

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 August 1988

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 10 August. Page 132.)

The **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (Coles): It is my pleasure to support the motion to adopt the Address in Reply and to reaffirm my loyalty to the Crown. I convey my condolences to the family of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls, a former Governor of South Australia. I had the honour to represent the Opposition at the funeral of Sir Douglas Nicholls, a most moving and memorable occasion.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I ask the House to come to order. On Thursdays there is normally some excuse for extra conversations, because with private members' time members might have to go into some private discussion about how business is going to proceed over the following two hours. That excuse does not apply today and I ask members to resume their seats.

The **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE**: The funeral of Sir Douglas Nicholls was a most moving and memorable occasion. I would estimate that at least 500 people gathered together to pay a tribute to a man who had started life in a very unassuming fashion, as a young Aboriginal baby on a backblock in Victoria, and who ended his life in a position of such national eminence. It was indeed an occasion that made one reflect on the kind of lives that make an impact on this nation. There is no doubt that Sir Douglas Nicholls through his personal qualities had that kind of impact, which has been well documented by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in their tributes to him. I would like to take this opportunity to convey my condolences to his family and also to say how much I admired the manner in which Sir Douglas's son and other speakers presented the eulogies at the funeral.

I also want to congratulate most warmly the members of the Government recently elected to the Ministry, the members for Mawson, Todd and Florey, and to wish them well in what my colleagues and I hope and anticipate will be a relatively short career on the front bench. My colleagues and I naturally assume that we will be taking their places some time next year.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the retired member of the Legislative Council, my former colleague Mr Murray Hill. His contribution to the State of South Australia and to the Parliament has been well recorded on numerous occasions. However, I note that in the tributes to Murray Hill, in which reference was made to his service to local government, to the arts and to ethnic affairs, one principal achievement appears to have been overlooked, namely, Murray Hill's part in establishing the History Trust of South Australia. I regard that as one of his most significant achievements because it brought together the administration of museums in this State and it gave a status and a priority to museum development which I think is very much in keeping with our cultural origins and with our cultural, educational, scientific and tourism objectives. I believe that that achievement—establishing the History Trust—has been very well respected and will be regarded with gratitude by future generations.

I would now like to examine the way that the Minister for Environment and Planning in particular, and the Government in general, is administering a State national parks policy which is in conflict with the Government's own Party policy, substantially with the spirit of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, and demonstrably with the policies document of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In his Address in Reply speech the member for Heysen demonstrated very effectively that the Government's proposals for Cleland Conservation Park are in conflict with the law as it applies to the hills face zone and the law as it affects everyone else in this State.

The **Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy**: Two sets of rules.

The **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE**: As the Deputy Leader says, two sets of rules: one set of rules for farmers, residents, manufacturers and everyone who owns property in the hills face zone and another set of rules for the Government. The Government called for registrations of interest to develop the Mount Lofty site. An appalling amount of time has been allowed to elapse between the Ash Wednesday fire five years ago and moves to develop and restore that site to its natural beauty and to provide a proper viewing place for the hundreds of thousands of tourists who visit the Summit each year. But for the Government to do it in this way—and to cast aside three proposals contained in the principles and objectives of the hills face zone supplementary development plan, and to choose instead a proposal that flouts that plan in every substantial respect—to my mind, and to the minds of most conservationists (and certainly those who are directly affected), was an arrogant flouting of the law and one which should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

The member for Alexandra has one of the most beautiful national parks in the State in his electorate and I refer to Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island. He has drawn to my attention the fact that the Government intends to proceed with tourist development in that park, and that is arousing deep concern among his constituents—and very rightly so. The park to which I wish to address my remarks is the Flinders Ranges National Park and the proposed development at Wilpena. We should see this proposed development in the context of conservation, tourism, economic development and the State's attitudes generally to each of these matters. There is no doubt whatsoever that South Australia lags behind other States when measured by all significant economic indicators, including its share of tourism growth. At the same time, a significant section of the public believes that the principal beneficiaries of tourism should be the local host community, whether it be on Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Ranges, Mount Lofty, or the wider community of the State. There is a belief that the host community should be the principal beneficiary of tourism.

We believe that South Australia's assets, both natural and man-made, should be protected, enhanced and developed in a way that ensures that the essential environmental, social and cultural nature of the State is preserved. If there is time today (and if there is not, at some later date) I propose to consider the Government's support for and seeking of the multifunction polis scheme which is proposed by the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry and which this State Government hopes to have established on Fleurieu Peninsula, which is also substantially in the electorate of the member for Alexandra.

This morning I will confine my remarks to the Flinders Ranges National Park and the proposed Wilpena resort. That resort is being developed at a time of intense interest in and public concern about the importance of conservation and the natural environment on the one hand and an aware-

ness of the economic and social importance of the growth of the tourism industry on the other. It seems to me, and many others in South Australia (and no-one can doubt my own personal commitment to tourism), that the Government has become quite unbalanced in its attitude to the one against the other. The primary principles of conservation and of protection of the environment are being thrown out the window in the case of Cleland Conservation Park, apparently in the case of Flinders Chase, and most certainly in the case of the Wilpena resort in the Flinders Ranges National Park.

The resort, which is to be located in a remote and very fragile area of South Australia, has become a focus of public debate, and I believe eventually it will arouse even more public debate than the Jubilee Point proposal, principally because the resort is in the Flinders Ranges, made famous in the 1920s and 1930s by the paintings of Sir Hans Heysen and by the subsequent writings of Hans Mincham and Dr Reg Sprigg. Further, the Flinders Ranges are much visited and loved by South Australians.

The ranges are an area of exceptional interest in geological, geographical, botanical, historical and anthropological terms and they represent much of what is unique in South Australia. They contain a vast open-air museum of geological treasures, of Aboriginal dreamtime mythology, as well as being the home of the red kangaroo, the yellow footed rock wallaby, the wedge-tailed eagle and numerous species of native flora. The proposed \$50 million resort is to be constructed in stages and it will ultimately comprise nearly 700 accommodation units—more than six times the present number of units located at the Wilpena Chalet—and it will result in a vastly increased number of visitors to the park. The accommodation will be provided in a four star hotel, bungalows, cottages, dormitory style accommodation, cabins, powered sites, tent sites and staff accommodation. In addition—and I ask members to remember that we are speaking about a national park with all that that concept entails—there will be swimming pools, tennis courts, a games room, gymnasium, two playgrounds, a nine hole golf course, provision for camel and horse rides, joy flights and vehicle hire.

Apparently the Government was not prepared to finance the basic infrastructure of roads, water and power to this area for which my colleague, the member for Eyre, has been fighting valiantly during his whole period in office in this Parliament. The member for Eyre wants those basic facilities for his own constituents and, of course, for visitors to the region. He has fought consistently in this House to achieve some kind of sympathetic understanding by the Government of the need for these facilities. He had very little success—and not for the lack of trying—until the Minister for Environment and Planning who, with the Government, was not prepared to finance the infrastructure, then invited expressions of interest from developers, and chose to accept the Ophix offer of preparing feasibility studies and providing infrastructure in return for the sole rights of the development.

I wonder how many members of the House realise what statutory means the Minister used to implement the development. He did not use the National Parks and Wildlife Act but section 7 (3) (b) of the Planning Act to implement the development. This provision exempts a Minister of the Crown or a prescribed instrumentality or agency of the Crown from giving notice to the Planning Commission or a local council if the development is 'of a kind excluded from the provisions of this section by regulation'. Thus regulation 59 (e), pursuant to section 7 (3) (b), refers to 'development of land dedicated under the National Parks

and Wildlife Act where such development is carried out in accordance with an adopted plan of management'. That section was used to enable the Minister to bypass the provisions of the Planning Act and the environmental impact assessment procedures laid down in section 49 of that Act.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The environmental impact procedure is being used certainly as a matter of political necessity as perceived by the Minister. It is not being used in accordance with the statute. It is being used in a way in which it was never intended. It is being used in concert with a management plan. I suggest that an environmental impact statement and a management plan are two entirely separate statutory processes.

Mr Lewis: They should be.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: They should be, indeed, because they are irreconcilable in their purpose and should never be combined in a single document. I will pursue that point in more detail later. I believe that in overriding the Flinders Ranges National Park Management Plan of 1983, which, as I will demonstrate, would prohibit a development of the scale and nature of the proposed Wilpena resort—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The honourable member should study the law and then ask herself whether the Government has manipulated the law and has possibly put itself *ultra vires* in doing so. As I say, the Minister has gone outside the 1983 Flinders Ranges Management Plan and his timing is questionable, to say the very least. He has used regulation 59 (e) to exempt the Government from the requirement to go to the Planning Commission, but at the time he used section 59 (e) the land in question on which the resort is to be built was not part of the Flinders Ranges National Park. At least six months elapsed between the invoking of that regulation and the annexing of the land to the park. The Government is open to serious question about the manner in which the Minister has handled the issue.

I turn to the management plan and the policies of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Flinders Ranges Management Plan states that the entire park is included in a class A environmental area on the Flinders Ranges Planning Area Development Plan of 1973, a classification which covers most of the scenic areas of the Flinders Ranges. The description of this area of the central Flinders Ranges as a national park puts a responsibility on the National Parks and Wildlife Service 'to develop and manage the plan with particular sensitivity'. The proposal is in conflict with many statements in the policy document of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, fourth edition, issued by the Department of Environment and Planning in 1987. That is the most recent policy document and it contains not one word about the commercial exploitation of national parks. The document states:

The parks system should provide the people who visit parks with the opportunity to shrug off the urban environment, traffic, neighbourhood noises, city streetscapes and crowds . . .

There is not much chance of shrugging off urban environment, traffic and noises when there are joy flights buzzing overhead, and when the whole paraphernalia of sophisticated urban development is plonked down in a remote, fragile and beautiful area. The policy document, which is a guideline for the National Parks and Wildlife Service, states:

It must be remembered that landscapes which do not bear the stamp of mankind's immediate activities will be even more difficult to find in future than they are today and damaged landscape will be costly, difficult and often impossible to rehabilitate.

If anyone tries to tell me how a golf course can be reconciled with a national park—and we are not talking about a rec-

reation park—they will have to show me a statute which is very different from the National Parks and Wildlife Act of South Australia. The policy document of the service maintains that the major thrust of the service is towards conservation. It states:

This provides the philosophical base from which it appreciates its management of natural land forms, habitats, indigenous species and historical sites.

Let us leave aside for a moment the National Parks and Wildlife Service document and look at the ALP policy document that was current before the last State election. The ALP environment policy makes no mention of commercial exploitation of reserves. It states:

The second Bannon Labor Government will, as resources allow, undertake measures to foster new tourist developments established near—

not in, but near—

those parks with a high potential for conservation based tourism.

The use of the word 'near' is quite specific and therefore the proposal goes significantly beyond ALP policy. The fact is that the Government has adopted a *de facto* policy of commercial exploitation of parks which has never been endorsed by its own Party, which has never been put to public debate—until recently on the initiative of the Environmental Protection Council—which has never been endorsed by the Parliament or the people and which is causing deep concern among conservationists and the wider community throughout the State.

It is interesting that the Flinders Ranges National Park Management Plan of 1983 involved a survey of attitudes of visitors to the park regarding proposed development. That survey, which was undertaken in 1977, revealed that strongest opposition was expressed against banning of wood fires, larger camp grounds—and, of course, we are now expanding the camp ground by a vast extent—vehicle access inside Wilpena Pound, and a bigger hotel/motel complex at Wilpena. I repeat: public opinion was strongly against a bigger hotel/motel complex at Wilpena. The policy document of the National Parks and Wildlife Service further states:

As a general rule overnight facilities located within a reserve will be restricted to simple developments—

and I contrast the words 'simple developments' with a four star hotel, a golf course, a swimming pool, a spa, joy flights—you name it—

such as camping provides and existing basic accommodation facilities. Exceptions may be considered where suitable locations are not available outside the reserve in the area concerned.

There was a suitable location outside the reserve but the Government chose to annexe that location and bring it into the reserve in order to simply facilitate its move as a developer in its own right.

In approving the proposal in December 1987 the Minister for Environment and Planning has effectively overridden existing National Parks and Wildlife Service policy; he has overridden ALP policy; and he has given an interpretation to the National Parks and Wildlife Act which places far greater emphasis on the perceived public benefit and enjoyment role of reserves than on the conservation of wildlife in a natural environment role.

The statutory process which the Minister has used has tended to blur the real nature of the decision-making and statutory processes that have applied to the project. As I said earlier, there was no statutory obligation on the Minister—because he avoided the relevant section of the Planning Act—to require an environmental impact statement. He has required one, I believe, as a matter of political necessity. Also, I believe most people would think that it is occurring as a result of a statutory requirement. They have

no idea that the Minister ran round the back way of the Planning Act in order to implement this proposal.

I know of no other circumstance, at least in Australia, where a draft environmental impact statement in fact forms part of the management plan for a national park. The very nature of the provisions of an environmental impact statement requires objectivity and a scientific assessment and analysis of factors that will affect the environment. It is a completely different function from that of a management plan. In this case, because the Assessments Branch of the department has to assess the environmental impact statement, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service is the developer of the management plan, we have, effectively, one department acting as Caesar judging Caesar. I regard that as an entirely unsatisfactory state of affairs.

It is impossible for there to be the proper objectivity in this case, and it is impossible for the service to be required by the Minister to fulfil the role of both prosecutor and judge, yet that is what is happening in one of Australia's most unique national parks, and one which is highly regarded by South Australians. To summarise, there are doubts inherent in the Government's use of regulation 59 (e) of the Planning Act, which exempts development of land dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act simply because it used that regulation prior to the alteration of the park boundaries.

There is manifest conflict between the scale and nature of the project and existing legislation governing reserves. There is conflict between the project and existing policies governing the National Parks and Wildlife Service. There has been a failure by the Government to undertake separately two entirely different statutory procedures, that is, the environmental impact statement under the Planning Act and an amendment to the management plan under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. All in all the Government stands condemned on a number of counts.

I wish to conclude by saying that, in modified form and eliminating elements which are demonstrably in conflict with the general thrust of the National Parks and Wildlife Act and policies, the project could well proceed. If it were to do so it would be more appropriately located adjacent to rather than within the park boundaries, thus enabling the integrity of the park to be preserved. The Government's actions in respect of Wilpena, Cleland and Flinders Chase are arousing very deep concern.

As I say, there has been no endorsement whatsoever, no support whatsoever, as evinced by the people, either at an election or through the parliamentary process, for this quite fundamental and dramatic change of policy. It is a policy which is being rejected worldwide in countries where national parks are an important part of the national estate. The United States, Africa and the United Kingdom are all moving away from the commercial exploitation of parks. Public opinion in Australia, as evidenced by surveys, is strongly against this policy, yet the Bannon Labor Government is pursuing it at full pelt in complete defiance of public opinion and, I believe, in contravention of some of its own policies and legislation.

The debate on this subject should be opened up more widely. It should take place in the Parliament as well as in the community. I commend the Environmental Protection Council for its recent seminar on the general subject and I urge that more and more members of the public scrutinise very closely indeed what the Bannon Government is doing to exploit parks which were placed there in order to give them statutory protection and reserve them from the normal planning and development procedures that are undertaken quite properly in this State.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to support this motion and, in doing so, place on record my condolences to the family of Sir Doug Nicholls. I did not have the privilege of knowing Sir Doug but I have been personally involved in the sport that he loved so much, that is, football. Over the years I have learned that anybody who has a close connection with that sport must be a good person.

I also wish Murray Hill all the best in his retirement and I hope that both he and Eunice will have the opportunity to spend many hours doing the things that they wish to do. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the new Ministers: the members for Mawson, Todd and Florey. I hope that, in the next couple of years, if that is the length of time that this Government is to serve, we have the opportunity to ask them pointed questions.

Today I will talk about three major areas of concern in transport. I will touch briefly on two of them and spend the majority of my time on the last issue, that being the State Transport Authority. These three important issues, which have been neglected and poorly handled by the Bannon Government, are the funding of the Highways Department, the *Island Seaway* and the management of the STA, which is directly under the control of the Minister of Transport. My first comment about highways concerns the lack of funds. That is brought about by two major problems. In the past three years, there has been a drop of 8 per cent per year in Federal funding. At State level, there has been a significant leakage of funds from the State fuel tax.

In 1982-83, when the fuel tax was introduced, the Government collected \$25.7 million, and all that money was paid into the Highways Fund. In 1986-87, \$47 million was collected but still only \$25.7 million or 54 per cent of the money collected was paid into that fund. In 1987-88, with a prospective collection of \$75 million, the same \$25.7 million or only 34 per cent is to be paid into the Highways Fund.

Mr Lewis: They're ripping us off.

Mr INGERSON: Yes. In the six years of the Bannon Government, the leakage to general revenue has amounted to \$129 million. However, in 1987-88, it is a massive leakage of \$50 million. I know that the Minister and the Premier would say that there has been an increase in revenue in the Motor Registration Division relating to licensing and registration of vehicles. That points out to me the lack of priority given by this Government to the funding of the road system and, in particular, the funding of road maintenance programs: That is a major area of concern and, at a later date, I will pursue that matter at greater length.

The second issue concerns the *Island Seaway*. If ever we have had a saga that shows the mismanagement and lack of action of a Government it is this one. The original budget figure was \$11 million and that is now estimated to be \$21 million (or significantly more, if one listens to all the arrant rumours around town)—a blow-out of some \$10 million, and we still do not have a vessel that can perform in rough weather. The Minister knows that the vessel traverses some of the most difficult waters in the world.

We have a vessel which was poorly designed and which has performed poorly because of that design; and we have the Bannon Government slowly but surely admitting that we have to do something about it. I hope that in the next few days the Minister will inform the House of the independent people who are supposed to be looking at the vessel. I hope that he will publish some of the comments made by the operators, passengers and the people of Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: As the member for Coles said, perhaps one day the plans might be tabled. I do not intend to go

into a great deal of detail about the *Island Seaway* because I know the member for Alexandra will take this matter up in greater detail.

I now turn my attention to the STA to show how this Government has neglected its role to ensure that we have an efficient and cost effective public transport system. In my five years in this place I have never seen such a disgraceful public relations campaign by the STA where there was such a waste of public money as the \$20 000 that was spent, on the authorisation of the Minister, to say absolutely nothing.

Let me turn to some of the comments that were made: that Adelaide has a superb transit system—a comment made by Professor Fielding, but no other comments were made by him in relation to how inefficient and poorly productive the system is. The next comment was that the STA was holding down its costs. The 1982-83 cost to the taxpayer was about \$75 million and today the cost is about \$127 million (and I will support those figures with comments made by the General Manager at a recent UTLC seminar). This brochure talks about real costs, but no-one pays bills in real dollars; one pays them in actual dollars, and the Minister knows that as well as anyone else.

The next comment was that the STA was catering efficiently for its customers, and I will come to that in a moment. The next comment was that the STA had the most efficient Government-owned transport system in Australia, and I notice that that comment was made by the Chairman. I would be most surprised if the Chairman did not say that in any case.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I am not saying that at all; I am saying that I hope any chairman would be saying that his system is very efficient and I do not expect other comments. I wonder whether the consumers who consistently wait for buses, trains and trams would say that we have a very efficient system? I wonder whether the consumers who miss buses because they do not turn up would say that we have a very efficient system? I will quote from a copy of a letter of 26 July addressed to the General Manager of the STA. It states:

Over the past few months the bus departing Currie Street, namely the 4.27 p.m. and 4.44 p.m., has been constantly late, up to and including 15 minutes. This has become a regular occurrence, even in off-peak times, especially before 5 p.m. That is just an example of 20 or 30 letters I have. I know every member on this side has exactly that same sort of letter. It continues:

I arrived at the bus stop directly opposite Harris Scarfe's at 11.36 a.m. The bus 'did not' arrive until 12.10 p.m. therefore making the service 19 minutes late. A number of other residents using this service are also most dissatisfied and appalled at the inconsistency of buses constantly arriving late or not arriving at all.

That is an example of many many letters that members on this side are getting. What about the consumer who has to queue up? If one goes down to King William Street or Grenfell Street one can see the problems that are being created there.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Just wait and you will be told about that; do not be impatient. Buses, trams and trains are passing stops, not stopping at all, because they are full. All this has happened since May when we had this magic new system that was going to save a lot of money, and be efficient and of benefit to the consumers. There is not one single thing in that public relations campaign that is in the interests of the consumer. Not once has there been any recognition that this system should be geared for the consumer. It is all geared to show us how good our bureaucracy is at running the STA. Not one single message in there that

says buses will run at this time, and it is in people's interest to be at the stop at a certain time.

Not once is there any mention of benefit for the consumer. It is all about the bureaucracy and how well it is supposedly handling the system. It is a pity the Minister and the Premier did not get on a few of these buses and go out and talk to a few of these people and find out what the problem is.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I bet he has not done so in the past two years. What about the ticketing system? The Minister would be aware that between 40 and 60 faults are reported to headquarters in the system every day. That is continuing, and there is no reduction at all. The union says exactly the same thing; that the system is not working. The Minister saw last week how I was supported by the ATMOEA. It is not only me saying this any more; it is people using the system who are saying that. People have seen their fares rise 157 per cent during the period of this Government, rising from 70c in 1982-83, to \$1.80 today. The Minister may talk about multitrip tickets, but let us compare the weekly ticket. In 1982-83 that was 58c. Today it is \$1.15, a 98 per cent increase. So I am being fair, and comparing apples with apples, not apples with bananas, as the Minister so successfully tried to do a couple of weeks ago when he said that the multitrip fare was less than the standard fare of two years ago. Of course it is less than the standard fare but he is comparing apples and bananas. One is a 10-times trip—a multitrip ticket—and the other one is a one-only ticket. Over 30 per cent of the people use and pay the full price and 70 per cent use the other ticket. The Minister knows full well there has been an increase of 98 per cent over the period of his Government.

Over the period from 1979-80 to 1986-87 there has been continual comment about the increasing deficit of the STA. There have been numerous reports and investigations during that period with very little obvious change in the escalation of this deficit. The net cost of providing services was \$47 million in 1979-80 and \$63 million in 1981-82. For the Bannon Government, the net cost of providing services increased from \$75 million in 1982-83 to \$107 million in 1986-87 or from \$1.4 million to \$2.7 million per week.

More importantly, so that everyone can understand it, we are losing in the STA, \$18 000 per hour for every operating hour that it runs. That is the equivalent to the cost of a Magna car for every single hour that this service is running. The 1985 status report of the Director-General of Transport to the Minister contained a detailed analysis of the STA with broad predictions that by 1995 the operating cost would be about \$437 million a year and a capital cost of \$115 million, if no change occurred. He estimates that the total expenditure during the period to 1995 will be close to \$1 100 million—and an operating deficit of \$850 million and capital expenditure of \$250 million.

It is interesting that in a speech to the UTLC in May this year the General Manager of the STA referred to the problems we face, and he said that the subsidy (that is, the cost to the taxpayer) has become unaffordable at \$127 million in 1986-87. He went on to say that that represents an operating loss of \$94 million and a contribution to ownership of \$33 million, making up the \$127 million. However, he also went on to say in that same document that, 'if we pursue only the current initiatives', on his estimation the deficit cost of the STA to the taxpayers of this State in 1990-91 will be \$150 million in 1986-87 dollars or \$195 million by then, that is, if there are no new initiatives at all.

In fact, I say that that represents not \$18 000 per hour but \$29 000 per hour in terms of the cost four years down

the track. He also says that the Government's \$127 million per annum is equivalent to \$380 per household, or nearly as much as is paid in council rates. Therefore, the General Manager clearly recognises the massive future cost of public transport to this State.

In May 1987, the Government appointed PA Consulting Services to conduct a review of the State Transport Authority's performance. Its report was adopted by Cabinet in July 1987 when the State Transport Authority was directed to implement the recommendations. Those recommendations include the preparation of a business plan and an immediate \$10 million reduction in the deficit. It will be very interesting to see, when the STA's annual report comes out, first, whether we have this business plan which was to be made public and, secondly, whether there has been an immediate reduction of \$10 million in the deficit. I do not believe that that has been done but I will be very interested to see the annual report when it is put before Parliament.

More recently, the Government has announced a further review of STA operations designed to establish the most cost-effective transport system suitable for operation into the twenty-first century. The review is being conducted by Dr Peter Fielding of the United States. It is my view that such a review, whilst reasonable in its motives, is opportunistic in its timing as the Bannon Government appears reluctant to provide clear guidance and strong leadership to contain the deficit.

I now refer to the market in which the STA is involved. In 1984-85, the STA identified its market as being about 9 per cent of all journeys undertaken by the community. Of these public journeys the STA's market share, in the categories shown, is said to be: working journeys to the city, about 41 per cent; shopping journeys to the city, about 39 per cent; and educational trips, about 33 per cent. It is further claimed that about 20 per cent of Adelaide's community use the STA system four or more times a week, and a further 50 per cent are casual users. The same statistics were reported in 1985-86 and 1986-87. Analysis later in the speech does not support the claimed market share. The market statistics are therefore outdated and suspect and need to be revised by contemporary market research—not by a ticketing system which could not possibly provide an accurate result. In fact, over the past two or three months people have been standing at bus stops physically counting the number of people on buses.

I noted this week that the Minister said that this new system would give us all the results from the number of people who use the system, but the reality is that there are people out there hand counting in the buses and so one would have to suspect that the Crouzet system is not giving us all the answers that are required.

To support my comments, an analysis of trends of the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for 1981 to 1986 indicates that the public transport system has been able to capture only a small proportion of increased travel from the outer suburbs, and in the inner suburbs there has been a massive defection from public transport to other modes, mainly car travel. The increase that occurred in outer suburbs was due to population gains rather than a better market share for public transport. In fact, these outer suburbs experienced the biggest increases in car travel. In Adelaide as a whole, the total market share for public transport as measured by people travelling to work, either by public transport or by car, has decreased from 17 per cent in 1981 to only 14 per cent in 1986.

I now refer to the matter of fares. The gross fare collections are matching inflation only after including the Gov-

ernment subsidy. The paying public, whether on full or concessional rates, are not meeting the full flow-on effects of inflation. Nearly 60 per cent of passengers receive concessional fares of some type, costing in 1986-87 some \$19.8 million. In 1979-80, the total outlay on concessional travel subsidies was \$102 million. In 1982-83 the adult fare for two zones was 70 cents, while in 1986-87 it was \$1.50, and now it is \$1.80. That represents an increase of 157 per cent. In 1982-83, a weekly ticket was 58 cents, while in August 1988 it will be \$1.15—an increase of 98 per cent. Also, of course, instead of having an unlimited amount of travel per week we now have a maximum of only 10 rides.

Earlier I referred to market size. In fact, the market share has declined. According to State Transport Authority annual reports, during the life of the Bannon Government there has been a decline in patronage for all modes of transport, that is, bus, tram and train travel. In 1981-82, 79 million journeys were made, while in 1982-83 there were 67.5 million, and there was a drop in 1986-87 to 60.95 million. As can be seen, there has been a significant decline in journeys from a high of 79 million in 1981-82 to a low of 60.95 million in 1986-87. During the term of the Bannon Government there was a slight increase in journeys in 1983-84, but then there was a significant decline to 60.95 million last year. This is a fall of 8.3 million journeys per year, or 168 000 journeys less per week. To put it into perspective, that represents a crowd bigger than that which goes to the Grand Prix meeting on the Sunday. That is how many people are not riding on the buses, trains and trams today as compared with 1982-83.

The State Transport Authority's net cost of providing Adelaide's metropolitan services for the year 1986-87 was \$107 million compared with a net cost of \$99 million during 1985-86—an increase of \$8 million. The increase was due principally to the effects of inflation on salaries, wages and materials, as well as for finance costs for loan moneys used for fleet replacement and for the upgrading of infrastructure. At the same time, it is noted that the accumulated cash shortage—the difference between the net cost of providing services and the Government's contribution to these services—increased by a further \$14 million, to \$70 million, in 1986-87. This accumulated shortage started to escalate in 1984-85, when there was an addition to the accumulated shortage due to a change in accounting policy re employee benefits and self-insurance. Broadly, the balance of \$70 million relates to the lack of funding of depreciation and amortisation costs of leases. In future this accumulated shortage will need to be funded by the Government. There is no question that the STA has a cash shortage and it has come about by this lack of previous funding by the Government. Present criticisms follow the general view that the transport system is too expensive and that the deficit must be reversed. It should also be noted that the net cost of providing services exceeded the inflationary index using the base year of 1979-80.

As the CPI index increased by 32 per cent and the operating costs of the STA have increased by 47 per cent from 1982-83 to 1986-87, it can be said that the STA has been poorly managed when taking into consideration the productivity and efficiency increases that have occurred in most private sector operations during the same period. Regardless of the efforts to contain costs over the period, there has been a continuing escalation. These costs have outstripped the value of Government subsidy except for the period 1983-84. It appears that the Government has deliberately discounted its subsidy and left the STA short of cash. As well, the total cost of providing services during the period 1982-83 to 1986-87, has escalated from \$117 million

to \$171.6 million, or by 47 per cent. Particular areas that we need to look at include increases in administration and general expenses (82.8 per cent), in the amortization (187 per cent) and the interest on leasing (48.8 per cent) and interest payments on loans (153.1 per cent).

The rate of capital expenditure has increased over the period due to the development of the O-Bahn system, the upgrading of the signalling system, the replacement of buses and trains, and the new Crouzet ticketing system. The carry over of expenditure on committed works will mean that substantial capital expenditure will continue for some time. The cost of debt servicing resulting from this expansion of capital investment has been a major element in the increase of the STA deficit.

Effective control and management of capital expenditure is therefore a key aspect of the authority's performance. PA Consulting Services' assessment is that there is a clear scope for improvement in this aspect of the authority's performance. It is quite incredible that over five years the Bannon Government has not picked that up and yet an independent consultant picked it up.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: The Bannon Government have not, because they let it happen. In particular, it is the PA consultants' view that inadequate attention has been paid to the prioritisation of capital expenditures and to the flow-on effects of such expenditures on the STA's recurrent costs and deficit. As a result, it has generally been Treasury limits on capital allocations, rather than internal capital rationing processes, which have determined the size of the authority's capital program. What is more, PA Consulting Services said that it is not clear that the authority's capital investments have always been as cost-effective as might have been expected or given rise to anticipated savings in recurrent costs. In part this is attributable to two areas:

(a) the method of specification and tendering previously adopted by the authority for the 2 000 series; and

(b) we also believe that it is likely that a less ambitious approach to updating the rail signalling system would have allowed more discretion on the timing of expenditures.

It is interesting to note that in the *News* of last week the Chairman of the STA made an amazing comment when he said that the original budget was \$25 million, that today's cost is \$43 million, and the only reason that it has blown out is inflation and exchange rates. I find it absolutely staggering that any budget does not include allowances for inflationary costs and fluctuating exchange rates. It is quite staggering that an \$18 million blowout is not regarded as a blowout at all. That statement is staggering. Further, it is quite staggering that at the same time SAFA, which is supposed to be the best authority for managing money, did not check the two programs of Crouzet and the signalling system, because we have massive exchange rate blowouts in both instances. Over the years the authority has purchased a variety of makes of buses, and of course that is also a major problem.

One must consider that there are up to 40 to 60 reports of daily failures, machines do not work and tickets are not validated. Last Monday more than 100 people at the tram terminus complained that their ticket failed. When the union representatives went to Paris, they were told that we would face all of these problems as well as fraud problems. Last week the unions commented on the ticket system. There was a massive blow out because of the exchange rate and because nobody looked properly at the cost of the system. There were supposed to be savings of \$1 million a year, but the budget for the system has blown out to over \$7 million. There were comments also this week concerning counting

at bus stops and all of the things that are wrong with the Crouzet system, yet we were told earlier this week that that will be one of the best information systems. Late last session the Minister was asked to supply us with—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this Address in Reply debate and at the outset express my sympathies to the family of Sir Douglas Nicholls, former Governor of this State, whom I did not know personally but from comments made in this debate and previously, he obviously was a fine upstanding citizen of this State who did his work as Governor very well. It was most interesting to hear the comments from the member for Hanson last night when he described instances where Sir Douglas was able to meet with the ordinary person, being much happier in that role than in the very formal official role that Governors and people in similar positions so often have to adopt.

I also wish to extend my sympathies to the family of the late Arnold Noack, the former Head Attendant of this House. All of us had a high respect for Arnold. I certainly did. He was most helpful to me from the time I came into this House, even though he was not Head Attendant at that stage. Arnold is sorely missed and we certainly sympathise with his friends and family. I was sorry to see the Hon. Murray Hill leave the Upper House. Murray was the grandfather of the Parliament and was a fine example for other members to follow. I believe that he has been—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I said that he was the grandfather. The current grandfather of the House is the member for Daventry, Mr Stan Evans. I believe that Murray Hill has been very well followed by Mr Julian Stefani, and it was said by the Premier and also by the Leader of the Opposition that he is a most appropriate person to follow the Hon. Murray Hill because of Murray's great interest in the ethnic communities of this State.

I acknowledge the work of two former Ministers who have now taken their places on the back bench, namely the member for Spence (Hon. Roy Abbott) and the member for Mitchell (Hon. Ron Payne). I had many more dealings with the member for Spence than with the member for Mitchell because there is a lot of coastal area, and many jetties, in the District of Goyder. Being the Minister of Marine, the member for Spence visited my electorate regularly. He was very helpful and he had many areas upgraded. I felt that I got on very well with the former Minister. I thank him for the contributions he made to the District of Goyder. They were most appreciated and I assure him that the Ministers following on from him will receive similar representation from me.

There were many occasions when I had to take up a case with the former Minister of Mines and Energy in relation to people who were not able to get an electricity supply or where things were installed in such a way that they did not supply the required service. It was very pleasing that on quite a few of those occasions the Minister was able to intercede personally and my constituents were assisted. I express thanks on their behalf and I trust that the former Ministers will enjoy their stay (if that is the word) on the back benches. I am sure that their contributions will be noted.

Many matters were touched on in His Excellency's speech, but I felt some of them were very predictable. The speech was an endeavour to pat the Government on the back at a time when it is obviously failing in so many areas. From

that point of view I appreciate that the Governor perhaps has no other option, because I suspect that I know who the speech writer was.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I withdraw that comment and say that it is appreciated that the Governor is speaking on behalf of the State Government. First, I wish to refer to the rural sector, because little was said about it in the Governor's speech. The rural sector was covered under paragraphs 12, 13 and 14, commencing with the following statement:

In the rural sector, primary production has enjoyed favourable seasonal conditions, with good to excellent rains in most parts of the State.

The next paragraph indicates that there could be a 7 per cent increase in the gross value of rural production in the State during this financial year. I acknowledge that. True, the season has started satisfactorily, although the Government cannot take credit for that—not for one second. However, the House must appreciate that the rural sector has been through a period of real rural decline and a few A1 seasons are required to boost the productivity of the State as a whole if the rural sector is to maintain its position. We have had to rely on the rural sector for so many years. It is in regard to this relationship that I refer to one of several letters addressed to me, in this case from the Curramulka branch of the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia, as follows:

Dear John,

I enclose a copy for you of a letter to the Minister of Agriculture from our branch.

I wish to quote that letter, which is addressed to the Honourable Kym Mayes and which states:

Dear Sir,

It is with grave concern that we of the Curramulka branch of the Agricultural Bureau wish to make it known that no replacements have taken place at the Kadina office of the Department of Agriculture. It is of paramount importance to the agricultural industry of Yorke Peninsula and South Australia that this office be adequately staffed. Please give this matter your highest priority.

This letter was dated 3 August—it is very recent—but I had taken up this matter with the Minister back in March this year after it was pointed out to me by several people that replacement staff had not been appointed to the Kadina office of the Department of Agriculture. I would like to give a brief history of the Kadina office, which is the district office for the Yorke Peninsula district, part of the central region of South Australia where about half this State's farmers operate. However, only about one-third of the staff of the Department of Agriculture have duties connected with this area. Rationalisation 10 years ago in 1978 saw Kadina as the model office in this State. Any members who have been to Kadina may have seen the premises on the road from Kulpara and Paskeville to Kadina. This former modern and attractive house was converted to the Department of Agriculture office and certainly it is an ideal setting.

It is not surprising that the Kadina office was a model agricultural office for the rest of the State, because today's figures indicate that, on average, Yorke Peninsula produces 40 per cent of barley, 15 per cent of wheat and 30 per cent of peas produced in South Australia. Also, on the figures available to me, it has approximately 800 000 sheep (including some top sheep studs). Many cattle are also raised on the peninsula, and piggeries exist there as well.

What did this model office have in terms of staff in the period from 1978 and the few years thereafter? It is always difficult to identify exactly what staff existed in any particular year. I am talking about a 10 year period, and I am now referring to the earlier years of that period. It had a plant protection agronomist; a media and promotions person, who later transferred to the position of an agronomist;

a pig adviser; an animal health adviser; an animal production adviser; a vertebrate pest and pest plant control adviser; an economist; a farm mechanisation officer; the Senior District Officer, who has, in the main, been serving as an agronomist; and a receptionist. The office had a permanent staff in the vicinity of eight to nine people throughout most of this period. It should be recognised that, as Yorke Peninsula is one of the major rural producing areas in the State, it is only right that so many persons should be there.

What has happened over that 10 year period? Let us look at the rural situation. As I mentioned earlier, the rural situation has gone through a decline. The farmers have needed help, real help at times, especially those who have been in financial difficulty and who have needed advice on the best areas to go in for. We have seen big technological changes during the past 10 years. Department of Agriculture personnel are presently there to advise the farmers on the best technology, be it in terms of the type of fertiliser or machinery to use, or whatever.

One would think that during this 10 year period that figure of eight or nine persons would have increased. It is logical to think that way because the farming population has needed more advice. But what is the truth of the matter? Are there eight persons left there—no; seven—no; six—no; five—no; four—no; currently, there are three and four-fifths persons, but in real terms there are only two and four-fifths persons because the one person resident there should be transferred to Nuriootpa and is waiting on certain other conditions to be fulfilled before he moves. So, in real terms there are two and four-fifths persons at the Kadina office of the Department of Agriculture. That is disgraceful, to say the very least. It is a dereliction of duty by the Minister of Agriculture not to have addressed this situation beforehand. It is disastrous and potentially devastating to the State.

I have taken up this matter with the Minister and his reply was one of those fifty-fifty no/yes type letters—wait and see. In the meantime, the poor farmers have to wait and see. I am pleased that the Minister is with us at present because I will shortly read from his letter. Why has nothing been done? Why, when the Minister has known for a long period that the numbers have been going down, has he not done anything? His letter indicates that finances were not available before the end of June. That is totally ridiculous when we hear what happened last week. The former Minister of Health was up for paying something like \$170 000 or nearly a quarter of a million, depending on which figures are going to be used now, and the Government is happy to pay that amount at the twinkling of an eye. So, an amount of something like \$200 000 or \$250 000 is instantly available.

I am talking about a matter of one or two persons, probably a salary bill of \$30 000 to \$60 000, and the Minister says, 'There was not sufficient money before the end of June and we will have to reassess the situation afterwards.' This is said to the State's most productive area, an area on which the State has had to rely for many years, and the Minister shows total arrogance towards the plight of the farmers in this area.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I cannot use any other term. Let us look at the Minister's answer on 2 April this year, which reads:

Thank you for your correspondence of 14 March 1988 seeking an early appointment to the agronomist position at Kadina. The Chief Regional Officer responsible for the Yorke Peninsula district, Dr Donald Plowman, explained to the bureau conference that there was a freeze on positions until 30 June to enable the department to meet its 1987-88 funding allocation. Vacant positions have been listed in order of priority for filling, commencing

early in the new financial year. The exact timing will depend to a large extent on the 1988-89 budget.

As far as I am concerned it is stall, stall, stall. He goes on:

I appreciate the importance farmers in a district place on advice from their district agronomist. Until the appointment can be made the Senior District Officer based at Kadina, Mr Trevor Dillon, will maintain essential agronomic services to Yorke Peninsula farmers. In response to your question regarding additional staff being placed at the Kadina office, at this stage it is not intended to increase the number of staff providing services to the farming community at the Kadina office.

I thank you for your continuing interest in agriculture in your electorate.

Oh, boy! I am hopeful that when the new portfolios are announced—and for all I know they might have been announced while I have been speaking—the Minister of Agriculture will no longer have his portfolio, because there has been a dereliction of duty in this area, as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: He should be in transport.

Mr MEIER: Transport would not help, either, because transport in my electorate has been terribly neglected. We need money urgently to upgrade the roads. Significant representations to the Federal Government need to be made—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to take his seat, and I ask the House to reduce the level of interjections so that other members may hear what the honourable member is saying.

Mr MEIER: It is all very well for the Minister to say that until a replacement can be made Mr Trevor Dillon, the Senior District Officer, will carry on the work. Let us look at what Mr Dillon has to do. Remember that he used to have approximately eight other people to help him. At present he has two and a bit, but one person is not really there because he is waiting for a transfer to Nuriootpa. So, he is working out of that office half the time anyway, I believe, and not just looking after Yorke Peninsula.

He is not only an agronomist, he is also in charge—which is fully appreciated. He has to write several articles from time to time for publication. He has to put out what is commonly referred to in my electorate as 'the gospel according to Dillon', and I will refer to that a little later. He has to put out monthly reports for the farming area, which are also used by agricultural publications, and he has to attend many functions as well as so many of the bureaux. In fact, there are some 16 bureaux in the Yorke Peninsula region, and Mr Dillon would attend about three meetings per month.

One can well understand that it is not unusual to ring the Kadina office now and not be able to get Mr Dillon or anyone else, because he is flat out and, in fact, we are very lucky that he has stayed on. Many other people would have accepted another position. He is well respected in the area, and I know that private companies would look to him for his services. It probably would not take too much for Mr Dillon to leave. I know what the Minister would endeavour to do then: he would want to try to close down the whole office.

In addition, Mr Dillon has three major terminal ports to oversee: Wallaroo, Ardrossan and Port Giles. He must help with sorting out weed seeds and the like at the silos because quality inspection is very important, and we can be very proud of the fact that this State and Australia as a whole has very high quality grain storage. Mr Dillon is often called upon to help with inspections to see that quality is maintained. Members can imagine that he is doubly busy during harvest. Quality inspection includes checking for shot grain, pea weevil and too many stones.

The Minister has said of Mr Dillon that he will just have to hold the fort. That is just about what is happening. He

carries out his duties responsibly but, because there are just not enough hours in the day, he cannot carry them out effectively. At a time when the office should have been upgraded, if anything, over the years it has been downgraded.

Let us look at the type of publication put out by Mr Dillon, this gospel according to Dillon. I refer to the 1987-88 crop results and recommendations for 1988-89 Yorke Peninsula district. There is a multitude of information in this document which is so valuable to the farming community. Apart from indicating all the people who have been transferred from the office or resigned, the document goes into specific details of enterprises that farmers should be considering for 1988. As an example, Mr Dillon has looked at the figures for peas, wheat, barley and oats and indicates to farmers how many hectares they would have to grow, how much per tonne they would have to receive and what costs would be involved in producing those particular items to determine which was the most profitable.

Mr Dillon goes on to consider aspects of cereal disease and gives suggestions on how that can be overcome. He provides full details on wheat trial results that have been conducted in the Paskeville and Urania areas of Yorke Peninsula, again to give farmers an idea of what they should consider doing and how to do it. He gives specific information on wheat varieties for this year, stripe rust and seed treatments to look at improved crop emergence procedures. Interestingly, the Kadina office of the Department of Agriculture has come up with a method for improved crop emergence and the way in which farmers can sow their seeds. Several details in this particular document clearly indicate to farmers how they can use that method. So the document goes on. It is really and truly the gospel according to Dillon.

However, how is Mr Dillon or any other officer expected to continue to perform those duties effectively when staffing levels have continued to go down and the Minister has said that, at this stage, he cannot provide any replacements, that he will have to wait for the new financial year to see how money goes, and, as for any additional area staff, the answer is 'No'? I urge the Minister to reconsider the situation. I invite him to come and visit the peninsula. I know that he has been there on occasions but usually his visits are too brief to enable him to chat about the sort of problems facing the farmers who have contacted me. It is all very well to say that the private sector has taken over some of the roles. There are another two agronomists in private firms, at least, on the peninsula. Farmers seek information from them but the Minister and every farmer knows full well that privately employed people give advice to try to sell their particular product. Obviously, that will be good advice.

When we considered legislation in relation to chemicals last year there was debate about what concentrations to use. Obviously, a firm selling chemicals will suggest a higher concentration because it will sell more of its material, and that might be the officially recommended amount anyway. However, the Department of Agriculture is able to give an unbiased view—a second opinion—and say whether the concentration can be decreased. It can indicate the results of tests that have been conducted by the department and say, 'It is not necessary to use that amount. You can buy the product but we suggest that you buy only half or three-quarters as much as the manufacturer suggests.' Independent advice is essential, and many more inquiries can be taken to the Department of Agriculture.

I ask the Minister, for the sake of South Australia's rural industry and, in particular, for the sake of farmers on Yorke Peninsula and in the surrounding areas, to ensure that, first,

a replacement person is allocated forthwith and, secondly, that additional personnel are allocated so that, although we might not get back to the eight or nine who have traditionally been there, we might achieve at least four or five permanent personnel, in addition to the secretarial staff. Also, when the four-fifths secretary is not there, for that one day one can only get through on an answering system and, if she wants to go to a conference, the office is virtually closed in relation to farmers ringing in for information.

I now refer to the pamphlet issued by Tourism South Australia entitled 'Tourism in South Australia; Invest in Success'. When first looking at this glossy production one would say, 'How neat it is.' However, after one sifts through it one would say, 'How shallow it is', because it only picks on Adelaide and a few limited areas. Its title is completely misleading and areas such as Yorke Peninsula, Port Pirie, Whyalla, most of Eyre Peninsula—most of the State—are missing. It is a hit over the face for the Yorke Peninsula region and its surrounds, and for the Adelaide Plains.

I was devastated when I received a copy and found that it contained nothing of interest about my electorate. The Minister should know that this State is not limited to Adelaide. Many investment potentials in the rest of the State, and particularly in Goyder, can be considered. Many areas need outside investment, and that interest has been shown in the past; it is not as if it is new. People should know that we have the Cornish Festival in the Copper Triangle towns of Kadina, Moonta and Wallaroo; the Port Vincent classic yacht race each year; and coming up this year for central Yorke Peninsula the wine and cheese festival. We also have the Port Vincent birdman rally, which attracts great interest from outside.

There is massive potential for the development of coastal resorts. The historical prospects are numerous. Caravan parks are needed and existing ones can be further developed. New hotel/motel complexes can be looked into and a marina complex is desperately needed in the area. Currently there are plans relating to the Simms Cove area and there were earlier plans in relation to Port Hughes. These types of investment are needed. I felt that it was reprehensible of the Minister to ignore our peninsula. The booklet has three attachments, and it is a pity that I cannot show it as that is not permitted by Standing Orders. The document contains a glossy page which shows a picture of the Minister—a good photograph of her—and half that page is blank, anyway. Why could that page have not been used—or even half a page—for Yorke Peninsula, or any other region that did not get a mention? Yorke Peninsula is shown on the map in the directory issued from Adelaide, but not one town is identified. There is no direction toward Yorke Peninsula or any part of Goyder or to any other part of the north of the State other than to the Flinders Ranges and the Clare Valley.

It is a tragedy to see this sort of document printed and published. I took it up with the Minister. I have asked her for an explanation as to why the omission has occurred, what the publication has cost and I have asked her to redress the problem. I hope that will occur.

I know there were many other subjects that were brought forward in the Governor's speech. Other members have referred to some of them. I believe the two points I have mentioned show that the Government is not addressing the problems which need to be addressed.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I was going to give the member for Gilles a mention in my speech but I did not expect it to be in relation to an interjection. I offer my

support for the motion. In so doing I recognise the accolades which have been already afforded to a number of departed friends; departed friends in the sense of those who have been members of this place and those who are about to be not members of this place. It was at this point that I intended referring to the member for Gilles, the member for Stuart, the member for Mitchell, and the member for Playford. They are four of the remaining five members of the class of 1970 and I wonder whether they in fact will be speaking on the Address in Reply for the last time in their parliamentary careers. It is, I believe, quite on the cards, that we will not see them occupying a place in Parliament during the next Address in Reply.

An honourable member: Does that mean I am moving up?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is possible that one or two will slide off the bench but some of them have provided a very useful purpose in this place and I would not take that from them but I suggest there is quite a possibility, Mr Deputy Speaker, which has not gone unnoticed, on this side that the Government is running down in very many ways. That is depicted in the document which was presented to the House by His Excellency the Governor, because it said very little.

The Governor was left devoid of material indicating a purposeful Government program. One would believe that there is no program and that we are heading to an opportunistic early election. It will be interesting in a week or two to see whether the Treasurer is going to follow the line of his colleague across the border, Premier Cain, and dangle out the carrots in a pre-election issue. I suspect that that is going to happen because whilst many people in the Public Service were advised that they should not project their programs forward on the basis of large sums of money being available, that they ought to prune their programs by 5 to 6 per cent, they are now of the opinion that they only have to reduce their programs by 2 per cent. Why would we suddenly move from 5 or 6 per cent to 2 per cent if we were not preparing the carrots to dangle out in front of the electorate? I recognise that there is a dearth of funds, whether it be from the Commonwealth or the State, to undertake a number of the programs which are essential for the people of this State. We are in a position where for too long the Labor Governments, be they State or Federal, refused to accept the direction of the tide in respect of fiscal matters. They put off vital decisions which were essential for a more beneficial lifestyle for the public by handing out additional funds for a whole range of new projects. Delightful as they may be, it has left us all with a very sore hip pocket nerve. We are living on the never never and having to pay large sums of money to service our debt and our position is in jeopardy as a result.

In case the event should come to pass, I point out to the member for Gilles, the Minister of Transport, and the member for Mitchell that I have welcomed the opportunity to serve with them in a variety of ways over a period of years. I have not appreciated the side of the House from which I have had to view them but I thank them in advance for the services that they have provided as Ministers of the Crown in service to the State of South Australia.

I recognise the courtesies that they have provided me, and through me, the members of my constituency in the areas of responsibility that they have held. I also thank the member for Spence for his courtesy in the same way but, not being one of the class of 70, I put him on to the next rung down—he will appreciate why that should be. I remember when he first attended in this place along with his colleague, the then member for Price—it was the tall

and the short. They were a commendable pair and we have, over the years, served on committees and served in various ways the Parliament of this State. I appreciate the efforts that the member for Spence has also made.

I mention in passing the retirement of Mr Murray Hill, who has provided a very real service to the State. I mention also the late Sir Douglas Nicholls whose swearing in ceremony I was pleased to have attended, and the subsequent meal shared by members of Parliament when he indicated very clearly, 'I am but a simple man and I hope to serve the people well.' In the limited period that was available to him as Governor of this State he did just that, and he endeared himself to a large number of people because of the sincerity of purpose that he brought to that role.

I make particular reference to a former employee of this House, Mr Arnold Noack, who carried out his duties here so well. In his early days he and his family lived in the electorate which, at that stage, I was serving. He was a native of St Kitts, a very small area currently served by the Leader of the Opposition. He always showed a very keen interest in matters relating to Truro, Stockwell and Kapunda. He knew them well because of his early association with that area.

I have already mentioned the failure of the Governor's speech to give a direction for the forthcoming session. There is scant mention of a number of vital issues facing the people and, indeed, the servants of this State. I will concentrate my comments very briefly on the areas of local government, police and fire services.

First, I refer to the fire service. This service is required in the community. Everyone hopes that they will never require this service, but, like hospitals, it is a service which must be in place for those eventualities which, from time to time, occur. For many a long day the fire services have been crying out for proper financial recognition from the community at large so that they can work to the benefit of the community.

There are now changing circumstances in the insurance industry. Money is being moved interstate and offshore in respect of insurance policies and the flow back to the benefit of the State and the fire service has been denied. The community at large is being asked to pay through the hip pocket to provide assistance for the many people who either do not insure or who take insurance in some faraway places—at some benefit to themselves but none to the State—leaving the cost of the shortfall to be picked up by the community at large. This therefore puts those people who are responsible and who do insure in a double jeopardy situation. They are not only providing for their own salvation or benefit but they are called upon to provide the service for those people who do not look after themselves or who insure at bargain basement prices.

Notwithstanding that a document has now been in the hands of the Treasurer for almost 12 months he has failed to give it the consideration that it deserves, to provide insurance for future community benefit. I trust that we will see a mark of leadership before too long by the Government—which will be beneficial to the whole population. The Premier often ducks issues and answers to questions. He has certainly ducked on this one. Both the country and metropolitan fire services are essential services. A fire service in the country is particularly important to a large number of people throughout the community, including those who live in the metropolitan area. Such a service guarantees our living standards, our food supply and, indeed, the reason why so many manufacturing jobs are available in metropolitan areas is due to the people in the country areas purchasing products from manufacturers.

We cannot take country and city in isolation in this respect. They are inter-dependent. Certainly in relation to the fire services in this State, the whole community, and most particularly the metropolitan area, is served very well by those services. We are served very well by the existence of the Country Fire Services and the large number of people who provide voluntary effort at no cost to the State and who are there when the need arises.

I believe that we will be in a position to address some aspects of the Country Fire Services before too long, but I make a plea to the Government here and now that it is extremely important if there are to be changes, even if they are only minimal, that relevant legislation be brought before the House without delay so that we do not go into a new fire season with people wondering which law or regulation applies—the one that was or the one that will be. We cannot afford a circumstance where there is any doubt or question at all in relation to what the law that applies to these matters is.

I now turn to the matter of police services. Here again, I believe that South Australia has been well served by its Police Force throughout the years. All members on this side of the House and, I believe, members opposite, recognise that we are fortunate to have a Police Force of such high calibre. We can thank people like John McKenna, Harold Salisbury, Laurie Draper and John Giles for the efforts that they have put into the establishment of this service for the community in what I might term in a general sense these modern times.

It is always unfortunate when circumstances arise which bring discredit to the Police Force, whether those circumstances involve events surrounding the Duncan case on the banks of the Torrens River, or the most recent problems associated with drugs and the like. Nevertheless, we need very quickly to remove some of the stresses that are being placed on members of the Police Force and that have the potential to drive them out of the Police Force at a time when we need their assistance in the community. I refer to the pressure that the Government has placed on the police who live in country areas by threatening to increase rentals. These officers, along with their families, provide a very essential service, but they are being told that a long-held industrial agreement, which provides housing at a reduced rate, is under threat.

Yesterday, along with the Deputy Premier and the member for Eyre, I attended the opening of the new Roxby Downs police station. I was interested to note that both the Deputy Premier and the Commissioner of Police highlighted the benefits to the Police Force of the active support of wives and families of the police officers. This is particularly so in country areas, with the senior constables in charge of the Roxby Downs police station. Yesterday, the Deputy Premier and the Commissioner of Police went out of their way to highlight the part that the wives of those two officers are playing in providing a police service to the Roxby Downs area, more particularly because of its isolation and because, quite frequently, patrols take the officers away from their home base.

The Government should not continue to put pressure on the serving police officers by threatening to have their serving conditions reduced in the form of massive rental increases, when that condition has been an industrial arrangement for very many years. I also draw attention to the pressures which have been placed on some members of the Police Force, particularly those who have Senior Constable rank, and who are being financially downgraded, not only because of the activities of the Government but also, unfortunately in this case, because of the ease with which

the Police Association accepted a package which did not embrace benefits for all its membership. A number of Senior Constables have had their incomes reduced by a set of circumstances that were agreed to by the Government and also, regrettably, by their Association, before the full ramifications had been sorted out.

I stress to the Government the importance of maintaining those people in the service who have a commitment to the service and who are needed in a community which constantly cries out for assistance, because of the escalating crime rate under this Government.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The member for Albert Park interjects. I simply refer him to the Police Commissioner's Report to this House and I would be very pleased if he could identify one area in which there has been a reduction of offences over the past five years. In a number of cases during the past five years the increase has been well over 100 per cent and in a number of other cases over 400 per cent. The Government is placing additional pressures on the police in relation to their fight against drugs. From 1 August 1988 a police officer may not issue more than one charge per form on an expiation notice for cannabis. It has been usual for officers to list on an expiation notice charges relating to a number of offences, such as possession, smoking, sale, purchase, storage, or whatever.

As from 1 August, this Government has further hampered the fight against drugs by requiring police officers, when issuing expiation notices in respect of cannabis, to make only one charge per expiation notice. One might say, 'So what?', but there may be three, four or five instances relating to that detection, so the officer not only has to detail those five instances but also has to fill out five times the name, address, age and all the other details. This impedes work of an already overworked department.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is a decision of the Government: it has been gazetted. It is all very well to lay the blame back on to the Police Commissioner or the Police Department. It is the Government which processes the documentation and which should be sufficiently alert to address these matters before they become an issue. It is a similar situation, which the Minister at the table may recognise, to that existing when we first came into this place back in the early 1970s. The Government passed a regulation requiring any tractor travelling on the road to have front and rear mudguards, when front mudguards could not even be bought as an optional extra. The Minister, along with myself and the Minister of Agriculture, has been a party in the past two years to correcting an interpretation problem associated with the registration of grape harvesters which saved grapegrowers many thousands of dollars.

The interpretation, permitted within the department on the basis of regulations passed, caused great problems for the grapegrowers. I welcome and acknowledge the speed with which the two Ministers corrected that situation, but those circumstances would not have occurred if there had been a proper understanding or consideration of the documents before they were approved by Executive Council.

In the brief time available (I will conclude before the allotted time in order to expedite procedures) I want to refer to local government. There are great bleatings from the Government at present, from the Premier down. In fact, we had the hypocrisy of the Premier's answering a question earlier this week in relation to the approaching referendum, when he stressed the importance of supporting the 'Yes' vote. I draw members' attention to the fact that the recognition of local government in the Commonwealth Consti-

tution is a matter which has been addressed since 1973 by the Australian Constitution Convention, and most recently addressed by that convention before it was stood aside by the present Federal Government in Brisbane in 1985. The official record of convention debates in Brisbane from 29 July to 1 August 1985, volume 1, pages 103 to 136, contains a wealth of information on how legislators and people from local government addressed this matter at the time.

When it came to a vote, it is interesting to note that the Government of South Australia, along with those members present from the South Australian Opposition, did not support the vote before the convention because, as the Attorney-General in another place said then, recognising local government in the Federal Constitution involved matters of considerable concern, and it was essential that those concerns were considered by the Premiers' Conference in advance of any further action being taken.

However, the matters in question have not been considered by a Premiers' Conference because of the cavalier manner adopted by the Commonwealth and certain Labor Governments in 1985, notwithstanding that the whole matter of constitutional reform was referred after the 1985 meeting to a group of eminent citizens emanating from either side of the political fence. Including local government in the Commonwealth Constitution, unlike the way it has been presented for the purpose of the referendum, did not result from a decision of that group. The Federal Government has gone against the advice of the group that examined the matter over a period of years and, more recently, the group of eminent citizens referred to. Referendum question No. 3, in respect of local government, is a matter of political opportunism which will do nothing to benefit the people of Australia.

I also refer to volume 2 of the Australian Constitution Convention's Brisbane proceedings, as contained in the report prepared by a committee chaired by the Hon. Doug Lowe, former Labor Party Premier of Tasmania and currently a member of the Tasmanian Legislative Council. A wealth of information sets out the background of the importance of local government and the inter-relationship which needs to exist: not forced recognition, as provided by the present Government.

I say to the member for Briggs, who raised this matter the other day, that his pleadings on behalf of local government seem very shallow indeed when he is at such great odds with his own local government body in Salisbury at present (as witnessed in local newspapers, including the Messenger Press of this week, where he is attacking the local government body in his own electorate by suggesting that it ought to be given the onceover by the Ombudsman).

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Is the boy wonder in trouble out there, too?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, very much so. Certainly, he is in trouble with the Mayor of Salisbury because of his lack of support for the local governing body in Salisbury. The Federal Government has effectively reduced funds flowing to local government in Australia by 35 per cent, and that is a 35 per cent reduction in real terms in the past five years. That is not only a reduction in the PAYE amount via the Grants Commission but also a marked reduction in the amount available through road funds. I support the motion.

Mr D.S. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1989.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGIES

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There has been some expectation that the Government would, this week, make a detailed statement on anti-corruption strategies for the South Australian Police Force. The expectation has arisen from comments I have made following the recent receipt of the National Crime Authority report on its investigations in South Australia. I think it is also in response to a question I answered from the member for Hanson, probably on Tuesday. Members would appreciate that detailed statements of Government intent on such an important matter need careful consideration and consultation with key individuals involved. Much consideration has gone into the Government's response and consultation has occurred with the Deputy Commissioner of Police. However, as the Commissioner of Police has been absent from Adelaide on duty it has not been possible to confer with him.

I should add parenthetically that I was with the Commissioner yesterday, as was the member for Light, but it was hardly the occasion to be discussing these matters. The Government is firmly of the view that the Commissioner of Police should be directly involved in determining the response to the recommendations of the National Crime Authority. Accordingly, the Government will defer any announcement to the Parliament until the Commissioner has been fully consulted. It is my present intention to make a statement at the earliest opportunity.

WOOLPUNDA GROUNDWATER INTERCEPTION SCHEME

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Woolpunda groundwater interception scheme.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME PROCEDURE

The SPEAKER: For some time, I have been concerned at the gradual diversion of Question Time away from its original purposes, especially regarding the number of questions to Ministers of the Crown that can be asked in the hour put aside for Question Time, and even more so regarding the amount of debate and comment that accompanies questions without notice.

The number of questions asked in Question Time each day has, in recent years, usually been satisfactory. For example, 20 questions were asked yesterday. However, precious time is often wasted on some days by unwarranted verbosity in both questions and answers. Questions, with rare exceptions, should be reasonably brief and to the point. Questions from members should be seeking information from Minis-

ters regarding their responsibilities, not giving information. Questions are not intended to merely be opportunities for speechmaking, debating, or posing for the media representatives in the galleries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For reasons that I have given previously, the Chair has refrained from the practice of rising to make statements to the House. Were I to do so, it would be even more out of order for interjections of the nature just made by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to occur. Explanations of questions should meet the criteria of Standing Order 124, which states:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

It is clear from Standing Order 124 that: first, questions seeking information from Ministers cannot include comments or opinions, nor should they constitute attempts to make political points or to debate political issues; secondly, questions are not opportunities for speechmaking, regardless of whether a member's statements are based upon universally accepted facts or upon what the questioner merely believes to be facts or simply claims to be facts; and, thirdly, some facts may, however, be stated with the leave of the House in order to explain a question that is not reasonably self-evident. Those facts cannot be strung together in a way that would constitute argument or debate.

In relation to factual explanations being allowed in order to clarify questions which would otherwise be sources of confusion, members must have the leave by agreement of all other members. Traditionally, the Chair acts on behalf of the House in granting leave for explanations to be given.

That leave can be withdrawn by the Chair, and will be withdrawn in the case of explanations which are not acceptable according to the points that I have mentioned. But the option is also open to any other member—as mentioned in a ruling of 29 October 1986—to withdraw leave if that member believes an explanation is in contravention of Standing Orders. I would hope that members who choose that option would apply the same standards to their own questions, and to the questions of colleagues on their side of the Chamber, as they would apply to members opposite them.

I also draw the attention of the House to Standing Order 125:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

Although conceding that a certain degree of tolerance has traditionally applied, I have previously ruled, on 7 August 1986, that the general reference in that Standing Order to a member obviously includes Government Ministers. I quote:

The problem then arises as to what constitutes 'debate' in a Minister's response. Ministers may feel an obligation to provide information to the House that may not have been specifically mentioned in the question, and it is in the interest of the House that they should do so. . . . The Chair has no wish to unduly restrict the liveliness of Question Time but calls on Ministers to refrain from introducing irrelevancies or unduly provocative comments in their replies, particularly when questions have not incorporated material of that nature. However, the Chair would stress that mere dissatisfaction with a Minister's reply is not in itself an excuse to justify interjections or points of order claiming a Minister is allegedly 'debating' a response.

The Chair will use its own discretion in determining whether a Minister is 'debating' a question or is guilty of introducing irrelevancy or prolixity. I do not intend to apply the test of a predetermined time limit, as has been suggested by some members, of, say, two minutes for an answer, in order to determine whether or not a reply is too long. Instead, I will rely on my admittedly subjective judgment regarding the likely stance of the House on particular occasions when

replies seem lengthy. For example, there will be occasions when a reply may require substantial detail to ensure clarity, and there will be other occasions when the seriousness of the subject matter may mean that the House is receptive to a reply that is lengthier than would otherwise be desirable.

There is no excuse for long-winded replies that do not serve either of those purposes, nor for long-winded questions which are political point-scoring exercises rather than endeavours to elicit information. I intend to take a firm line against debate, comment, irrelevancy, repetition and excessive length in both questions and answers, and I ask all members for their cooperation towards the Chair's efforts to raise the tone of Question Time and to bring it more closely into accord with the requirements of our Standing Orders.

QUESTION TIME

MYER REDEVELOPMENT

Mr OLSEN: I address my question to the Premier. Has the Government received any approach from the Remm group to provide concessions on State taxes and charges for the proposed \$570 million Myer redevelopment, what is the Government's attitude to the granting of concessions to a project like this one and what are the current prospects of the project proceeding according to the plans approved earlier this year by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission? I ask these questions in view of the fact that the Managing Director of Remm Pty Limited last night told people at a gathering at the Hyatt Hotel that his attempts to discuss the project with the Premier had been met with 'nothing but brick walls' and that the project was now unlikely to proceed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am surprised that the Managing Director did make such a statement. If he did, it may have been an expression of frustration at the progress of the project which, I guess, is fair enough. However, I can assure the House that that frustration of progress has nothing to do with the Government's desire to either block the project or not facilitate it in any way.

Incidentally, I was not aware that the Managing Director wished to see me. The Leader of the Opposition talks about last night: in fact, I am aware that my executive assistant actually had a meeting which lasted for some time yesterday evening with Mr Brown, the Managing Director of Remm. Certainly, he has plenty of access to me. Indeed, I have met Mr Brown on a couple of occasions.

To go back to the substance of the Leader's question, some time ago the Government and the city council received a detailed analysis of the financial requirements of the Remm project and a request for certain concessions to be made. Those requests have not been complied with. There are a number of problems involved in granting concessions to particular types of development. I might say, incidentally, that I certainly reserve an open mind in these matters. There are obvious occasions when it is appropriate. Certainly, the previous Government deemed it appropriate in relation to the Hilton Hotel project; and the Government was actively involved in the ASER project and its various components.

In relation to this particular project, the concept of concessions in the form of waiving of rents and so on was not something that the Government in the end felt it could agree with, and I understand that to be the position of the city council also. The project, mammoth as it is, must obviously have a commercial drive and basis. All the evidence is that it has just that. Intensive negotiations have

been going on with various financial groups in order to put together a commercial package that will make this happen. At this stage I remain confident that the project will go ahead as planned. I am not in a position to say whether all the financial package has been completed satisfactorily. It has not at the moment, but I understand that negotiations are well advanced.

I conclude as I began, by saying that I am very surprised to find that the Managing Director did say those words in an address or whatever, as reported by the Leader of the Opposition. All I can say is that the Government is very keen to see the project go ahead. But like Remm, Myer, and all the other parties involved, the city council has to be sure that they have the financial package in place. After all, one should remember that as part of this arrangement Myer will have to vacate its prime site in the Rundle Mall temporarily while the work goes on. Obviously, it needs to be satisfied that the project will be completed satisfactorily and that it will be back in there.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS

Mr DUGAN: I address my question to the Minister of Education who represents the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. Will he advise the House of the advantages of a bipartisan policy on ethnic affairs?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to advise the House of the Government's views on this important matter concerning the maintenance of a bipartisan approach to the development of multicultural policies and their immigration program, which indeed is of importance to the well-being of all South Australians. I would think that South Australians need look no further than the achievements made in this State to appreciate the importance of our existing migration program and indeed our policies, which are well developed in this State and which are based on the concept of multiculturalism. We do have a socially cohesive community, one in which all citizens no matter what their racial or ethnic backgrounds, can contribute equally and fully to community life. Indeed, one notes the contributions of people of different backgrounds in all sorts of spheres of both public and private activity in this State. We live in a country where it is possible to 'make it' despite the differing cultural and racial backgrounds. For example, the Premier of New South Wales was born in Hungary and my colleague, the member for Todd, who has recently joined the Ministry, was born in Holland.

The bipartisan policy that has created this climate in Australia is now very much under threat. It is important that every member of this House realises the importance of the debate that is currently going on in this country and follow the example of so many people who are now asking the Federal Liberal Leader to change his current attitudes towards this policy and indeed the recently stated policy of the Coalition on this matter, particularly that of Senator Stone. I congratulate Liberal Senator Baden Teague, for example, for the courageous statements that he has made opposing the statements made by his Leader.

Racially based proposals are an affront to all sense of decency. They can also be extremely damaging to this nation on purely an economic basis. My colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education has done an enormous amount of work in the area of marketing education services in Asia, and currently we have a team of people representing education institutions in this State who are marketing education programs in Asia. The effectiveness of that program is very much at risk from the sorts of

statements we are hearing from the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra.

For example, the South Australian Senior Secondary Assessment Board markets its programs in Malaysia and indeed that earns us a good deal of income to further develop our educational programs. Dr Eyers, who is the Director of SABSA, is currently in Malaysia, and I believe that if there is a continuation of this debate, specifically related to Asians, then those programs are very much at risk. The statements emanating from Mr Howard are no more and no less than immigration programs based on a concept of white European supremacy. I call on the Leader of the Opposition in this House to make his views—and I believe he holds views on this matter—very clear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is under the impression that the member for Mitcham wishes to raise a point of order. It is very difficult for that to be done when members behind him are interjecting.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this House has been subject to a gross waste of time. You, Sir, have already addressed this House on the merits of brevity of answers and yet we have been subjected to this diatribe.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister, if he has not already done so, to wind up his remarks quickly.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am disappointed that the Opposition thinks that this matter is a waste of time. I certainly do not think so, nor does the Government. I simply repeat my call for the Leader of the Opposition to speak up on this issue.

MYER REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Government is offering Remm any concessions in relation to the Myer redevelopment?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is not offering any concessions to Remm in the Myer redevelopment. The Government has, though, been prepared to look at some propositions which, I think Mr Condous, the Lord Mayor, has already mentioned in relation to the city council in terms of a deferment of payment of certain charges that may be levied against the project. Whether or not they are necessary or indeed desirable has not been determined. I believe that a viable financial package should be established for the project, as I think I said in this House on the last occasion it was raised. I am sure that can be achieved provided there is goodwill on the side of all the parties.

REFERENDUM

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Can the Minister say whether there is any divergence between the State Government's stand on the proposed referendum question to recognise local government and the stand being taken—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Why don't you belt up for a minute! Haven't you got any manners?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order all those members who interjected, and I call to order the member for Albert Park. It is in total breach of Standing Orders and practices of the House to refer to members opposite as 'you'. The question should have been directed through the Chair to

the relevant Minister and there should not have been extraneous material of that nature directed to members opposite. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I apologise to the House for being provoked in such a way. I will repeat my question. Can the Minister say whether there is any divergence between the State Government's stand on the proposed referendum question to recognise local government and the stand taken by the Local Government Association on this matter?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am forced to note that questions on multicultural policies and questions on the referendum and the recognition of local government and the Federal Constitution are subjects that the Opposition in this House seems to treat with contempt and believe are not matters that are important or are worthy of the consideration and time of the Parliament of South Australia. I am very happy to advise the honourable member in the House that there is no difference at all between the Local Government Association and local government authorities and the State Government on the question of recognition of local government in the Federal Constitution. I was privileged to be present when the Federal Attorney-General, the South Australian Minister of Local Government and the Lord Mayor each addressed themselves to this very important subject.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Mitcham and, I hope, every local government authority in South Australia understands this. I will make it my business to let them know that ever since I started answering this very important question, he has just called out, 'Boring, boring, boring!' The local government authorities in South Australia—and all members here have a number of local government authorities in their electorates—will be very interested to know what a senior member of the Liberal front bench thinks about this very important question. The Lord Mayor at that function made it his business to strongly support the 'Yes' vote for recognition in the Federal Constitution. That has also been strongly supported by the LGA. It is interesting to note that in the past it has been supported by such luminaries as the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Howard, who said on 26 February:

The Coalition Opposition supports and will continue to strive for constitutional recognition for local government at the earliest opportunity.

The Leader of the National Party, Mr Sinclair, said, 'In principle'—and I guess that let him out immediately, but he did give himself—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order. We were subjected to this same material in the Address in Reply debate yesterday. I do not believe that this House should be subjected to its repetition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that matters that may or may not have been canvassed in the Address in Reply do not preclude their being canvassed in Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! However, I ask the Minister to restrict himself to the actual question, which invited—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Murray-Mallee. His next interjection will be his last.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: For the day!

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Now that we don't have capital punishment—

The SPEAKER: I will treat that not as an interjection but as a point of order from the Deputy Leader, and point out that we do not have capital punishment in this State

and that the powers of the Chair, great as they may be, do not extend that far, whatever may be the Chair's view of the interjection. I ask the Minister to restrict himself to the actual thrust of the question and to be careful about debating the matter. I think he would be aware of what constitutes debate.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your direction and encouragement. It is important for people to understand the contrast between the Local Government Association and South Australian Government and the position of the Opposition. Mr Sinclair said:

In principle, I support the constitutional recognition for local government. This depends on a successful referendum.

There we have the two Leaders of the Opposition Coalition federally supporting in a strong way recognition for local government. We are also very much aware of the view of Mr Kenneth Price, President of the Local Government Association in South Australia who described the Opposition's reaction to local government's need as sheer opportunism. What is more important is the sort of leadership being given on this question by the Opposition Parties in South Australia, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition. We know that in 1980, when he came into this House as a fresh new member—

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Under the Standing Order to which you last drew the House's attention, prior to Question Time—Standing Order 126—you asked Ministers particularly to restrict themselves to the subject matter of the question, which as I recall involved whether the Minister knew that the ALP and the LGA had the same point of view on this matter referred to in the referendum on 23 September. No mention was made—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has proceeded far enough. His point of order is correctly raised, except that he drew attention to the wrong Standing Order. I think he had in mind Standing Order 125 and not Standing Order 126. Although I cannot remember the wording precisely, he is correct that the main thrust of the question related to similarities and overlap of the policies of the Government and the policy of the Local Government Association as to the recognition of local government. Although a certain amount of latitude has always been allowed, the Minister should restrict himself reasonably closely to that aspect.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The important question concerns the positions of those people who have the authority to express views on this question in this House and elsewhere, and I certainly appreciate your guidance. When the Leader of the Opposition came into this place in 1980—and this was after he had been Mayor of Kadina—he strongly supported the concept of Federal constitutional recognition for local government, and he was right to do so. He had the support of both Parties in this place and the general community.

More recently he has wanted to evade his responsibility as the Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia and say that this question is no longer one for South Australians to concern themselves about, but that it is a matter for the Federal Government and the Federal Constitution. I do not know what local government in Kadina or the other local government authorities in the Leader's district would think of this total lack of honesty in their local member, who has weaved and wandered around the question over the past 12 months.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that the traditional tolerance granted to Ministers regarding their replies would permit some sort of tangential or peripheral mention of the point introduced by the honourable Minis-

ter, but for the Minister to dwell upon it comes close to debating the matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I certainly would not want to debate the issue. I just want to bring to the attention of Parliament and, through Parliament, the people of South Australia the hypocritical stance of Opposition members, who a few years ago—and with my very strong support as Minister of Local Government, and as someone who even prior to that had a great interest in local government had a different view of recognition in the Federal Constitution of local government. In fact, it was the Liberal Party which introduced recognition in the State Constitution—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat, and I consider him to have wound up his remarks, because he has proceeded further than the Chair considers reasonable. The honourable member for Light.

LABOR POLITICIAN

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Premier. Is it true that a senior South Australian Labor politician was investigated for several years over a relationship with a major heroin importer, and that documents relating to this investigation were shredded on the orders of a senior police officer, as reported in the 28-29 May issue of the *Weekend Australian*?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have no knowledge of this. As I was rising to my feet, I just checked with the Deputy Premier, and he has no knowledge of it either. This report, apparently made in May, has not been brought to my attention; therefore, I am afraid I can shed no light on it whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland.

O-BAHN

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of Transport advise users of the O-Bahn busway of the progress made in introducing accident prevention and emergency measures following the investigation into the 17 June busway accident?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland has the floor. I ask the Premier and the member for Light not to conduct a dialogue across the Chamber. The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: After finding that the two-bus collision was the result of human error, the accident report recommended five changes to improve the O-Bahn service. My constituents who use the busway are anxious to know of progress on those matters.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question and for her continued support of the O-Bahn system. I think it is important to say that the accident was the result of human error and all the systems that were in place worked effectively, and it was no fault of the busway system itself. There was sufficient line of sight and, in ordinary circumstances of course, such an accident should not occur. It is very difficult to devise systems that will overcome human error. However, if there is a potential for accident, even though all the systems work effectively, it is incumbent upon the authority and the Government to provide additional security over and above that which is already in place and which works effectively.

The report has been completed. It is a public report, and I think it is right and proper for the honourable member to ask what action has been taken to implement its recommendations. In the first instance, fire appliances will have access to the busway, as do ambulance, police and ordinary service vehicles. We will ensure that there is appropriate access for all emergency service vehicles.

In addition to the existing procedures, an electronic warning tone will be broadcast over all bus and tram radio channels immediately it is known that a busway bus or a tram has stopped on a track or a tramway. As soon as that information is made available, the warning tone will be broadcast so that the drivers of all vehicles will know that there is a stoppage on either the busway or the tramway. Normal voice transmission procedures will then resume. We are also trialling a visible warning light, which is a rotating high intensity orange light, to supplement standard hazard flashers. Such a light is already on trial on a bus and we have reason to believe that it will contribute to an additional security for people either working or riding on the busway. Immediately the results of the trial are known a decision will be made. Additional cutting gear has been fitted to the breakdown truck. Cellular phones have been purchased to ease the communication demands on the radio system and a padlock on the busway boundary fence has been changed. Concerning the emergency services, the ambulance service has had access maps reissued to it. Busway access gate keys, previously offered, have now been accepted by the St John Ambulance Service, and that, too, is a good thing.

The safety procedures on the busway were appropriate and perfectly adequate but, if there is just the slightest possibility of human error causing an accident (although, fortunately, on this occasion there was no severe damage to persons and although the buses involved were damaged, they remained on the busway, so the effects of the accident could have been much worse had it occurred anywhere else but on the busway), it is important that any necessary action should be taken to reduce the possibility of such an error occurring again.

LABOR POLITICIAN

Mr OSWALD: In view of his answer to the previous question asked by the member for Light, will the Premier take up with the Police Commissioner the serious allegations in the *Weekend Australian* article and bring down a report to the House as soon as possible?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, if there is any basis for those allegations and they have been published, the Police Commissioner would have reported on them to the Government, but I am not aware of that having happened. However, I am happy to refer the matter to my colleague to see whether there is any basis to the allegations.

NORTHERN TERRITORY RAILWAY

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Transport give the House the import of any ongoing dialogue or correspondence that he has had with his Northern Territory counterpart concerning the latest proposals for a privately funded freight railway line between Darwin and Alice Springs? According to the Hon. Fred Finch (Northern Territory Transport Minister) when speaking on talkback radio this morning, such a project is well to the fore, has many prospective benefits for South Australia, is supported by

South Australia and could get under way almost immediately.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The Hon. Fred Finch takes great trouble in keeping me informed on the progress of the proposal for a rail link between Alice Springs and Darwin and I have always told the Northern Territory Minister that such a proposal has the support of the South Australian Government. No doubt, there would be advantages and it could also be argued that there could be disadvantages to South Australia in having such a link. There might be an impact on South Australian port facilities, but we have always tried to look positively not only on projects that would benefit our State but also on those that would benefit in a material way the national economy and Australia as a nation. Because of the commercial orientation of the details I think it would be appropriate at this stage if I did not make available details of the information provided for me by the Minister.

It seems that the Northern Territory Minister feels confident that such progress has been made as to enable his Government to make statements about the future viability of a railway. We will not be making any financial contribution to it, nor should we. The matter is one for the Northern Territory and the Federal Government. However, if the Northern Territory was able to successfully negotiate contracts, there is no doubt that South Australian businesses will do very well in the supply of concrete sleepers, rail and a number of other products for the completion of a successful rail scheme. We are closely monitoring the situation and we are very interested in what is happening in the Northern Territory. I trust that the Minister will continue to keep this Government informed.

POLICE CORRUPTION

Mr S.J. BAKER: I direct my question to the Premier. Does the report that the Government has received from the National Crime Authority on police corruption make specific conclusions and recommendations and, if so, will the Government make them public and indicate whether it accepts them and what further action will be taken based on those conclusions and recommendations?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is 'Yes' and, as my colleague indicated in a statement at the commencement of proceedings today, a full statement will be made shortly.

GRANGE RAILWAY STATION

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House when work will commence on the removal of the old Grange railway station? I have been approached by the Henley and Grange Residents Association to see whether it is possible to expedite the removal of the old Grange railway station. The association has expressed concern about the traffic hazard that the old station represents and about the need to upgrade the parking facilities in that area. It has informed me that this stretch of road has been the subject of a traffic management survey by the Highways Department and the Henley and Grange council, which recommended that the old station be removed.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The work undertaken by the Highways Department and the local council may have been completed; I expect that it has. As yet I have not received advice from the Highways Department as to when

the actual work will commence. It is important for the House to know that the State Transport Authority has agreed to accept responsibility for the removal of the old Grange platform and the associated station equipment.

However, as I just mentioned, the timing of the work is dependent on the proposed widening of Military Road, which has been initiated by the Highways Department. The platform forms a retaining structure for the abutting properties and the design and construction of a new retaining wall will be included in the road widening proposal. So, a complex and very important study is under way.

It is also intended that the road and footpath will be rebuilt and cleaned up at the same time to provide a much better environment for residents who live in the area. I acknowledge the consistent representation that the honourable member has made on behalf of those people who, inevitably, will be wondering what is happening and why work has not commenced. I undertake to find out immediately when it is proposed that that work will be under way.

POLICE INFORMANTS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I direct my question to the Premier. What guarantees can the Government give to police drug informants that their safety and anonymity have been protected? When the Opposition asked a similar question on 20 August last year during the last session of Parliament, the Government said that no answer could be provided because that would breach suppression orders on the identity of a senior police officer charged with serious drug offences. Our question was based on information we had received that the officer involved was the sole custodian of the names of all police drug informants. We were concerned about the position of informants, including those who had provided information during the 1985 and 1986 Operation Noah, supervised by this officer. The suppression orders which prevented the Government from answering the question a year ago have now been lifted and the Opposition now seeks information on what action was taken to protect the safety of drug informants, following the serious charges that were laid against the former head of the Police Drug Squad.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certain institutional arrangements which are in the process of being put in place will be included in the detailed statement that will be made to the House about this and other related matters. What I can say is that, of course, the police take every precaution in trying to protect the position of informants. Some of those techniques that might be involved perhaps should not be made public, for obvious reasons, but I can assure the honourable member and the House that every effort is made to ensure that that protection is available. I will be in a position to talk about some changes in institutional arrangements, and they will be included in my forthcoming statement.

MULTICULTURALISM IN SCHOOLS

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Education assure the House that South Australian schools will continue to promote multiculturalism? There was an article in the *Advertiser* last Tuesday about a school in my electorate, the Cowandilla Primary School. The article described the wide range of ethnic backgrounds of students at that school. The students there held monthly ballots to choose the 'Aussie

of the month'. The article reported on the positive benefits to the school from the ethnic mix. The school regards this as an essential part of the learning process.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his raising this matter and indeed for his interest in the well-being of schools in his electorate. I also want to acknowledge the sensitive way, I believe, in which the *Advertiser* covered the story and indeed the positive dimension it gave to a very important area of education in this State.

The Education Department obviously recognises the importance of multiculturalism in our school programs and the opportunities it gives to many students in our schools, opportunities that they would not otherwise enjoy. Cowandilla Primary School is an important school in that aspect but it is just one example of the many achievements that can be gained in our schools by recognising the cultural backgrounds of individual children while acknowledging that they are all part of the Australian community.

Recently a member of my staff visited the Cowandilla Primary School and on that occasion the principal of that school pointed to three children playing together in the playground. One child was of Greek background, another came from Kampuchja, and the third was from Vietnam. The language program at that school enables those three children, and the other children at the school, to learn about the language and culture of their countries of origin while the general curriculum provides a strong and broad education which is also tailored to take into account the cultural backgrounds of individual children. It has been demonstrated that in their early years children learn best when taught in their own language, and that is clearly the thrust of the Education Department's language development plan, which has set the pace in this country for language teaching. Indeed, our implementation of that plan is far ahead of that of other States in Australia. So, we can be very proud of what has been achieved in our State education system in fostering multicultural heritage and the maintenance of family languages.

The thrust and the confidence that the community has in those programs is very much a question on the lips of so many of our teachers and parents and indeed those students, as that article indicated recently in the *Advertiser* newspaper. I can only repeat what I said earlier in this Question Time, that it is beholden upon the Opposition in this State to dissociate itself clearly and unequivocally from the statements that are emanating from the Federal Liberal Party on this important matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's attention was momentarily diverted by a member of the Opposition attempting to find out whether or not he had the next call and I missed the last few words of the honourable the Minister. If the Minister was indulging in repetition, I ask all members to avoid doing so.

MARINELAND

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Is it still the Government's intention to ignore ALP policy and hold to the written undertaking it gave to the West Beach Trust in October 1986 to support the upgrading of Marineland and to permit dolphins to be taken from South Australian water? The 1987 ALP convention directed Cabinet to revoke all permits issued for the capture of dolphins

in South Australia. The matter is to be raised again at this year's convention beginning tomorrow when, according to the *Australian* of 1 August, the Minister for Environment and Planning will come under attack for a statement he made recently that 'it wasn't an unreasonable proposition to capture a few dolphins'.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am amazed that the shadow Minister for Tourism should be carrying on in this particular manner. I think it would be not unreasonable for the people of South Australia to ask the honourable member where she stands in relation to this matter. The Government has made its position perfectly clear on a number of occasions. The proposed developer of Marineland came to the Government and asked, in the event that it was found necessary to take a few animals from the wild in order to build up their breeding population, whether I would be prepared to use my powers under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, given that these cetacea are protected animals, and allow some to be taken. The Government gave that guarantee. The guarantee still stands. The Government has not been asked to deliver on the guarantee at this stage and may not be.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mrs APPLEBY: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward has the call.

Mrs APPLEBY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister guarantee that the actuated pedestrian crossing lights on Morphett Road and Diagonal Road remain operative to the many residents who have found this to be a safe road crossing? Those crossings have, in the past, been for the welfare of students attending the Oaklands Primary School which closed at the beginning of this year. However, residents of the area have put to me that they have become used to utilising this safe aspect of crossing and because of the busy traffic flow, as the two roads are feeders to the regional shopping centre, an unsafe road crossing situation could arise should the crossings not remain.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. Both Morphett Road and Diagonal Road are very busy arterials that carry heavy road traffic. It is because of those reasons that I can give the honourable member the assurance that these actuated pedestrian lights will not be taken out because people need to have safe crossings of our busy roads.

Where we have a set of pedestrian lights, people become accustomed to them and they manage their transport patterns to fit in with these lights and it is incumbent on the authorities to retain those lights until such time as it is clear that no-one is using them. If that ever becomes the case, and I suspect that it would not, the decision may have to be varied. However, I can give the honourable member the assurance that she seeks.

TEACHERS

Mr BECKER: I direct my question to the Premier. Premier, how does—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Housing and Construction is out of order.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: It is a waste of time—he could not answer it, anyway.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: How does the Premier reconcile his new school staffing formula which his own Education Department has admitted will result in the loss of 150 to 200 teacher positions with his clear promise at the last State election, 'There will be no reduction in teacher numbers'?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am pleased the honourable member has raised this question because the Opposition has been particularly silent on this matter.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: The Opposition seems to have overlooked the fact that the staffing formula that has been explained in recent weeks by the Education Department to school communities has come about as a result of the decision reached when the 4 per cent second tier productivity increases were announced earlier this year. The arrangements reached with respect to that matter have been registered in the Industrial Court and, as much as the Institute of Teachers might want to walk away from the agreement, it is there and it is registered for everyone to see. It includes specifically the arrangements we have reached.

Under those arrangements \$20.5 million of taxpayers' funds have been paid to teachers in this State. Some teachers are conveniently forgetting when they raise this matter that they are the substantial beneficiaries of that agreement. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. However, I want to put on record my appreciation of the work by officers in the Education Department who have been the subject of Opposition attack and indeed scurrilous attacks by one member of the Opposition in the Upper House who attacked the so-called education bureaucrats who, I believe, have worked in the interests of every student in this State to provide a formula whereby we can maintain in our schools the highest standards of education in this country.

We have been able to develop a formula to achieve that. Not only that, but under the agreement reached with the Institute of Teachers, we will not only make provision to increase their salaries but we can provide other additional fillips for our schools and teachers, including substantially increased professional development programs. We will reach agreement of an industrial nature on very important issues, for example, the reconfiguration of our schools. The honourable member who raises the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I know it. I had a deputation from a school in his electorate yesterday.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: They came and saw me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot tolerate a three-way conversation between the member for Hanson, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Public Works.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. They said, 'We accept that there needs to be a reconfiguration of schools in our area because of the declining enrolments.' They said, 'We want to work our way through the problem. We disagree with some of the aspects and the way some of

these aspects have been occurring and we want to explain where we think you are wrong, but the fundamental issue is that we believe that we can improve the educational opportunities for our children by reconfiguring our schools.' On the other hand, the Opposition has not helped in this matter at all by first raising it as a political issue rather than an educational one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: If the honourable member wants to take responsibility for dividing parents, dividing teachers and their pupils and the like, he can accept that responsibility. That is not the way I operate. A further aspect is that the honourable member has been making public statements saying that we need to spend more money on upgrading our schools. The only way in which we will provide that money will be by reconfiguring the resources we currently have in the education system, something which the Opposition is opposing. We now have the opportunity to proceed on a rational basis with the reconfiguration of many of our schools in this State because of the decline in enrolments. I think that the debate going on in some school communities at the moment must be placed in that broader context of the ultimate aims we were hoping to achieve for our schools and, in particular, for our students.

I am happy to provide members with detailed information about the effects of the new staffing formula, because unfortunately there is not a lot of accurate information in our community about this matter. People have simply taken the information provided by sources outside the Education Department as the bases of fact, and much of the correspondence I have seen is simply not based on fact. People have not considered the issues and the explanations that are being provided by the Education Department and, when they do, I am confident that they will see the benefits in the short term (and, particularly, in the long term) that this will provide for schools throughout the State.

WORLD GRAIN MARKETS

Mr RANN: Can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House what effects the current drought in the United States will have on world markets for Australia's grain? Following his recent visit to the US, the Minister indicated that he was not optimistic about the commitment of the US Congress to the phasing out of subsidies for grain exports as requested by Australia—which, apparently, amuses the Opposition. He suggested that the US may well continue with these types of programs for some time—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee appears to have withdrawn leave for the honourable member to continue his explanation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair was clearly of the view that the word 'question' was called. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee: is that a correct interpretation by the Chair?

Mr Lewis: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been withdrawn. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am disappointed that the member for Murray-Mallee has not allowed my colleague the member for Briggs to outline his question and explain it to the House because, of course, it is a very important issue, particularly to his constituents. I would have thought that he would at least have the decency to allow the member for Briggs to outline his question to the House. However, I will take the opportunity to respond to that question in a

way which I think would help not only the community but also this House to understand what is happening with regard to agriculture in the US, as I had the opportunity to meet with most of the agricultural leaders, both at a political and agri-political level in the US.

As members are probably aware, there is a severe drought in the mid-west northern states of the US. I had the opportunity to visit several of those states, and the situation is very severe. The holding stocks of grain have dropped dramatically in the past year and a half. The figures given indicate that there has been a significant drop both in grains and in maize and other feedstocks being held by the US at this time. Officials indicated that they would release their conservation lands, as well as the reserve lands which they hold in stock and which they pay the farming community to hold. Unfortunately, that has come about because of the dramatic drop in stocks.

I believe that that will lead to a release of something like 17.5 per cent of that holding stock for agricultural production. It will not have an impact this year in terms of the increased supply to the world community, but it will have an impact in years to come. It is important to note that it is probably the poorer agricultural land which has been put into this category of 'reserve', but it will still add significantly to production capacities. The US wheat production is expected to fall around 7 million tonnes in 1988-89 to around 50 million tonnes. When we look at our expected crop this year of around 14 million to 15 million tonnes, we see how significant the US is as an exporter.

Fortunately for us, the fall in supply to the world market has led to an increase of about 20 per cent in the world market price for grains, in particular, of course, wheat, given that we produce excellent quality wheats that go on the world market and are sought by most of the premium markets in terms of the international trade situation. We estimate that the price will increase in the order of \$30 to \$50 by the time the markets are satisfied with the supply from Australia. There has been an increase of about \$35 since the beginning of the year.

If we look at the way in which the Americans have been subsidising their grains, we can expect (given the political situation with the Presidential election and Congressional election coming up) to see a further subsidy program being entertained by the Congress. Unfortunately, the political system in the US is such that the executive arm and the parliamentary arm are often at loggerheads, and often the parliamentary arm is servicing its electorate in a local sense and not taking a global view of the situation. The people I met with, including the Under-Secretary of Agriculture (who was acting for Mr Lyng while he was overseas), were very concerned about the long-term situation. In fact, the Under-Secretary sympathised with our position.

I think that the general understanding of the bureaucrats in the US about the situation internationally, and particularly the Australian market situation, is quite poor. I think it is fair to say that many people who have visited the US—and I am talking particularly of Australian trade officials, industry representatives and farm leaders—have helped to enlighten those bureaucrats about the impact on Australian farmers of their subsidy policies. In many ways, there are hidden subsidies which are not always promoted (such as the export enhancement package, which represents some \$5 billion), but also many millions of dollars which are also provided to the farming community by credit support, farm retention schemes, reserve schemes for land holding and subsidies in the way of farm products.

All those schemes together lead to a pushing down of our price, and a pressure on the grain prices and feedstock prices

around the world. It is not a good situation for the long term, but it is certainly in the short term—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You don't know! Certainly, in the short term the situation is quite positive and augurs well for local producers, certainly grain producers, and feedstock producers internationally. I hope that we will see the GATT conference in 1990 produce some very positive responses to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thought that members would be interested in agriculture, but it seems that they are not—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I'm not sure that you do know, because you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that all members, whether or not they have rural interests, would have some interest in the Minister's reply. However, he has spent a substantial amount of time, and I ask him very quickly to wind up his remarks. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions can only be directed at call and to Ministers.

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It is interesting that I appear to be the first member of the Opposition to pop the question to the new Minister of Marine and Harbors. My question is, in fact, to the Minister of Marine and Harbors, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I ask whether it is the Minister of Marine and Harbors to whom I should be so grateful for the extraordinary courtesies and comforts that have been offered to me whilst on the *Island Seaway* tomorrow between Kingscote and Port Adelaide? Yesterday, and again today, I have been advised (indeed, today I have been positively advised) that arrangements are being made for me in the way of comforts and courtesies while I am *en route* from Kingscote to Port Adelaide on the *Island Seaway* tomorrow.

The reason for today's call was to confirm that I would take up the booking arrangement and depart from Kingscote at 6 a.m. tomorrow on that vessel. I recognise that so far no present or former Federal or State member of Parliament has travelled on that ship even though, as I understand, numerous invitations have been extended to certain members of this Parliament to do so.

However, I am grateful for the offer of these extraordinary courtesies, and my question concerns whether the Minister of Marine is responsible for these arrangements. They are that a representative of Howard Smith, Sydney, is coming through the system and going to Kangaroo Island this evening, that a senior representative of Patrick, the new manager of R.W. Miller, and Mr Bruce Moorook, a marine engineer, are going to Kangaroo Island on the plane this evening so as to be able to board the ship with me tomorrow morning and look after me *en route* to Port Adelaide. These are matters of fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is not certain whether the honourable member is giving an explanation or is taking part in an early grievance debate.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: There is no element of grievance about this. I am absolutely delighted to have been extended these courtesies, and the opportunity for me to ask a question today is important.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is obviously canvassing a whole range of matters, some relevant and some not. I withdraw leave for him to continue his explanation, and I call on the honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Apparently, the member for Alexandra cannot tell the difference between the new Minister of Marine and me. I have never really believed that, but some Opposition members have difficulty in that regard. I only hope that it is because the honourable member is a long way away from the Minister of Marine and from me that he has got us mixed up and that there is no other reason for doing so. If the operators of the vessel want to provide the honourable member or any other member with special treatment on the *Island Seaway*, that is for the operators to do. They do not ask the Government or the Highways Department. Indeed, if it was up to me, I should not give the honourable member that sort of treatment, especially because of the way in which he has spent about eight or nine months trying to destroy any confidence that people on the Island and tourists would have in the *Island Seaway*.

I rather suspect that Howard Smith may be acting under instructions from the new owners, because I understand that Howard Smith has been taken over, and it occurs to me that there is a big corporate fight proceeding between some of the leading Australian industrial entrepreneurs as to who will own the *Island Seaway*. Indeed, it seems that the battle is between Adelaide Steam and Sir Ronald Brierley. If Howard Smith, Patrick, Miller, or whoever wants to provide comforts for people travelling on the *Island Seaway*, that is their business. However, members of this House need to understand that Howard Smith is the operator: neither the Highways Department nor the Government operates that service. It is operated by Howard Smith, an experienced private enterprise shipping company, which is the oldest in Australia and knows what it is on about. If that company believes that it is important to provide comforts for the honourable member that is up to it and, if I were he, I should just accept it and shut up.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: O-BAHN

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the House. During a reply to a question asked by the member for Newland, I recall saying that there had been no serious injury as a result of the accident on the O-Bahn busway. I should have said that there had been no serious injury to any passenger, but there was injury to the drivers. That was regrettable. Indeed, it is regrettable whenever anyone is injured, and it is particularly regrettable when people are injured in the course of their duty. I should like to put on record that, in replying to the member for Newland, I was talking only of passengers. I should have mentioned the drivers. I do so now because they certainly have my sympathy both as regards the accident and the hurt incurred as a result of it.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the select committee on the Firearms Act Amendment Bill have leave to sit during the sittings of the House today.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1989. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$995 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$700 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is for \$995 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Members will notice that the amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$120 million on the second Supply Bill for last year. About \$75 million is to cover wage and salary and other cost increases since that time. The remaining \$45 million represents the Government's contribution towards superannuation pensions for the first four months of the 1988-89 financial year. Authority for these payments was previously provided in the Superannuation Act but is not included in the new legislation which came into operation on 1 July this year. Supply Bill (No. 1), which was passed in the previous parliamentary session, did not include an amount for this new arrangement. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$995 million.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: 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

Members will recall that in late 1986 the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982 was amended. The important radiation protection measure which the amendments introduced was the requirement for a licence for operations in which radioactive ore is mined or milled. The application of those requirements to the Roxby Downs joint venture was set out in a schedule to the amending legislation.

The Olympic Dam project has advanced to the point where the mine and mill are almost fully commissioned,

and will shortly move into the production phase. It is now the appropriate time for the licensing provisions to be invoked, and discussions have been proceeding about the manner in which that should occur, taking into account the interaction between this Act and the indenture Act.

The joint venturers hold a special mining lease which was granted under the terms of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982. This lease was granted in 1986 for a period of 50 years and, as provided by the indenture, this term can be extended.

Having regard to the term of the special mining lease, the absence of time limitations on approvals under the codes of practice and the effect of clause 10 of the schedule to the Radiation Protection and Control Act, it is considered appropriate to issue a licence under the Act for the period of the special mining lease. However, the legislation currently requires payment of the full licence fee prior to the grant of the licence.

It is considered unreasonable and unrealistic to require the entire licence fee to be paid before the licence is granted. In negotiations with the joint venturers, agreement has been reached that there should be an indexed fee payable annually. The amendments made by this Bill therefore provide for the payment of an annual fee for a licence to mine or mill radioactive ores of an amount determined in accordance with the regulations. The amendments do not change in any way the obligations of the joint venturers to comply with appropriate radiation standards or codes of practice, and do not change the rights of the joint venturers under this Act, or under the indenture. Only the method of payment is changed.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 24 of the principal Act which deals with the granting of licences for the mining or milling of radioactive ores. The amendment provides for the grant of a licence on payment of a fee of an amount determined by the regulations for the first year of the licence and for payment of annual fees thereafter for the term of the licence, payable on or before the commencement of the subsequent year, and in respect of the years for which a licence is renewed. The amendment also provides that any amounts not paid as required by the section are recoverable from the holder of the licence in a court of competent jurisdiction. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment to section 37 of the Act which deals with licence renewals.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: 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 problem of SP bookmaking is one of national concern. In South Australia, estimates of illegal betting turnover range from \$50 million to \$200 million annually. Clearly, any estimate must be largely speculative, but it nonetheless

remains a serious concern to both the Government and the racing industry.

SP bookmakers pay no tax and make no contribution to the cost of operation of the racing industry. Consequently, SP bookmakers are parasites, thriving on the racing industry which is a significant contributor to the economy of the State in terms of capital investment, employment and revenue.

In November 1983, at the first National Racing Ministers Conference held in Melbourne, the conference was unanimous in expressing its concern with what appeared to be the growing incidence of SP betting, and the importance of taking action to minimise its effect on the viability of the racing industry. It should be realised that SP betting is no longer a 50c each way operation but a large national network handling millions of dollars. None of this money goes back to the industry which has enabled this turnover to be generated.

The Costigan Royal Commission confirmed this concern and stated further that SP betting is a significant social evil which has connections with organised crime. The State Government subsequently legislated for amendments to the Racing Act in 1984, for increased penalties for SP bookmaking. It is acknowledged that increased penalties are only one way of combating the problem. Law enforcement agencies must have significant manpower to carry out the work of apprehending offenders—and in this regard my department and I are appreciative of the efforts of the Vice, Licensing and Gaming Squad. In addition, the courts should impose maximum penalties where appropriate.

The public should also be aware that SP betting carries penalties for persons betting illegally with SP bookmakers and currently this carries a maximum penalty of \$2 000 dollars or six months imprisonment. Licensed bookmakers on-course and the TAB provide an extremely adequate service to the racing fraternity in South Australia. In recent times, initiatives adopted by the TAB, such as extended hours, the location of agencies and sub-agencies, (especially those in licensed premises), tele-text facilities and Sky Channel services have all been designed to provide the public with adequate opportunities to bet legally.

State Governments have a responsibility in protecting the viability of the racing industry, and in creating an awareness in the public eye of the insidious effect that SP bookmaking can have on our society by its association with other criminal activities throughout Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 63 of the Act by increasing the pecuniary penalties incurred by a person who acts as a bookmaker without being licensed or by a person who holds a licence but fails to comply with the conditions of the licence from \$8 000 to \$15 000 for the first offence, while the penalty for a second or subsequent offence is increased from \$15 000 to \$40 000. The penalty for a second or subsequent offence of \$4 000 or imprisonment for one year is inserted for a person who makes a bet with an unlicensed bookmaker or who makes a bet in which its acceptance by the bookmaker would constitute an offence against the Act.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: 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 problem of SP bookmaking is one of national concern. In South Australia, estimates of illegal betting turnover range from \$50 million to \$200 million annually. Clearly, any estimate must be largely speculative, but it nonetheless remains a serious concern to both the Government and the racing industry.

SP bookmakers pay no tax and make no contribution to the cost of operation of the racing industry. Consequently, SP bookmakers are parasites, thriving on the racing industry which is a significant contributor to the economy of the State in terms of capital investment, employment and revenue.

In November 1983 at the first National Racing Ministers Conference held in Melbourne, the conference was unanimous in expressing its concern with what appeared to be the growing incidence of SP betting, and the importance of taking action to minimise its effect on the viability of the racing industry. It should be realised that SP betting is no longer a 50c each-way operation, but a large national network handling millions of dollars. None of this money goes back to the industry which has enabled this turnover to be generated.

The Costigan Royal Commission confirmed this concern and stated further that SP betting is a significant social evil which has connections with organised crime. The State Government subsequently legislated for amendments to the Racing Act in 1984, for increased penalties for SP bookmaking. It is acknowledged that increased penalties are only one way of combating the problem. Law enforcement agencies must have significant manpower to carry out the work of apprehending offenders—and in this regard my department and I are appreciative of the efforts of the Vice, Licensing and Gaming Squad. In addition, the courts should impose maximum penalties where appropriate.

The public should also be aware that SP betting carries penalties for persons betting illegally with SP bookmakers and currently this carries a maximum penalty of \$2 000 dollars or six months imprisonment.

Licensed bookmakers on-course and the TAB provide an extremely adequate service to the racing fraternity in South Australia. In recent times, initiatives adopted by the TAB, such as extended hours, the location of agencies and sub-agencies (especially those in licensed premises), Tele-Text facilities and Sky Channel services, have all been designed to provide the public with adequate opportunities to bet legally.

State Governments have a responsibility in protecting the viability of the racing industry and in creating an awareness in the public eye of the insidious effect that SP bookmaking can have on our society by its association with other criminal activities throughout Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 117 of the Act by increasing the pecuniary penalties incurred by a person who acts as a bookmaker without being licensed or by a person who holds a licence but fails to comply with the conditions of the licence from \$8 000 to \$15 000 for the first offence, while the penalty for a second or subsequent offence is increased from \$15 000 to \$40 000.

The penalty for a second or subsequent offence of \$4 000 or imprisonment for one year is inserted for a person who makes a bet with an unlicensed bookmaker or who makes

a bet in which its acceptance by the bookmaker would constitute an offence against the Act.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the Electrical Products Bill 1988 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 157.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I thank the Governor for opening this session of Parliament and congratulate him on his service to South Australia. I also commend his wife, Lady Dunstan, for her support in his service to this State. I state my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II as Queen of Australia.

I record my sadness at the death of the former Governor of South Australia, Sir Douglas Nicholls. Although his term in office was short, I know that he gave a lot of good service to the State. I also offer my condolences to the family of the former Head Attendant, Arnold Noack, whose sudden death came as a shock to us all. Arnold was one of those cheerful people who was always there to help us and he was very kind to me at all times.

It is fitting that I say a few words about the Hon. Murray Hill who was the grandfather of the Parliament and who retired recently. Many of us who have had dealings with Murray know the effort he put into the portfolios he held over the years and helping all the junior members of Parliament if they had any problems or at any stage asked him for advice. I wish him and his wife good health and happiness for the future.

I acknowledge the two Ministers who have retired, the member for Spence (Hon. Roy Abbott) and the member for Mitchell (Hon. Ron Payne). In the short time that I have been in this Parliament both those gentlemen have handled their portfolios to the best of their ability. At any time that I have taken deputations to them they have been not only helpful but also very courteous and have wanted to do their best to help the constituents I took along. I have appreciated that, and I have appreciated the constructive manner in which they have handled affairs in my electorate. I wish them well in their remaining time in this Parliament and, of course, I wish them well for the future.

I congratulate the three new Ministers, the member for Mawson (Hon. Susan Lenehan), the member for Todd (Hon. John Klunder) and the member for Florey (Hon. Bob Gregory), and I hope that they show members the same courtesy and attention that was shown by the former Ministers. I wish them well for the future.

Members have made speeches in this Parliament trying to assess the doctrine of ministerial responsibility and, as all members would understand, that is a most difficult assessment to make in the Australian parliamentary system. It is clear that the role of Parliament is declining with increasing dominance of the Executive Government. Aus-

tralia is almost moving back to the colonial days with public officials, I believe, having more power than Ministers.

In Australia there has been the peculiar development of the statutory authority, with over 400 in South Australia, several thousand in other States and about 500 federally. I believe that that in itself is leading to ministerial responsibility being extremely difficult to define. How does one assess, in our present system, the democratic view that Ministers are held responsible by the Parliament for their administration when so much public activity is shielded by statutory authorities?

Accountability must be the essence of our democratic form of government. Accountability is a fundamental prerequisite for preventing abuse, delegation or assumed power. At the very centre of this chain of accountability stands the Parliament. No new policies can be put into effect or into law without its consent, and I think that every member from both sides of Parliament would agree with that.

But how true is it? Can the law be altered without Parliament's approval? Unfortunately, the answer is 'Yes'. But just to complain about Parliament's declining responsibilities does not address the next step, and that is that even Ministers are losing their ability to administer and to be responsible for policy and changes to the law. Ministerial responsibility is my theme today. I believe that the case I will put to the House is one of the reasons why the standing of politicians and Parliament has dramatically declined in the past 20 years.

I wish to draw members' attention to three important events which occurred in my electorate in the past three months and which illustrate the growth of this bureaucratic control and, I believe, the loss of ministerial influence. It must be admitted that the gap between Parliament and the Administration has been increasing over many years, and this is due to the range and complexity of government. It has reduced the likelihood of individual members of Parliament, and indeed even Ministers, fully grasping the significance of what the Government is doing.

What I am really saying is that many Ministers who accept ministerial responsibility, unfortunately for the taxpayers of South Australia, are not competent to do the job which they are asked to do. It is in the interests of the bureaucracy to keep parliamentarians at a distance, and this stops them from interfering or knowing too much. That is really not a criticism of members of the civil service, for whom I have a genuine regard and who are only doing their job to the best of their ability. It is happening because of the complexities of modern political life and the inabilities of Ministers to administer. It is just something that has happened, and the Parliament has allowed it to happen as politicians search for more power instead of acting in a legislative and managerial capacity.

Let me return to the issues I wish to raise. I refer first to the public reaction in my electorate to the obvious intention of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to attempt to take over the ownership and control of the beaches adjoining national parks. Incidentally, that would have placed some 50 per cent of the coastline from the Murray Mouth to the Victorian border under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In an article in the *South-Eastern Times* which referred to the beach at Wrights Bay, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service said that he believed there would be little opposition to including the intertidal zone into the new coastal park planned along the Cape Jaffa area.

Mr Leaver, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, continued by saying that the inclusion of the foreshore areas in the new parks would be automatic and

there would be no public exhibition process. Mr Leaver decried the existing situation where parks adjoining by a coastal area are not subject to the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The point that needs to be stressed is: who is making the policy for the Government? What is the Government's policy on care, control and management of our beaches?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The Minister is supposed to be responsible, isn't he?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly. The Public Service is the administrative wing of government. It does not make policy; it carries out Government policy made by Ministers of the Government who, in turn, are responsible to Parliament. Section 44 of the Harbors Act provides that the foreshore shall be under the care, control and management of the Minister of Marine, or where the foreshore is within the area of a municipal or district council it shall be under the care, control and management of that council. However, there is one proviso, namely, that by proclamation the Governor may place any of the foreshore under the care, control and management of any Minister of the Crown, the Coastal Protection Board or a council. Therefore, the foreshore or the beach is under the care, control and management of the local council unless the Minister uses Cabinet's powers through a Governor's proclamation to place the foreshore under the control of another Minister or the Coast Protection Board. What is specified as 'foreshore'? Under the Harbors Act the foreshore is defined as follows:

... land extending from low watermark to the nearest road or section boundary, or to a distance of 30 metres from high watermark (whichever is the lesser distance)...

A further interesting question that needs to be asked concerns the surveying undertaken by the Lands Department and the placement of a section number on a 30-metre strip around most of our coasts, from the high watermark inland. This appears to be designed to take out of the hands of local government part of the existing foreshore which, technically, is under its control. One may well ask to whom has this 30-metre strip been transferred? One also needs to examine the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Section 28 provides:

By proclamation the Governor may constitute as a national park any specified Crown lands that he considers to be of national significance by reason of the wildlife or natural features of those lands.

As the Harbors Act Amendment Act was proclaimed in 1978, and the National Parks and Wildlife Act in 1974, the Harbors Act was subsequent to the National Parks and Wildlife Act, and that needs to be 'read down' when using the National Parks and Wildlife Act in relation to dealing with the foreshore. Already a proclamation has been made in relation to the foreshore adjoining the Innes National Park on Yorke Peninsula, and there must be some doubt about transferring the care, control and management to another body. It may be that the Warooka District Council still has care, control and management of that beach. As I was concerned about this matter, I wrote to the Minister of Marine, and I received the following reply:

During 1978 the Department for the Environment approached the Department of Marine and Harbors requesting that action be taken to have the foreshore within the then harbor of Stenhouse Bay withdrawn from my control and added to the Innes National Park.

The aim was to have all of the foreshore adjoining the Innes National Park included in that part to enable activities on the foreshore, particularly the possible lighting of fires for barbecues during total fire ban periods, to be policed by the National Parks and Wildlife Division.

Initially it was assumed that other foreshore adjoining the park was under the control of the District Council of Warooka.

The Department of Marine and Harbors was agreeable to the proposal. There was no need to retain the harbor of Stenhouse

Bay, commercial use of the jetty having ceased during 1975, and on 23 June 1980 Cabinet approved a recommendation that action be taken to give effect to the proposal.

Subsequently certain complications arose because of some confusion over the original declaration of the council boundaries. Various proclamations were issued to rectify the matter and the foreshore was finally added to the park by a proclamation which appeared in the *Government Gazette* of 24 May 1984 at page 1261.

(Signed) Roy Abbott.

I then wrote back to the Minister and I asked four questions. I note also that the aim was to include in the Innes National Park all the foreshore adjoining that park. It is clear that under the Harbors Act the Minister may transfer care, control and management to the Minister for Environment and Planning, but it is a different matter to permit the inclusion of a foreshore area in a national park. In my letter I asked the Minister the following four questions:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Harbors any power, under the Harbors Act, to transfer the care, control and management of the foreshore to a national park?

2. As the Harbors Act amendment section 44 was a subsequent Act to the National Parks and Wildlife Act, should not the provisions of that Act be 'read down' with the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

3. Do you consider that the proclamation of 25 May 1984 on page 1261 of the *Government Gazette* is valid?

4. Do you consider that irrespective of the ownership of the foreshore the care, control and management of the foreshore adjoining the Innes National Park is still in the hands of the Warooka District Council?

I then stated:

Your views on these questions would be appreciated.

As yet I have not received a reply to the letter that I wrote to the Minister of Marine. In the whole of this story a very clear thread emerges. There is no clear statement of Government or ministerial policy. Throughout the history of the matter there has been a clear domination of bureaucratic influence, a domination of public servants over the direction being taken. The tragedy in all this is that ordinary people appear to have only one recourse, namely, to protest, but at an enormous overall cost in getting their point over.

At a meeting in Kingston, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service did not answer the important question of whether or not the statement he made in the *South-Eastern Times* that the National Parks and Wildlife Service would take over the beaches automatically was ministerial policy. That is really the basis of my complaint. We need to know what the Government policy is. We need to know whether all this trouble stems from the bureaucracy, or is it a ministerial policy that the Minister does not wish to admit. It is also interesting to note that the Cabinet decision although originally made in 1980 was not proclaimed until 1984. Why the delay? I can assure the Parliament that the battle of the beaches is not over yet and nor is the battle to ensure that Ministers and the Government have a responsibility for policy to this Parliament. Let the Government determine policy and let the bureaucrats carry out that policy. No reversal in those roles should be allowed or condoned.

My second complaint deals with the Australian design rules, known as ADRs, which were put out by the Federal transport authority. At this stage the complaint is related to the ADR which will require all light trailers to be fitted with hydraulic brakes. That will double the cost of a light trailer. This subject has already been taken up by the *7.30 Report* and by the proprietor of Bob's Trailers. Almost every city household has in the garage a light trailer. There will be considerable extra cost incurred by most families in this city. The Australian design rule under discussion has been agreed to by the Federal Department of Transport, I am told, after seven years of lobbying by the Metal Trades

Union. I just wonder about its motives considering such a long period of lobbying. When a Federal department agrees to those design rules, there is no legislation and no regulations, just departmental decisions.

Ms Gayler: It only applies to very big trailers.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It applies to very small trailers, I think the honourable member will find if she reads the ADRs. The State of South Australia proclaims those design rules as applying to this State. Nowhere can I find power in legislation for such a proclamation. Under the Road Traffic Act, there are regulation making powers. The power used in this case is section 176 (5) which provides:

A regulation under this Act may impose requirements or require compliance with standards or specification, as amended, varied or substituted from time to time that may be stipulated or recommended by a person, body or authority referred to in the regulation.

So, under this regulation making power, regulation 700 (a) is made which provides for the application of the Australian design rules made in Canberra—not just design rules, not legislation and not regulations. This appears to be the only power that I can find for this proclamation.

Let me reiterate the process that has taken place. Here we have a Federal department making a law with nothing being passed by Federal Parliament or being subject to disallowance as a regulation. Here in South Australia, those laws are proclaimed without there being any legislative power to do so except in the form of a regulation, which can be altered without the ability to disallow being provided. This is most disturbing. I ask the Minister of Transport whether he has agreed to proclaim the new Australian design rules to apply in South Australia. He must have already done that, because manufacturers in South Australia already know that the new design rules will apply from 1 January 1989. Has the Minister agreed or has the decision on the proclamation been made by the bureaucrats? The Canberra bureaucrats have stipulated design rules, and that can be extremely upsetting for South Australian industry. The design rules can be applied by bureaucrats in South Australia or a disinterested Minister, while the Parliament has no ability to prevent the changes in the law to which this applies.

The third complaint concerns the Health Act regulations relating to septic tanks. In 1987, Parliament passed a Public and Environmental Health Act which was assented to in April of that year but which has not yet been proclaimed. So, the old Health Act is still in operation and, under the old Act, regulations can be made under section 47 (h) which provides:

The Governor, on the recommendation of the Central Board of Health, may make regulations for or with respect to the installation, maintenance and inspection of bacteriolytic tanks, and the fittings and drains and water closets used in connection therewith.

The regulation states:

No person shall install or cause to be installed any bacteriolytic tank unless and until plans and sections of the proposed tank including details of all fittings, drains and water closets in connection therewith have been submitted to and approved by the Central Board.

The Central Board of Health then brings out the guidelines which, of course, can be altered. The guidelines are not subject to public scrutiny. I will briefly quote a letter I received from the Robe council. It states:

To the new home builder, this will mean an increase from the existing 1 200 litre septic tank, with a nine metre soakage trench to a 3 000 litre septic tank for a three bedroom house with a 45 metre soakage trench.

Mr Meier: That is totally ridiculous.

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is totally ridiculous. It is impossible to do that on many of the building blocks in relation to which that order has been made.

Mr Meier: Could you imagine what would happen if they applied those regulations to the city?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, there would be an uproar if it was applied to the city. All three cases may be legal in process, but all raise serious doubts in my mind as to ministerial responsibility and the role of the Parliament. Today, one wonders whether the Executive is the controller of policies. I believe that ministerial responsibility is now riding a slippery dip in the same way as parliamentary responsibility has gone down that slippery dip over the past 50 years.

Mr Meier: Do you think there are too many bureaucrats not having enough to do?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly. In examining the question of ministerial responsibility, one cannot overlook the most recent case: the ministerial responsibility to this Parliament of the Treasurer regarding the payment of costs resulting from the verbal indiscretions of the Hon. John Cornwall. I wonder whether we should now appoint a special Minister to handle a new portfolio to cover ministerial irresponsibility, or is the Treasurer assuming that role on behalf of his Government?

Mr Meier: We could bring back Mick Young.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mick could come back. There would be quite a few who could come back. There is no doubt in anyone's mind, except those totally biased and devoted ALP supporters, that the recently deposed Minister of Health should pay for his own personal indiscretions, but no longer is the problem in the Hon. John Cornwall's court. Cornwall is the albatross around the Treasurer's neck, and it is now his responsibility. In our Westminster system, there is individual ministerial responsibility for any action taken and, in this case, the matter is now in the hands of the Premier and Treasurer. He is the one who will sign the cheque and hand it to John Cornwall. He is now the one who has responsibility to this Parliament to not only explain his actions but also justify them.

The policy of paying for any indiscretions of a Minister has been established, but will that involve only Ministers or will it be a one-off situation? If so, for goodness sake, let him tell us. It may be that, if a more serious offence had been committed by the Hon. John Cornwall, if he had somehow physically attacked Dr Humble, the damages could have been much greater. If Dr Cornwall had pushed Dr Humble and he had suffered injury, who would pick up the compensation then? Would the taxpayer be expected to do it? Would it be restricted only to Ministers? All members are subject to press releases. All could be guilty if they misbehave during press interviews. Should they not have their damages paid also?

Should we stop at members of Parliament? What about the top public servants—we have had some questions about them in the last week. I believe that these questions have to be answered. Why does Dr Cornwall not resign from Parliament, collect his superannuation, which is 70 per cent paid for by the taxpayer, and pay the \$150 000 himself? It would still leave him his house and an income and he could run a veterinary practice and upset his patients as he was accustomed to do when he had his practice in the South-East. At least that way the taxpayer would only pay 70 per cent of the costs caused by the ex-Minister's indiscretions.

Let us look at what the Treasurer has done. He did not ask Cornwall to apologise in the court—that is quite clear from questions asked in the House this week. There is absolutely no thought for the taxpayer of South Australia. Dr Cornwall was allowed to pursue this lost cause with a 'nudge nudge, wink wink, don't worry comrade, we'll fix it', but at no stage did the Treasurer think of the ongoing ramifications. Then the case is lost and Dr Cornwall comes

bleating to the Premier and says, 'My life is shattered, I cannot pay.' What about his superannuation and what about the taxpayer—no thought of that at all. He was never asked to resign from Parliament and relieve the taxpayer of this onerous cost.

What about the Treasurer's decision to give Cornwall an open chequebook? Surely that is an irresponsible act by the Treasurer of this State who claims that he is running this State in a responsible fashion. Surely that is the most irresponsible act ever perpetrated on the taxpayers of South Australia by a Treasurer of this State in its long history. Fancy not taking advice as to the ramifications of this irresponsible act. We know that he went to the Attorney-General to find out if there was a loophole if the Government could pay the damages and court fees for Dr Cornwall. He did not take any other advice from Treasury or any other Ministers as to the ramifications of the fringe benefits tax.

We have heard from questions asked this week that the Premier has washed his hands of the matter and does not want to hear about it. 'Thank you very much for asking the question, I will go away and find out.' That was two days ago. The Opposition was able to get the information very quickly; unfortunately the Premier was not. There was no thought about the financial implications, but plenty of thought by the Attorney-General about how the Government can pay this fine for Dr Cornwall. Fancy not asking about Dr Cornwall's responsibilities under section 26 (e) of the Income Tax Act—fancy not asking that.

What is going to happen when poor old Dr Cornwall comes back bleating and says, 'Look, if I am not up for the FBT it looks like I am going to have to pay tax on this \$150 000, which will amount to another \$70 000.' Surely there is some responsibility, some obligation on a Treasurer of the State to make some inquiries into the ramifications of this decision. I think it clearly shows that the Treasurer does not understand finance. He understands how he can help out his comrade; he understands how the Government can find a loophole so that the taxpayers of the State can pick up the tab, but when it comes to the financial implications, I am sorry, there is nobody at home.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): In supporting the motion and the Governor's speech which marked the opening of this parliamentary session, I also express my condolences to the family of Sir Douglas Nicholls, the former Governor of this State. I congratulate the members for Mitchell and Spence and the Hon. John Cornwall in another place on their contributions to the Parliament, the Government and this community. My electorate has been a major beneficiary of the efforts of Dr Cornwall to improve health and hospital services and to broaden community services generally in the fast growing suburbs that I represent. That includes services for children and young mothers, youth and the older residents of Tea Tree Gully.

I extend my good wishes to the newly appointed Cabinet Ministers—the members for Mawson, Todd and Florey—and I am especially pleased that the north-eastern suburbs are now represented in Cabinet by the latter two members. I am sure that each member will speak out vigorously on behalf of our local community in Cabinet deliberations.

I want to devote my time today to the needs of older people in our community and their need for social justice in our society. I refer particularly to elderly people in the north-eastern suburbs and the Government's plans for

improved services for them. The situation in South Australia is that one in four people is aged 50 or over—some 350 000 people—and one in nine is aged over 65. In Tea Tree Gully, of a population of 75 000 people in 1988, 15 per cent are over 50; 7.4 per cent over 60 and almost 5 per cent over 65. The 5 per cent over 65 years of age is not a high proportion compared with other areas of metropolitan Adelaide, but the dramatic thing is that that elderly category increased by 50 per cent between the last two census periods.

It is projected that Tea Tree Gully will have a real increase in aged population, a significant increase in the number of aged women in the future, more women than men by the year 2001, elderly people are likely to retire earlier than they have in the past and, therefore, be on fixed incomes and require more services. The demographic change occurring locally is due to the fact that often people choose to live near their younger families and relatives in the outer suburbs. Also, there is little rental accommodation available for them. In my electorate 10 per cent of the population is aged 55 years or more and 7.3 per cent is 60 years of age or more; 15 per cent of the over-sixties live alone, many are widowed and a high proportion of them are women.

Aged people are often caricatured with a simple traditional stereotype. It is true of older aged people that more are likely to be women, but it is not true that a simple stereotype of elderly people is the case. In reality they have diverse interests, diverse health conditions and views, they take part in a wide variety of activities, they have varying circumstances in respect of income, wealth, housing and education and their needs for support and assistance are varied. Nevertheless, many face economic and other disadvantages and need access to a range of governments, programs and services.

About 10 per cent of older people need extensive support services. About 7 per cent are in triple jeopardy, being poor, disabled and living alone. Our Government is taking a number of notable steps in an effort to improve the circumstances of the elderly in our community and, in particular, those who especially need support and services. For example, the Bannon Government appointed Australia's first Commissioner for the Ageing to plan and coordinate appropriate services for older people. The Government set the aim of the Commissioner, as follows:

To enhance the quality of life of older people; to blaze a trail for the future.

It has found that the elderly population is increasing slowly and that we do have time to plan. The agenda for the ageing is being developed and items which stand out as priorities for action are suitable income security, efficient, effective and fair health care, accessible social services, life enrichment and life enhancement, suitable housing accommodation, policies on work and leisure, communications and transport and issues of safety and consumer protection.

A number of achievements have already been made in respect of the needs of the elderly. The Housing for the Aged Committee has been established to ensure that future accommodation for elderly people meets appropriate planning and design guidelines. A ministerial task force on nursing home accommodation has been negotiating with the Commonwealth to ensure high standards of nursing home accommodation in South Australia and a ceiling on the amount that retired people and pensioners are required to pay.

The Ethnic Aged Advisory Committee has been at work recognising the various needs of the largest growing segment of our elderly population, those born in non-English speaking countries. Various services for those people are being devised. Seniors Week has been established as a celebration

of the contribution of older people to this State. The Home and Community Care program, which was established in 1985 jointly with the Commonwealth Government, has developed a comprehensive range of integrated home and community based services for frail, elderly and disabled people and for their carers as an alternative to long-term residential care, which many elderly people do not opt to take. This program presently costs \$25 million a year and is designed to enable people to live in their own homes for as long as possible.

One of the functions of the Commissioner for the Ageing is to assess the incidence of discrimination against the ageing in employment and other areas and to promote action to end such discrimination. The Commissioner has established an Older Persons Advisory Committee and this forum is holding discussions to establish future directions. A paper entitled 'Ageing Strategy' has been released, identifying many of the directions that might be followed over the next five years to support older people. The strategy has been released as a green paper for comment by those who are in that category and those who care for them or provide them with services.

As this State will continue to have a proportionately greater ageing population than other States, the Labor Government believes that it is critical to seek the views of older people and to plan for their needs. In the meantime, a number of initiatives are proposed from the green paper. In particular, aged awareness programs for general practitioners and other health professionals are planned to ensure a more sensitive response to some of the main problems affecting the elderly such as incontinence, isolation and depression. Secondly, financial and consumer protection services including insurance, pensions and concessions, superannuation and investment schemes, wills and estate security are to be covered because, in these areas, elderly people often feel vulnerable to consumer fraud because of the lack of information available to them.

The Government has also sponsored health and fitness courses for the over 50s. The development of a safety check list for older people by the National Safety Council is under way to provide the elderly with information about crime levels and ways in which they can protect themselves, not just in the home but on the roads. It is well known that older people, particularly pedestrians, are disproportionately involved in accidents, and information to assist and advise them can be helpful. New design features such as hand grips and lower step and floor heights on buses, trams and trains to ensure that the elderly have greater access to public transport are being considered.

The National Agenda for Women, developed by the Federal Government with consultation across the country, highlighted the key concerns amongst elderly women as neighbourhood planning issues and amenities, transport, domiciliary services, housing and personal security. It was noted that many elderly women live alone and have fewer options than elderly men. Further:

The ageing of the population will place additional demands on those caring for aged individuals as well as on services for the aged themselves. Seventy-seven per cent of carers in the home are women, and they are frequently older women caring for frail relatives or providing voluntary services. Care of those with severe disabilities often assumes a significant part of the carer's personal and family life at a time in their life when their own health and ability to cope may be declining. Loss of privacy, constant stress, anxiety and a reduction in other family activities are common problems.

This points to the need for services which allow carers of the elderly to have respite care available so that their own lives are maintained in a healthy situation.

The range of Commonwealth and State Government programs and services available in my local community is steadily growing and improving. I include among those services Domiciliary Care and, particularly, home and community care. Under the home and community care funding provided by State and Commonwealth Governments is the home help scheme which is operated by Tea Tree Gully council staff. It provides short-term practical assistance in the home, including cleaning, ironing, vacuuming and other sorts of spring cleaning jobs and regular in-home jobs which elderly people often find difficult to maintain. In addition, Meals on Wheels in the north-eastern suburbs has been recently upgraded in a marvellous new setting, and now provides fresh rather than frozen food to the elderly and many housebound people.

Under the organisation of Ruth Dallow, it is making a valuable contribution to the local elderly, both in terms of the meals it provides and the valuable contact it provides people who would otherwise be housebound. Day centres operating in Tea Tree Gully are also vital local community centres. I refer to the Jubilee Centre and one of its hard workers, Harry Hirst, and also the group of frail and isolated elderly who meet regularly for meals and fun.

Hospital and health services in our area have also been improved. Hospice care is now available locally. Physiotherapy services are about to be improved with the extension of Modbury Hospital. Podiatry services, which are heavily in demand, I hope will shortly be expanded, although they probably still will not cater for all of the demand in hospital. Rehabilitation services at Hampstead Centre are superb. The South Australian Spectacle Scheme is providing important relief to those who otherwise could not perhaps afford new spectacles, and the pensioner dental scheme is also much appreciated.

Day surgery and improved outpatient opportunities at Modbury Hospital are now available with the new extensions recently opened. Housing in my area is also providing a wider range of opportunities for older people. The retirement villages at Ridgehaven Masonic Village and the Lutheran Village are providing for those who wish to go into such villages. The hostel at Masonic Village provides a superb setting and top quality service. The nursing home and units at Villaggio Italia in St Agnes provide particularly but not exclusively for elderly Italian residents. A number of these facilities also provide respite care for those who need that service, so that elderly people can go in for respite care and the home carer can have a rest.

The choice of housing for elderly people in the north-eastern suburbs is remarkably improved by the range of housing now provided at Golden Grove. In the past it was traditional, not only in metropolitan Adelaide but in other Australian cities, to build only traditional family homes, usually three-bedroom homes, in the outer suburbs. In the case of Golden Grove, by contrast, a range of smaller and more moderately priced housing opportunities are being provided including lovely courtyard houses, duplex units, home units, and so on, at a range of prices.

In the field of recreation and sport, it is often assumed that elderly people phase out their involvement, but the Modbury Bowling Club in my electorate is bursting at the seams and further plans and needs have been established for additional lawn bowls and croquet in particular. Lou Blakey conducts a most impressive exercise and fitness program for senior citizens in Tea Tree Gully. One hopes that the range of recreation and sporting possibilities for older people will grow. I note that Kath Hallett recently established a Tea Tree Gully walks program which is conducted during the day for older residents of the city.

In the area of transport services, Access Cabs is working very well and has been extended to provide additional opportunities for disabled people to get out and about more easily. In addition, the off-peak concessions for public transport are very much welcomed and relied upon by senior citizens. The local Greenline community bus service run by the Tea Tree Gully council provides a link between local centres. A further extension of that service would be much appreciated by senior citizens.

The issue of safety and security at home is often one of concern to elderly people and they particularly appreciate the Neighbourhood Watch schemes that are now up and running in parts of Tea Tree Gully, along with the move back to community policing and basing police stations right in the local community.

Social contact is also an important part of the lives of elderly citizens. I have already referred to the importance of domiciliary care and Meals on Wheels to the housebound and the day centres for those who are more mobile. The University of the Third Age, in the north-east, provides intellectual stimulation and new challenges for many senior citizens in my area and I congratulate Norman Dyke and Don McDonald who are both involved and active in University of the Third Age programs.

St Agnes Widows Club provides a central convenient meeting place for information, outings and fun for widowed senior citizens in my area, as does the Tea Tree Gully Senior Citizens Club which has a very wide range of daily activities. Red Cross has introduced a service called Telecross for the isolated, the ill and the lonely. This is an important new development for those who have a telephone but who do not have a supporting family: they appreciate the reassurance of a daily telephone call. Information services were one of the needs highlighted recently at a seminar for senior citizens in my area, and the Tea Tree Gully information booth will no doubt provide information, especially for elderly citizens.

On the financial side, concessions provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the South Australian Gas Company, the State Transport Authority, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and the health services are important for pensioners because such concessions ease the burden and the worry. However, often they do not extend to those on small, private fixed incomes such as superannuation. Those people are particularly affected by the inflationary spiral of past years, although thankfully that is easing.

A moment ago I referred to the achievements of our Government in providing a range of services to help elderly citizens. It is worth comparing the Bannon Government's efforts to improve services for older people with what is happening to senior citizens in New South Wales under the new Liberal Government. During the recent election campaign in that State, Nick Greiner said that under his Government all State concessions for senior citizens would be retained. However, Greiner's mini-budget abolished their nursing home and transport concessions. Having promised to reduce suburban bus and train fares for seniors, the Liberals instead increased them only a few months later from 60c to \$1 and from \$1 to \$2 for excursion fares. Along with that hit list, applying especially to the elderly, the Greiner Liberals also hit those on fixed incomes with increased charges for electricity, hospital beds, water and other essential services by amounts ranging from 1.25 to 2.5 times the consumer price index.

Organisers of the recent Tea Tree Gully day seminar entitled 'Seniors have their say' are to be congratulated—especially the Tea Tree Gully Community Services Forum, the Tea Tree Gully council staff and home help staff—

because it gave local senior citizens the opportunity to put their priorities before local service providers. The key issues that were raised at the seminar concerned such things as walkways, footpaths and the conflict concerning unsurfaced footpaths and cyclists riding on footpaths; health care and the uncertainties feared by the elderly; transport; leisure and recreation; information; finance; and housing.

In each of these areas the seminar identified suggestions for improvement and things that the participants would like to see added or changed and the priorities that the various Government, semi-government, council and voluntary staff and members should be addressing. Each of the agencies affected locally by those issues will examine them and decide what they can do, in cooperation with elderly citizens, to improve local services.

I support the improvement of services locally in accordance with the priorities that local senior citizens have identified. Further, I hope that particular attention will be paid at the Federal level to the problems, fears and doubts among elderly people about their future income support and financial security; about what happens to their superannuation plans; and about what happens if future politicians decide that this is another area of public expenditure that can be pruned.

In fact, I think it would be appropriate if all members of the State and Commonwealth Parliaments, and all political Parties, declared that, over time, they will maintain and improve the financial and retirement income security of older members of the community who are on pensions and other forms of low to average fixed incomes. This would overcome one of the major fears—sometimes a hidden fear—for the future of those with a very limited income, and that is that future Governments, having pruned here, there and wherever, will turn the axe, so to speak, to the financial security of senior citizens. Finally, we still live with the anomaly of discrimination in retirement age between men and women.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): It is a little disappointing to notice the lack of support from the rest of this Chamber.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I am sure that members are lining up outside the door to hear my speech. It is disappointing that there seems to be such a lack of interest, because this is an important part of our parliamentary procedure. In supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply, I add my condolences to the relatives of Sir Douglas Nicholls, the former Governor of our State, and also to the family of Arnold Noack, the Head Attendant of this House, who was a loyal and very valuable member of the staff and who unfortunately passed away suddenly.

I pass on my best wishes to Murray Hill in his retirement. I refer also to the retiring Ministers of this House, the Hon. Ron Payne and the Hon. Roy Abbott, and I thank them both for the help they have given me in the past. I also congratulate the new Ministers (and I believe that another Minister will be sworn in tomorrow).

I listened intently to the contribution from my friend and colleague from the adjoining electorate of Price (Mr De Laine) and I was pleased to note his interest in that electorate. We have adjoining electorates and many of our problems are common ones. The problem he raised relating to the marine environment and river mangroves is of very great concern to us all. One aspect in that area that does cause me concern is the proposal to remove sand from

Torrens Island which, on the face of it, will cause great ecological damage to a very valuable area.

The former Minister of Marine, through his own and his department's efforts, contributed greatly to shipping in the Port, especially in relation to Japanese shipping lines. I congratulate the Department of Marine and Harbors and the former Minister on their efforts over the years; they have been successful.

I again raise a fear, which I have raised over at least the past three years, about the future effects on shipping in the Port from alterations to the customs clearance system, the improvement in rail services in this State, and Australian National's and V/Line's competitive and aggressive attitude in relation to moving containers from Melbourne to Port Adelaide. Members should realise that Adelaide is the dead-end for ships coming down the East Coast of Australia and that they return past Melbourne and Sydney. If the rail lines put up a viable and economic case for the transport of goods from Melbourne, especially if those goods are cleared before they reach Melbourne (and members must bear in mind that currently Adelaide cargo is cleared in Adelaide and not Melbourne), the Port's operation is in danger.

Mr De Laine: It will be the end of the Port.

Mr PETERSON: Yes. According to an article in the *Australian* of 11 February, V/Line, which is still a State-run line rather than a national line, plans investment in terminal facilities in South Dynon in a bid for a greater share of the interstate container business.

I have raised this matter previously, and I am sure that all members, if they have not heard my speeches, have intently read *Hansard* to see the points I made. The article points out that V/Line is vigorously looking at the point-to-point movement of containers or freight. If it is freight, it means warehouse to warehouse consignment, and the goods will be distributed from the warehouse at this end. In that case the Port will no longer be viable.

At present the federal people have backed down a little in relation to customs, but the situation will return. We should not forget that Australian National has set out to become a viable freight mover, and I think that it may be into the black. V/Line has supported it previously. We should also not forget that the Victorian port and rail authorities and the national rail authorities have combined previously to provide rebates on the movement of containers from Melbourne.

I will now refer to His Excellency's speech. Paragraph 8 refers to work continuing to progress on the establishment of the Australian submarine replacement program at Port Adelaide. That undertaking has had its ups and downs, but I am sure we are all aware that it is safe for our Port and State, and this project will certainly be of great benefit to employment and to the economy of the State generally.

Paragraph 10 refers to recognising the important link between the provision of international shipping services to South Australia and the expansion of trade opportunities, and the former Minister of Marine covered that point very well in his speech. Paragraph 15 refers to the introduction of a Bill to amend the Fisheries Act, and I look forward to that with interest because I think that, even though it is a managed industry in this State, it has a pretty poor record. There have been crises in every fishery in this State despite the management, and we must grasp the nettle.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: The Minister may be superb but the fishery is going down the tube. That is the important thing. It has been a managed industry for many years and it is not looking good. There is something wrong, and I hope that the legislation that we look at can address that problem.

Paragraph 22 of the speech refers to amendments to the Mental Health Act. Unfortunately the Minister who was handling that Act is no longer the Minister. I must say that my discussions with that Minister in all areas of his portfolio were always successful. I could make my point, he would listen and he was always helpful to me. To that end I am sorry to see him go. But—

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I am talking about the Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Do they? It is nice to know, Mr Acting Speaker, that all the Ministers like me because every now and then I go to them with a problem. It is nice to know that I get a fair and even hearing from them, and I thank them for that. At the time the Opposition was in Government I must say that its Ministers were helpful, too. We need to look seriously at the question of mental health in this State. A report was produced recently about the housing of psychiatrically and intellectually disabled people in boarding houses. That report was produced at the instigation of the then Minister and investigated the accommodation of people who have been discharged from mental treatment and, really, they have been neglected.

Very few approved hostels are available in the community to look after these people and many of them have lived in boarding houses and lodging houses without proper care in the sense that many of them need medical treatment. Many of them have problems that are not treated properly and they have medication administered by people who do not have the proper authority or skill.

The report covered the types of housing available and also established how that situation came about as a result of de-institutionalisation which commenced in South Australia 25 years ago. Unfortunately, since that time these people have been put out into the community and, as I have said, in many cases they have not been looked after correctly and not housed appropriately. A situation has developed now where many of those people are being neglected.

The report states that the role of boarding houses has changed very much over the years. A boarding house was once a lodging house where people were living and working. However, many of those people have moved into a different class of accommodation—share accommodation, home units and flats. To a degree boarding houses have been occupied by people with physical and psychological problems.

Some of the findings of that report are interesting. There are 31 private boarding houses in metropolitan Adelaide. It is interesting to note that nine of them are owned by three proprietors. Twenty-five of the 31 boarding houses surveyed (because the others did not respond) have 387 bed spaces. The following point is significant, as it affects the area that I represent. The report states:

45 per cent of surveyed bed spaces are located in the western metropolitan region of Adelaide. 33.3 per cent of surveyed bed spaces are in the Port Adelaide council area.

As many members would know, that has caused some problems. Problems arise when groups of people are placed in any given area. If we intend to deinstitutionalise people we must ensure that they are properly integrated. They should not be put into ghettos; they should not be centralised. In striving for assimilation we must ensure that people are looked after correctly. They have to be cared for. The report continues:

Boarding houses ranged in size from two to 28 bed spaces, with eight boarding houses accommodating more than 20 residents each.

Twenty boarding houses offer personal care services in varying degrees; 15 offer actual assistance with personal hygiene.

We must remember that this relates to people who are put out of institutions, with no further responsibility being taken. Responsibility for their care is put on the person providing accommodation. There is nothing wrong with this as long as we make sure these people are adequately cared for. At the moment such care is at the discretion of the owner of the property. This is a matter that we must look at. The report continues:

Twenty-one of the 25 respondents state that they are accommodating residents with an intellectual or psychiatric disability.

These are people with a problem, and they need special care. The report continues:

Seventy-three per cent of disabled residents have been accommodated for more than one year at the same boarding house. At least 58 per cent of the disabled residents moved to their current boarding house from a hospital or institution.

These people have moved directly from a hospital or an institution where they were cared for very well in the sense of well-being, food, medication and personal hygiene. These people have come straight from an institution and they have no-one to check on their level of care. So, this is the problem that we have, and I have outlined my interest in the legislation pertaining to this. These people have to be looked after. I will certainly be interested to see what the legislation contains when it is put forward. Paragraph 39 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government has approved in principle the report of the inquiry into immediate post-compulsory education. It is anticipated that measures recommended in the report will result in both reform of upper secondary education and much improved pathways between secondary education and TAFE colleges—the main educational destination of post-school students.

In talking about students and youth, I want to refer to an article that took my interest some months ago. I refer to an article in *Time* of 18 January this year. This was a cover story entitled 'Grave New World'. We all think we know about the youth of today, ranging from people who put graffiti on railway stations to those who will end up being the doctors, lawyers and even politicians of tomorrow. However, do we look after them correctly?

An interesting way to look at this matter is to see what they think of their position in the world. The interesting thing is how they see the world themselves. I think this is very telling. For all the money that we pump into the State in promoting tourism, the Grand Prix, and the image of this being a great State, we do not instil in the youth of this State or of this country a feeling of confidence towards Australia, that it is the land of hope and glory and that there are hopes here to be realised if one works at it. We must get this message across to people.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Perhaps I used the wrong term. Maybe it is not 'glory' in the sense that it has been used before. However, it is a land of hope. What we are taking away from many of the youth is the hope of tomorrow. Let me tell the House why. The article in *Time*, relating to a survey of young people, states:

Aussie kids are hopeful kids: they hope that by studying harder and longer they will find a job; they hope that with a job they will be able to marry and have children and buy a home of their own, as their parents did.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: The Australian dream!

Mr PETERSON: Yes, the Australian dream, if you like. That is what they hope for. The article continues:

They hope that the world will survive long enough to enable them to do it all.

However, they are also fearful and cynical. This in-depth survey was done by psychologists and psychiatrists who know what they are doing. Many of those young people believe there will be a nuclear war in their lifetime. They

dread the fact that high technology will take over. They have no real concern for organised religion and they certainly hold the political process in disdain. They do not believe that the political system does anything for them, and I will come to that later.

Many of the feelings of young people are reflected in their actions. There are many articles in the papers about the suicide rate and the damage that they do to themselves in motor cars. The suicide rate has been covered quite comprehensively over the years. There was a full magazine article in the *Advertiser* about it. Other articles referred to alcohol abuse and even the fact that we now give young teenagers access to credit. An article in the *Advertiser* earlier this year was headed, 'Easy Credit Lures South Australian Teenagers into Debt and Bankruptcy'. Fancy a young teenager going bankrupt! So, we are doing this to people. On the other side, we are not giving them any hope. They have nothing to aim for. There was a report in one paper about the unemployment rate. They want a job; they want to look forward to the future; but this State has, I believe, the highest youth unemployment rate in the country. Their fears are personal destruction caused by either the nuclear holocaust or joblessness.

According to the survey, they want a job. They saw that the job was the most important thing. Responsible young people are so concerned about getting a good job and holding on to it that they almost commit themselves to a dull life because they are frightened to do anything once they get a job in case they lose it. Their attitude is that they want to earn as much as possible as soon as possible. Those who cannot make it fast, who cannot see a future or an aim to it all, opt out, and here I am talking about the suicide rate—the self destruction rate—amongst young people because they cannot see any future.

The survey also comments on the number of places that we have available for them to move into. Secondary education and TAFE colleges are mentioned in the Governor's speech. The diminishing number of places available for them is also causing distress to these young people. Many parents believe that pumping their child through school and giving them an education will necessarily give them a great future. However, that is not necessarily so if the child does not have the right situation. An interesting comment by one of those interviewed was that a lot of people would leave school not knowing how to fill out a bank book. Some 12 months ago I received a survey from a high school which showed that about 50 per cent of the students coming from primary school to high school were not up to the level of reading required to go on to high school. Perhaps the education system has some—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is the statistic given to me—about 50 per cent of them could not read properly. There was a specific item in this article about South Australia. Mr Noel Wilson, a former Assistant Director of the South Australian Education Department, is quoted as saying that students themselves do not see any future. He says that they have problems thinking about the future, about a job, about getting married, about growing up and having a worthwhile life. He said that many saw the future as full of people crowded into dome-like structures in a world run by computers.

That is another area of concern: computerisation and the technical revolution that is taking over the world. People are not grasping it. I have read in other places about this revolution. It is happening so quickly that people cannot grasp it and do not fully understand what is happening in the world in which they live. These are people with edu-

cation and learning: they do not feel capable of grasping the changes in their lifestyle.

As I mentioned earlier, a very interesting aspect of this survey relates to what these young people feel they may grow up to be. Their attitude to politicians is not very good; they believe that elected representatives do not bother with them. They feel that they are cut off and they are totally apathetic about politics. Only 8 per cent of them feel that the Government has any concern for youth trying to make its way in the world. Most feel that the Federal Government is very remote and they have little desire to exert influence on it. They see the Government as totally irrelevant to themselves. The following quote, which I love to use, is a group attitude:

Party politics is the worst thing about Australia. They are not really interested in doing the best for the country, they are just interested in keeping their Party in power.

People feel that elections are just a harmless joke. These young people are not interested in the system, how the country is run. If we cannot interest them in running the country or becoming the politicians of the future, all we are doing is leaving it open to the people who want power to take power rather than the people in this forum and like forums who can contribute and put forward their own points of view and perhaps guide the country and people's attitudes to, say, the education system, to give them more hope.

In 1983 the Australian Electoral Office, which was very concerned about the low numbers of young people who were voting, carried out a survey, which showed that amongst young people there is total indifference to politics. Many of them, particularly girls, do not care at all and do not see any link between the Government's actions and their own lives. The great majority of them are absolutely ignorant about our voting systems. They do not understand why and how the system works. These are the adults of tomorrow, voters of 18 years of age, many of whom are parents. They are not at all interested.

The average young person believes that Australia is a great country. They believe that there is freedom in this country and that it is probably the best country. They feel that the lifestyle is great.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is nice to see that the member for Hartley is back.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I did not write this. I refer to a survey on the youth of this country that was carried out by a very responsible magazine. It is very significant that young people think this way. They are concerned about the way our country seems to give in to foreign powers, such as America. This is how young people see the country. Members may come into the House and sneer and snigger at what I am saying. I am talking about the youth of today, the parents and the adults, the voters, politicians, lawyers and accountants of tomorrow, perhaps the future Ministers of this Parliament—and members sit there and snigger. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. These people are the adults of tomorrow.

I refer to the current immigration debate. Young people see immigration as a threat to them. These matters should be taken care of and given attention by politicians and the people who make decisions. These young people are the voters of tomorrow. The survey also shows that these young people are concerned about the loss of jobs and the threat to their future. It states that this fear could erupt into violence.

Members have to realise that we are talking about young adults, teenagers, our youth. I repeat for the satisfaction of

the member for Hartley that there was an article in *Time Australia* magazine. Does he claim it is a rag and is not worth taking note of? I am referring to an authoritative magazine, yet he seems to snigger at it. This survey of young people was carried out by qualified psychologists and psychiatrists, yet the honourable member sniggers at it. These are young people looking for direction.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order!

Mr PETERSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. I am dismayed by the attitude of some members towards the problems of young people. We are supposed to take notice of them and provide care and attention for young people in the community. Indeed, we are elected to look after their rights and interests. They are important people today, the adults of tomorrow, the mums and dads, and we should take notice of what they say. Their future is our future and the future of our country. If we do not look after them and give them some hope and direction, where will our country go? Where will our State go? What is the future for our country? It is all right for the member for Hartley to snigger, but I am referring to a survey of young people in respect of their attitudes and their view of the future. They need direction and, as I said, as well as spending money on the 'It's a great State, mate!' campaign, we should look after the interests of these people and give them something to aim for.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The topic that I wish to address briefly this afternoon involves computers, with particular reference to the debacle in respect of WorkCover. We all know that computers are simply devices for storing, retrieving and manipulating data. They have an indelible impact on our lives and that will increase. It is important that machines be controlled, not control people.

Computers have made large inroads into the area of finance, where all banking is now done by computer, into shopping, where there are scanning devices, and into transport, and I cite the Crouzet bus system which works rather indifferently. Our social security systems are geared up to computers and our manufacturing enterprises use computers for management control and numerically controlled machine manufacturing.

Computers are important to our lives and I ask the important question, 'Why have we had such a debacle with WorkCover?' Members would well understand that there are two elements to a computer: one is the hardware, the machine, and the second is the software, the means by which the machine stores and interprets data and carries out all the functions desired by the operator. For the WorkCover system, a US firm was hired for the sum of about \$2.7 million to create a software package suitable for workers compensation claims in this State. The system was supposed to provide ready access for retrieval, updates and linkage regarding rehabilitation and provision of data for the various arms of Government.

The importance of getting the system right from day one can never be overstressed. Unfortunately, we in this State have a monumental disaster on our hands. I have been advised that the computer system that was supposed to

have been put together by the United States firm will never work. It will never be able to carry out the functions for which WorkCover contracted it. The PMS package was not suitable for the job it was hired to do, nor was the United States firm competent to fulfil its contract.

In addressing this question, we should all be reminded that, if a private firm took on a computer function and used it as an important piece of its selling or management control and that system failed, the firm would suffer a very serious loss. On a number of occasions computer systems have failed and firms have gone out of business. For some time one of the banks had a series of malfunctions with its computers. It suffered financial loss and a serious loss of public confidence and, as a result, its profits were also affected. However, at government level, there seems to be no accountability whatsoever. The SGIC, as the agent appointed by the Minister of Labour, who must bear some of the blame, decided to use the PMS package for a purpose to which it was not readily applicable. The PMS package is widely used in Australia in general insurance applications. It is also used to a varying extent in the workers compensation field. However, it was not adaptable to the needs of the WorkCover scheme, which are complex. Because of its structural arrangements it cannot address the fundamental needs of WorkCover.

The Government has wasted \$2.7 million of employers' money and the Minister blithely sits in this House and says that it is the employers' responsibility. Importantly, it involves not only the loss of money but also the pain that has been caused because of the loss of that computer's function. Any member of this House would have received representations from people who simply have not been paid their workers compensation payments as they should have been after the first week. How many inquiries have members received from people who have had to wait three or four weeks—sometimes two months—for their cheque? Many of those people do not have extended credit or bank balances. They rely on the weekly pay packet to see them through. WorkCover does not care about the people out there who suffer. No real attempt has been made to make the software package work.

The scheme is bumbling along as if it does not matter who pays the price. It is not WorkCover but the people who pay the price. The employers pay the bills for a system that does not work, and the people who use the system are paying the ultimate price. They are missing out on their income. They are receiving wrong claim statements. They are getting wrong forms and incorrect cheques. The system simply does not work and all that the people at WorkCover can say is that they are sorry and that they are trying their hardest. This is approximately 10 months after the scheme was introduced.

It is a scandal of absolutely monumental proportions. It shows how inept this Government was in the first place in its appointment of SGIC, and it also shows how inept SGIC has been in its appointment of this firm to set up the software package. I do not seriously believe that any firm in this State could have continued for 10 months with a system that simply had not worked. It would have been out of business.

They would probably have been sued and, no doubt, would never have appeared on company ledger books again if they had a system which had malfunctioned for 10 months. Admittedly, some things have improved, but we are still having some very large delays with the system. Importantly, the computer will not be able to do some of the very important functions which it has to do. I know that on a recent weekend they had an in-house conference and said

'What do we do? How much more money do we have to spend on the system before we get it to operate?' When will we get to the situation where the records can show that there are firms which are paying well above what they should be. The subsidisation of high risk firms is extraordinarily high.

We cannot change the situation until this computer works properly, and it does not have the record structure to enable that to happen at the moment. On a number of fronts, therefore, I charge the Minister of Labour (who is about to become the Minister of Health) who is responsible for the problem that this State is facing. I charge the Minister of Labour because he did not search for alternatives. He did not try to get the best alternative in terms of his own scheme, and everyone—whether they be private employers, medical professionals who are trying to get some cheques from the Government, or employees who need some money for bread and butter—has been left lamenting. It is simply not good enough. The excuse that it is a Government system and it does not matter can no longer be tolerated. I call on the Government to get an investigative team into the WorkCover system and get it sorted out as soon as possible.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Just before Christmas last year Glengowrie High School raised the question of charges for the South Australian Film Corporation, and expressed their concern in a letter to the Premier from which I will read briefly. Addressed to the Hon. J.C. Bannon, it states:

The Glengowrie High School Council is concerned that charges are now being levied for use of South Australian Film Corporation material. With reduced moneys allocated for education compared to the increases in costs, we cannot afford this sort of extra charge. Although this council does not totally oppose the principle of 'user pays', we are asking that charges be waived or much reduced for schools. We would like your support to ensure that students do not have to suffer because of these increased charges.

It is signed by the Secretary of the school council. In response to that, the Premier wrote back on 14 December and, after lecturing the school council on the need to conserve costs within the Government, said in the final paragraph:

While it is with regret that, due to financial restrictions, the fee will be introduced, I hope that you can understand that it is necessary if services provided by the library are to be improved. The charge concerned was an average fee of approximately \$1 per unit borrowed from the library. It was a very small charge on the surface but, collectively, it does impose a major expense on school councils and, although six months has now elapsed, I would again put it to the Government, as it was correctly put to the Premier by the high school council in November 1987, that in this budget session the Government should give serious consideration to reviewing that particular impost being placed on parents in schools in this State. I am sure that I can on this occasion speak not only for the parents of students at Glengowrie High School but also for the parents of students in every State school.

The other matter I wish to raise is the question of computers in schools. The Minister of Education is on record as saying:

Computers are no longer seen as technology that is used in isolation from everyday school subjects such as English, Maths, Science, Home Economics or Business Studies. Rather, computers are, like pens, pencils or compasses, a tool that assists students in today's world to extend their skills and learning.

Members will be aware, especially those who live in the western suburbs, that, following a directive of the department, the Newberry Committee met to rationalise schools as a result of declining enrolments. Subsequently, Glengowrie High School Council decided, to its credit, that it should become a specialised high-tech training school, and it set about making sure that that happened. The parents responded and, through the careful guidance of the school

council, a high-technology unit within the school was established to set the school on a new direction for the south-western suburbs. The aim is for Glengowrie to become the focal point in this whole area of high-tech equipment and curricula within schools, particularly in the western suburbs.

To this end, members of the school council sought a meeting with the Premier so that he could become acquainted with their desire to become a high-tech school and to be able to offer a wide range of curricula in this field. The disappointing fact of this whole exercise is that the Premier just would not see them. They tried to obtain an appointment through correspondence and by telephoning the Private Secretary to the Premier, but they were told that the Premier just was not available. I am concerned that in June of this year the Government released a \$300 000 'computers in the classroom' grant for a host of schools around South Australia. A specific \$120 000 technology support grant, which I understand will be used to establish a technology-based program in a secondary school in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area, has also been made available.

The Glengowrie High School Council's concern, which I think has a lot of substance, is that the school is already well down the track towards establishing a technology-based program and yet no funds have been made available. It is also concerned that, when it tried to see the Premier to discuss this particular problem, he was not there. It is almost a repeat of the country hospitals dispute when 2 000 people gathered in Victoria Square. They asked the Premier to come out of his office and talk to them, but he was invisible. Council members have asked, on a couple of occasions to see the Premier and discuss the school council's desire to establish this high-tech component at Glengowrie High School.

The Hon. Susan Lenehan: What about approaching the Minister of State Development and Technology; the Premier cannot be available every single moment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order!

Mr OSWALD: I was hoping that someone opposite would say, 'Why don't they see the relevant Minister?', because that has been the *modus operandi* of this Premier ever since he took office. Every time he has a problem that cannot be resolved, it is zapped off sideways. We see it during Question Time every day: whenever there is a difficult question, it is zapped sideways to one of the other Ministers. On this particular matter I believe the school council has every right to say, 'You are the Treasurer, you allocate the moneys, can we come to see you?' But no, the Premier is not available. So this afternoon, when I was thinking about what I would like to say in this particular debate, I pulled out of the records the names of the schools that have received this \$300 000 grant. It makes very interesting reading. Honourable members will know that there are only two Liberal electorates in the whole of the western suburbs, and it is interesting that not one school in those two electorates has scored one cent.

Mr Hamilton: Maybe it is a reflection on the ability of the members.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order!

Mr OSWALD: I ask members to dwell on it and consider the number of schools involved, because not one of them in those two Liberal electorates received one cent. I also looked at the Mitcham electorate, where only one school received any money.

The Hon. Susan Lenehan: Maybe they're better off.

Mr OSWALD: The Minister of Community Welfare says, 'Maybe they are better off', but I can tell her that, when she gets further into community welfare studies, she will find that there are pockets around Glengowrie and some of

these Liberal-held electorates where people are not well off. I suggest that the Chairperson of the Glengowrie High School Council will be enraged when she reads that interjection from the new Minister of Community Welfare that some of these Liberal electorates are well off. That mentality pervades the Labor Party: because seats are held by the Liberal Party, they are well-off and do not deserve any money to be spent in them. I think that that is an outrageous statement from the new Minister of Community Welfare and I hope she takes the opportunity to retract it, because I would have thought that Ministers of Community Welfare have to be compassionate and accept that there are large areas in the western suburbs held by hardworking Liberal members that need help and fair distribution of funds in the education portfolio.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I have been in this House since 1979 and one thing I have learnt about politics is that it is a question of not only perception but also sometimes repetition. Over the past two days I have listened with a great deal of attention to the member for Morphett. There is no doubt that the Liberal Party this year (and also next year) will attempt to discredit the Premier. The member for Morphett would know as well as I that it is the role of Cabinet—and the Premier as part of that Cabinet—to manage the affairs of this State. The Liberal Party's attempt to blame the Premier for each occasion that a group of people come from the country or wherever to see him, but cannot do so (despite the fact that it is not his portfolio) was a puerile attempt to discredit the Premier and was really beyond the pale.

All members, including the member for Morphett who has been here long enough, understand the allocation of portfolios and the reasons why they are allocated to particular members. The hours that the Premier works are common knowledge. We all know from past and bitter experiences, not only in this place but also in many other Parliaments, the sort of impact that such long hours have upon Ministers of the Crown. So, to attempt, as the Liberal Party attempts to do, to heap such a puerile attack on the Premier is really beyond the pale. I can remember the campaign during 1979 and the outrageous advertisements placed by the Liberal Party, particularly Nigel Buick from Kangaroo Island. I repeat: his attacks were as low as sharks' droppings, and that is on the bottom of the ocean. I remember being on the receiving end of attacks at that time.

Members may recall that during my period in Opposition I asked many questions, many of which related to law and order issues. Ever since I entered this place I have persisted in raising matters relating to law and order. I would challenge any member in this House to say that they have asked more questions on law and order than I have. I am proud to be able to say, for the edification of the member for Mitcham, that in November 1983 I raised in Parliament the question of the need for a Neighbourhood Watch program. I remember that the member for Mitcham informed me in writing (and his memory is now jogged) that he had looked at this question while in America.

To the best of my knowledge he had not raised the matter publicly. I can say, with justification, that the Police Force recognises the very strong and active support that I have given to police enforcement and community involvement. I was amazed yesterday by the attack of the member for Morphett. As *Hansard* records, he said:

The people of this State have every right to expect that the Government will do something about securing a comfortable and safe lifestyle for the people of South Australia.

And, talking about the Premier, he continues:

He should also do something about community safety, law and order and young people.

I challenge the member for Morphett to bring before the attention of the Parliament in a subsequent debate in this place the number of occasions on which he has raised matters, overall in South Australia, about law and order. I also challenge him to look at the occasions on which people like myself have raised this issue, because I have done my homework in my patch and understand my electorate's needs, particularly in relation to the elderly (and I know I have more of them in my electorate than there are in any other electorate in the State). I have sourced it out and understand their concerns. I have constantly and persistently asked, and have publicly raised, these questions. So, the Government is—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I cannot hear because I am talking too loudly.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order!

Mr HAMILTON: Let us look at some of the issues we have raised. On the front page, my August/September newsletter to my constituents—and I have put in excess of \$500 000 into these newsletters in eight years; I wonder how many the member for Morphett has sent—states:

The Bannon Government has dramatically increased the penalties for convicted 'drug pushers' and has also increased support and counselling services for people with drug related problems.

Maximum penalty for selling or dealing in hard drugs is now \$250 000 and 25 years punishment. The courts have the power to order the forfeiture of the property of people convicted of such offences.

South Australia has the toughest penalties for hard drug pushers and dealers in Australia.

That is not a bad effort. I did not hear anything about this matter from the Liberals when they were in office; they were strong on rhetoric but in actions failed absolutely dismally. I now turn to statistics in relation to the number of police in this State. Per head of population we have more police in South Australia than any other State at this point in time. This fact cannot be denied. So, we hear this garbage, rhetoric and puerile attack (such as we heard yesterday from the member for Morphett) in an attempt to whip up this law and order campaign leading up to the next election.

Every time I hear the member for Morphett and the Liberal Party raise this issue I do not forget my very strong attack on the Liberal Party which is on record between the years 1979 and 1982. They failed dismally during that period to introduce strong measures in relation to law and order in this State.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You will have your go next week, so be quiet. I now turn my attention to an article in the *Australian Society* of April 1987. The Liberals know about this, and once again their puerile attempts to attack the Labor Party have failed. The article states:

If national rape statistics require sensitive interpretation then State figures have to be handled with kid gloves. The South Australian media made much of the fact that the institute statistics portrayed a rate of rape in that State well above the national average. But these statistics could well be inflated because South Australia has a broader definition of rape than most other States, a definition that includes rape in marriage and rape of males.

The point here is that although in South Australia and elsewhere rape is at unacceptably high levels and that each case is a tragic reflection of Australian male attitudes towards women, the publicised police figures may reflect the fact that, at long last, victims are asserting their undeniable right to be taken seriously when they are raped—and are increasingly taken seriously.

It goes on to talk about burglary rates. It is a proven fact in Police Forces, not only in this country but worldwide, that the greater the level of education and the more encouragement there is by the Police Force and the Government

to get people to report every instance of burglary or offence committed in the community, the greater is the possibility for a decline in the crime rate. I must point out that this includes the efforts made by the Bannon Government. Neighbourhood Watch is one such example of where people can be successfully involved in this area.

In conclusion, I remind the member for Mitcham of the report in the *Portside Messenger* press that there has been

a 77 per cent reduction in the crime rate in the Semaphore area. I think that that alone attests to this State Government's success in trying to reduce the incidence of crime.

Motion carried.

At 5.21 the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 August at 2 p.m.