obtained depend on the time when the details are gathered. I am not too sure, but the bed occupancy rate may be calculated as at midnight and may depend on the day of the week.

Some hospitals accept the survey in respect of the bed-occupancy ratio as a bed occupied for the day, whereas others use the bed-occupancy ratio even if it is a bed occupied by a patient for only part of the day, for example, for day surgery. Therefore, such statistics are doubtful.

The Public Accounts Committee found this when reporting on the health services of South Australia. Committee members believed that the figures used for bed-occupancy ratio were suspect. For these reasons, I would not vote for the closing of 200 beds at Queen Elizabeth Hospital or, indeed, any beds at any other hospital until we had found a better formula. Time does not permit me at this stage to refer to the excellent services, such as the renal services, provided at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I am pleased that you, Madam, are in the Chair at present because I wish to talk about some areas where you and I have a joint responsibility and about the problems experienced by you, the member for Brighton and me. It appears that, because of your Government's attitude, especially in relation to the Budget, we will continue to receive complaints from people in the area south of Adelaide. In this regard the first matter is of no great significance to your area, Madam Acting Speaker, although some of the children in your electorate attend the Happy Valley Primary School. During the terms of the two previous Governments of different political colours, I have argued for the provision of a crossing across Chandler Hill Road, near the school, and my request has been refused by Governments of both political philosophies. Therefore, I am asking for your support, Madam, and that of your Government, which states that it is concerned about the safety of people, especially children attending schools, and for a guarantee that the crossing to which I referred will be established, because Chandlers Hill Road, at the corner of Education Road near the school, is dangerous.

The corner, which was originally designed not for motor cars but for bullock drays and horse-drawn vehicles, has not been upgraded since those days, except that it has been given a black all-weather surface. Motorists coming down Chandlers Hill are inclined to travel at high speeds, and the police have difficulty in covering this stretch regularly. The authorities that fix the speed limit for this stretch of road allow one that is high, namely, 80km/h. Children must cross this road at a point where trees and grapevines block their vision, and the inclement weather in winter also makes such a crossing dangerous. After all, the judgment of young children is not as great as that of older people, nor is the caution that they exercise. I therefore ask you, Madam Acting Speaker, to join the fight and to do all in your power to ensure that at least the children coming from my area may attend the school in the same safety as those coming from your area.

It has been said previously that the decision of your Government, Madam, to cancel the development of the north-south traffic corridor, especially the southern section except for the widening of South Road, is a bad decision. You, Madam, know that it is a bad decision, as do your colleagues the member for Brighton and the Minister for Environment and Planning. You all know that the people in the south are having their travel time increased each day because of the cluttering up of the roads by motor vehicles, both commercial and private, trying to get to and from work and by the State Transport Authority buses. Indeed, this traffic is consequently using more fuel, creating more pollution, and causing a loss of effort in the community because of the time people are on the road.

It is accompanied with a frustration and attitude on the part of individuals to take a risk, because they are harassed by the delays and they just cannot put up with that, so they take a chance. Very often that results in accidents and injuries to individuals, but at least a cost to society. Some might argue that it increases the work opportunities by more smashed-up vehicles and human beings, but that is a rather poor argument.

Madam Acting Speaker, you were one of the most outspoken before the last election, as were your colleagues, the member for Baudin (the Minister) and the member for Brighton. You took every opportunity to have headlines in the local paper condemning the previous Government for not building the corridor to provide for the passage of traffic through the area. Once you get into Government you become silent and do not wish to speak. The member for Brighton never supports the people down there in relation to the completion of the traffic corridor. They back the Minister in the attitude that the land is not even retained for a future option.

Madam Acting Speaker, you would know that in those days the Southern Regional Council group made notes and minutes available to you condemning the previous Government, saying there should be an increase in traffic corridors down there; they continually made that allegation. You were using that politically in every possible way. At that time the Government was saying: 'Look, we have not got the money at the moment to order the things that are necessary,' but at least it was keeping the option open by retaining the land; it was not selling it in order to capitalise on it and not suggesting it would do that. What happens? The Party to which the three honourable members belong then says: 'We do not really mean what we said before the election. When this Budget comes out, we need the money. We are going to sell the land. We are not going to keep the land that has been there, in some cases, for up to 20 years. We are going to quit it in a way that cannot give a direct corridor to the north or south. We will dispose of it.'

Let us not kid ourselves. It is not just people coming from the south into the city, but it is also people coming from the south and wanting to go north to employment, people from the north wanting to go south to employment, goods that have to be transported to the north or south, down to the Port, the eastern suburbs, or elsewhere. That link is important in the long term. If we are to keep the cost of production and the cartage of goods produced in the State down, it is important that we have it.

In that area you, Madam Acting Speaker, the member for Brighton, and the member for Baudin were very outspoken about job opportunities to be created in the south. If we want to create job opportunities in the south, what should we be doing? We should be making it as easy as possible to cart goods in and out of the south, whether they are manufactured there, or whether the raw material is being carted in so manufacturing can be carried out. Every delay that is occasioned by increased traffic on the roads pushes up the costs. If we are to compete with other States, we

need to spend money to improve the traffic corridors and not decrease the opportunities. We must also realise at the same time that the Government was not even being sincere when, in the Estimates Committees, it was asked a question as to what happens to the money from the properties that are sold. We were told originally the money was going to be used for the development of roads in the metropolitan area.

But we were told in those Committees that only the value which was paid for the properties at the time of acquisition would be used for road purposes. The rest is going into general revenue. Some of those properties were bought for about 20 per cent off their present day value. So we have a very minute amount going towards developing roads to help improve the traffic flow within the city, to speed up people's opportunity to travel to and from work, while the balance is going towards supplementing the State Budget.

Therefore, the original statement by the State Government was not accurate or, perhaps to be fair, it was misleading. I am glad the member for Brighton nods and agrees with that. I am pleased that she admits that her Government was misleading in the information it put out.

An honourable member: Deceptive.

Mr EVANS: Deceptive is another way of putting it. The people of the south need an improved transport system. When there was talk of a railway line to serve the Tea Tree Gully or north-eastern area and talk of a busway or an approved traffic corridor, what did the southern candidates for the A.L.P. say? 'The Liberals are going to put an O-Bahn out towards the north-eastern suburbs. What are they going to do for the south?' They were greatly vocal in their condemnation then. We were helping to provide something for the people in the north-east, and certain Government members said they wanted it in the south. The people in the south do not matter a damn to the members concerned. There is no concern for them. It has been said that the Government will upgrade part of South Road. What benefit is that? It only builds up a bottleneck elsewhere. It does not help people in the south move through in their vehicles.

If people buy or rent a house in the southern suburbs because their job is there, they have no guarantee that that job will still be there in five years time. It may be in the north. If there is congestion on the road, how do they get from south to north? Some may say, 'Sell the house,' but in another five years time their job may well be in the south. People like to stay in their homes and make them places where they will spend a significant part of their lives. They do not want to change jobs and have several homes because the Government refuses to accept the responsibility of providing a satisfactory traffic corridor to accommodate them.

Madam Acting Speaker, as I said earlier, you and the members for Brighton and Baudin were some of the most outspoken people on this matter, but now you are like mice. You do not even squeak as much as a mouse on the subject. You have forgotten the people. You said, 'Support us and we will make sure you get a fair go.' There was another area of controversy, involving Flagstaff Hill Road and Reservoir Road. Both political Parties took up the challenge when the pressure was on. I believe that both Parties would honour that agreement to some degree. But, I ask the present Government and the members who represent the south whether they are still as environmentally conscious and as concerned about the quality of people's lives as they were before the last election.

Mrs Appleby: Totally.

Mr EVANS: I am pleased that the member for Brighton said that, and I ask her to speak to the Minister who sits on her right hand side at the moment and see whether he is prepared to let that traffic corridor be built a little closer

to the Happy Valley reservoir so that the quality of lives of people who bought their homes in that area is improved. They will be living adjacent to that road. They should get a little peace and quiet when it is developed. In other words, the route of the road should be shifted back near to the reservoir. Madam Acting Speaker, I seek your support in that area, even though it may not directly affect any of your constituents or their quality of life, but it will be your people who are involved in making the noise in high speed motor vehicles which will affect the quality of life for those people who live near the reservoir.

In 1965 to 1969 Governments of both Parties set out to acquire 300 acres in that area to protect the water quality of the Happy Valley reservoir, when already around the reservoir there was a protective channel, which is still there. Very little water runs off and gets into the reservoir. The Minister of Water Resources, who I am pleased to see is now in the House, should note that there is no need to make sure that the road be located far away from that reservoir: it can easily be taken back closer to the reservoir without interfering with the quality of life of those people who own homes in that area. In the same area there was some conflict about Housing Trust homes and the Housing Trust at that time gave certain assurances. I have had some contact on this matter in recent times, and I am pleased now that the Minister of Housing is in the House.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I've been here all the time.

Mr EVANS: That would be about as accurate as some other things that are said at times. The Housing Trust gave some assurances. The people in that area have never said (nor have I ever said or condoned the attitude) that Housing Trust homes should not be built in Aberfoyle Park or other parts of the southern area, but they would be concerned if we started to build large groups of Trust houses. Whole communities are disadvantaged when large blocks of people with similar problems are thrown into one area. People in the south, to my knowledge, have never said that they are against Housing Trust homes in the area, but they want them to be grouped in such a way that will afford an appropriate mix of society.

That is the sort of thing that the Hon. Hugh Hudson used to discuss, promote and advocate on nearly every occasion he rose in the House, explaining how planning for a community should take place in the future, not so that we get a rich society in one area and poor in another. In the case of the poor, their situation is usually no fault of their own: it is the result of bad luck or other factors, sometimes involving their health and sometimes family problems. I ask the Minister to note that the people in the south are becoming concerned at the attitude that the Housing Trust is again taking.

I give the Trust credit for what it has done in varying letter boxes and drives that go into houses so that they are not all identical along the street. House alignments are varied so that they are not all in one line: some are set back and some set forward, and the type of fence is varied, as is the type of bricks, windows and, to some degree, the roof design.

I give credit for those things. I think that as far as it is possible in an aesthetic or architectural way, or in landscaping, the Trust has gone almost as far as it can in building homes of a reasonable standard. I am not saying that they are substandard or too extravagant for the money available. But the one thing to watch is that we do not start putting a whole group of people with the same sort of problems into the one area, because it is unfair to those people and their neighbours.

At the same time the Trust promised to make available homes for purchase as well as for rental. As long as we keep doing those things, it will be better for everyone in the

community. The reason that I raise it is that it is only in the past two days that I have had the community association contact me from the Aberfoyle Park area with some queries, more particularly asking why build a high school for 1 400 or 1 500 students. Where is the massive explosion coming from for that number of students to go to the new high school, which I am pleased will be open next year as originally planned? I now wish to move to another part of the Budget and that is the Electricity Trust line.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You're on dangerous ground.

Mr EVANS: I do not think I will get any shocks from talking about the Electricity Trust: I am not on dangerous ground in that respect, and I am not worried about the comment from that Minister. The Electricity Trust is forced by the Government to collect a tax from the community. The Dunstan Government first introduced it: it taxed the Electricity Trust to supplement the Budget that we are now talking about. That tax is paid by the consumers of electricity. To my knowledge there is no expense on the Government in relation to the Electricity Trust: it may have to guarantee the Trust at times, but there are no direct expenses as far as the Electricity Trust is concerned against the Government. It is fair to say that the Electricity Trust in fact helps out the Government in some areas. So why does this tax continue on consumers when electricity is becoming so expensive and so exorbitant in cost?

That brings me to the point that in the hills at the moment there is some protest about the Electricity Trust trimming trees. I maintain more native trees than the vast majority of people in the Adelaide Hills: in fact, I am sure I do, so I am not against native trees, although I will not have them near my home. That is something that I have learnt through living in the Hills, because of the bushfire risk. I will not condone any native trees near my home because of self-preservation. However, this demonstration and protest being carried out against the Electricity Trust suggesting that it should go underground has some merit if we can afford it. Always, whether it be with public transport, water connections, sewerage or something else in servicing a community, there are some people who come along and say, 'They do it in other countries.'

Whether there are very high populations, multi-storey residential buildings—I mean 30 to 40 storeys high—or small allotments and dense double-storey accommodation, the distance that one has to travel with power, water or public transport to service a large number of people is not very great. In a country like Australia, where there are vast distances to travel to deliver the power, water and sewers, the cost to individual homes is very high. I ask the people who are making these protests to the Electricity Trust about trimming trees near the power lines as a bushfire prevention to stop and think of the cost of putting cables underground to a society which at the moment is struggling to meet its overall commitments.

I say that quite sincerely, because I believe the pressure that is being applied to the Trust may force it into an area of placing the consumer of electricity into a much higher price range, and Governments may not be able to pick up the tab to subsidise the pensioner area, where we are helping people, quite rightly, and in the case of industry and other areas. Many people would be forced out of the State because of the cost of electricity. I ask people to think quite seriously about that, and that brings me to the point of the country Fire Services. Madam Acting Speaker, part of your area is serviced by Country Fire Services, as is a significant part of my area. In the Estimates Committees, through questioning, we found that the Budget does not really assist the Country Fire Services to any great degree. I find it rather ironic that a fire unit from my deputy's area in Summertown was used in a promotional stint after the last major bushfire to say, 'Here is a dilapidated old vehicle, it needs replacing. We do not have enough money.'

What happens when there is an allocation of money? That poor old unit is told that it will receive very little. In fairness, I think we all should understand that the C.F.S. is one of the cheapest forms of insurance that we have: it is one of the cheapest forms of fire prevention and fire fighting. When there are so many volunteers prepared to give their time to train, to fight, and offer advice on prevention, then it is up to the Government to find the money to make sure that they are properly equipped. I know that the C.F.S. has a magnificent headquarters in town but it is starting to cost too much to run compared with a man going out to the field to supply the equipment where the action will take place. We must be conscious of this.

We do not want a massive headquarters if we cannot get the equipment out to those people who are putting their lives at risk, giving up time from work for the training process, their families backing them in fundraising, the community backing them in fundraising: we cannot go on saying to them, 'You give, give, give, but the Government will not recognise what you do give. We will not supply you with the money to get the necessary equipment to become a modern firefighting organisation.' I know that people of your philosophy Madam Acting Speaker, and in your Government, if there was a move tomorrow to bring in some paid people within the area of the Country Fire Services and move it towards a paid service, would be supporting it.

There are men and women out there prepared to give their time. There are women on the units serving it well. Let us be honest! Let us be fair and say that, before we start talking about paid manpower in that area, we will make sure all the equipment is available that is necessary for the volunteers to carry out their role effectively for the protection not only of their own homes and property and family, but those of others who live in the area and travel through it. That brings me to another point. In the 1970s, when people like myself advocated that the Hills should be a tourist area, advocated the sign posting of roads and advocated that small businesses should start to employ local people, and to encourage people to come to the Hills as a tourist area, there were many who condemned that attitude. They said, 'We do not want rubbernecks in the Hills'—in other words, tourists. They did not want them there at that time because they were living in a period when Governments were spending money as if it had no end.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Which Government?

Mr EVANS: Mr Whitlam in particular, if any honourable member wants to know. They were just throwing money down the drain, printing it as if it had no end. Suddenly, it started to run out and the luxury life that people were leading suddenly showed up and there was unemployment. People said, 'Tourism is a great area in which to employ people: let us promote tourism': 10 years later than it should have been. However, no-one gives any credit or says, 'We were wrong.' However, I am thrilled that now in the hills a group is promoting tourism successfully and has convinced governments, including your Government, Madam Acting Speaker, that there is some benefit in tourism in the hills. I am thrilled that it has occurred and I congratulate particularly the member for Coles (the shadow Minister of Tourism) for working hard to make sure that the Government toes the line in relation to tourism not only in the State but also in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 October at 2 p.m.