

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 August 1988

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BUDGET ESTIMATES

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Members will recall that the estimates for the 1987-88 budget outcome was a Consolidated Account deficit of \$14 million. When added to the accumulated deficit of \$30 million at the end of 1986-87, this would have given the State an accumulated deficit of \$44 million. Whilst this estimated accumulated deficit was significantly below the accumulated deficit of \$63 million that we inherited from the previous Liberal Government, the Government has been concerned to see this figure reduced or eliminated.

I am now in a position to report that the final result of the budget for 1987-88 is a Consolidated Account surplus of \$4.3 million, representing an improvement of \$48.7 million on the budget estimates. This means that the Consolidated Account deficit of \$63 million inherited from the previous Liberal Government has now been completely eliminated and replaced by a surplus of \$4.3 million.

This excellent result has been achieved by maintaining a tight control on Government expenditure in the past year; by consistently improved results from the South Australian Government Financing Authority; and by the improvement in revenue collections which have resulted largely from a stronger than expected performance of the South Australian economy.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: They don't like this at all.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: I caution the member for Victoria and remind him of what I reminded the House yesterday about the particular impertinence of interjections when the Chair is trying to call the House to order. The Chair was of the impression that leave was given to the Premier to make a ministerial statement and not for interjections to be made. The honourable Premier.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: This turnaround has been achieved despite a range of difficult circumstances which faced the State Government last year, including a further reduction in Commonwealth Government funding support. Turning to details of the financial result, I will deal with expenditures and receipts in turn.

First, actual expenditures in 1987-88 were \$4 833 million, a very slight increase over the estimated expenditure of \$4 818 million. This is an increase of only .3 per cent in a budget of nearly \$5 billion. This reflects the determination of the Government to maintain a strong discipline on its expenditures. It also reflects the excellent management performance of the departments and authorities and their employees. This result is even more marked in view of the fact that no provision was made for the impact of the 4 per cent second tier wage increase in the 1987-88 budget.

Substantial efforts have been devoted to implementing efficiency and productivity measures associated with the second tier award during 1987-88, and as salaries and wages

represent over half of the State recurrent payments the importance of this efficiency cannot be overstated.

Secondly, total receipts for 1987-88 were \$4 867 million, an increase of \$63 million above the anticipated \$4 804 million. This represents a slight increase of 1.3 per cent. It is important to emphasise that increases in the State's taxation revenue above the budget forecasts have occurred not because of any increase in the rate of taxation but, rather, through a more active economic climate.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Chair again reminds the House that leave has been given for a ministerial statement and not for a barrage of interjections. The honourable Premier.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The main area of growth has been stamp duty receipts which are \$43.1 million higher than budget. Property conveyances have accounted for \$38.7 million of this growth. Revenue gains from underlying improvement in the level of real estate activity were reinforced by several large property transactions in 1987-88. Stamp duty on share transactions largely accounts for the remaining improvement in stamp duty receipts (up \$3.4 million on budget). The result that has been achieved is significant, particularly because of the Government's determination to hold down the level of State taxes. The increased revenues flow from a higher level of economic activity within South Australia and not from increased taxes on ordinary families.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. The Chair is trying to take a charitable interpretation of the barrage of interjections that is greeting the Premier's ministerial statement and the Chair is assuming that members on my left have such short memories that they cannot recall having been rebuked by the Chair a matter of a minute or so previously. The honourable Premier.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Faced with this excellent result, the Government has taken the opportunity to eliminate the Consolidated Account deficit, thus providing a very sound basis for this year's budget. The most immediate effect will be to reduce interest payments of Government borrowings, which will help compensate for further substantial reductions in Commonwealth funds imposed at this year's Premiers Conference. The removal of this historic deficit, which I remind members was more than \$60 million when this Government took office, will contribute to stronger State finances in the future, which I will be referring to in the presentation of the State budget next week.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr OLSEN: So that the public and the Parliament can be more adequately informed about the extent of an alleged 'unacceptable level of unethical practice' in the South Australian Police Force, will the Premier reveal how many individuals and how many specific operational matters identified in the National Crime Authority report are to be further investigated?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I am not in a position to reveal those details. Incidentally, I might say that I thought some reporting of yesterday's statement was a little inaccurate in that it tended to begin by saying, 'There is a higher than expected level of unethical conduct in our Police Force' when, in fact, what the NCA report said was, 'A series of allegations, if true, would point to', etc. I think it is worth

putting that qualification on the record, because I know that the Leader of the Opposition does not want unreasonably to detract from our Police Force and its reputation. I think it is worth making that disclaimer or qualification.

If the Leader of the Opposition wished to so avail himself, I am sure he could discuss with my colleague the Deputy Premier the possibility of a briefing on the NCA report. That may help the Opposition to address the matter a little more constructively.

EDUCATION POLICY

Mr ROBERTSON: Does the Minister of Education intend to follow the example set by his New South Wales counterpart, Mr Metherall, who has pledged that \$100 million in new education programs could be funded through administrative chain savings? During the recent election campaign he also promised that 'no ancillary jobs in Government schools would be under any threat'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, because I understand that today in New South Wales there is massive dislocation to education services. It is important that honourable members and the people of South Australia realise what a change of Government in that State has meant to the education services and, indeed, to the standing of State schools in particular. In only a few months some 15 major changes have been made to the education system in New South Wales, and it is a lesson to all those concerned about education in this State to see what a change of Government would do here. First, some incredibly precipitous decisions were taken. The Director-General of Education in New South Wales, who had been in his position—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, has this got anything at all to do with the administration of the Education Department in South Australia and is it relevant to the South Australian scene? Should we be asking questions about the Education Department in Nauru or somewhere or other? It has no relevance at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister is obviously trying to highlight particular techniques of administration.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Sir, I am asking you to rule as to whether the question is relevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am asking you to rule whether this question is relevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Come off it! Are you saying, Mr Speaker, that I cannot take a point of order as to the relevance of a question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Premier not to further inflame the situation. The Deputy Leader took a point of order. He was ruled out of order. I now warn him for unbecoming behaviour and for disrespect towards the Chair.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek clarification. Mr Speaker, are you saying that I am not entitled to take a point of order? I am not suggesting that you cannot rule on the point of order, because you have said that there is no point of order. I am saying that I legitimately took a point

of order and I am asking you for a ruling on it. Your ruling that there is no point of order is obviously quite wrong.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition chose to attack the Director-General of Education in this State. It is important that we look at another State where a Liberal Government has been returned to power. One of the first acts of that new Government was to dismiss the Director-General of Education, although he had been in that position for only two days; and, indeed, it also dismissed other heads of Government departments and authorities. We could obviously expect similar sorts of irresponsible behaviour if there were ever a change of Government in this State. Why are people in New South Wales so concerned about the New South Wales Government's education policy? First, it chose to cut the teaching service by 2 700 jobs.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, would you please explain to the House the relevance of New South Wales Government policies and the administration and role of the Director-General of Education in New South Wales to the administration of the Education Department in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gunn: It is a smoke screen.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will try to be concise. The Chair does not have to explain anything. The Chair has simply ruled. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Obviously, members opposite do not want to hear what their colleagues are doing in other places. Not only did the Government cut 2 700 jobs in New South Wales but it cut the number of relieving teachers, which will mean that there will be pressure on teachers to take extra classes, and that will obviously have a detrimental effect on education in that State. In New South Wales they have abolished the disadvantaged schools program under which schools in poor areas received funding and staffing. The New South Wales Government has introduced a \$50 a term travel fee for over 100 000 students in that State, and it has slashed the child protection program.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will call the honourable member for Eyre when I am sure that the House has reached a reasonable level of silence. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: The Minister is obviously quoting from a Government file or docket, and I ask that it be tabled.

The SPEAKER: Is the Minister quoting from a Government docket?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No, Mr Speaker, I have notes before me.

The SPEAKER: Then in accordance with previous practices, there is no requirement. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Further to abolishing those equity programs, the New South Wales Government has also abolished the child protection program and the equal employment opportunities scheme. It has interfered in the public examination system. The board of secondary education in that State has claimed that 10 000 Year 12 students could be adversely affected by the changes that the New South Wales Government is currently bulldozing through the New South Wales education system. In reply, the Government has said that it accepts that perhaps 2 500 students will be affected. However, I point out to the House that if

only one student is affected it will be disastrous for an education system, in relation to which the expectations of students should not be cut midway through the year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I could go on, Mr Speaker, and outline further interventions of the New South Wales Government into the education system, in a most disastrous way, but I will simply refer to two examples which typify the pedantic and ideological commitment that that Government has to education—which is simply disastrous. First, it has demanded that every school institute a compulsory saluting of the flag each day, and the Deputy Premier of New South Wales has stated that the Government has promised to gaoil naughty children in that State's schools. Well, I can assure honourable members that South Australia will not be following the example of New South Wales, and I hope that South Australian people in fact learn a lesson from the Government of that State.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 125, which states:

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

The Minister is clearly debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the statement that the Chair made on Thursday last week, when I reiterated statements made on the very subject raised by the member for Eyre, and I quote:

The Chair would stress that mere dissatisfaction with a Minister's reply is not in itself an excuse to justify interjection or points of order.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Government accept the ultimate responsibility for what the National Crime Authority has called 'a lack of resolve and perhaps even reluctance' to take effective measures to investigate allegations of police corruption and, if not, why not and who is responsible?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, we do not. First we have attempted at all times to respond promptly and directly to any matters that the National Crime Authority undertakes to put before us. Secondly, I think it was the previous Government that in fact commissioned some sort of inquiry for my colleague (who actually is the Minister responsible for this area). The 1981 report was, I believe, one of the reports that was referred to by the National Crime Authority. That report was in fact commissioned by a government in which the member who asked the question was a senior Minister—indeed, the Deputy Premier. I think it was just before the present Leader of the Opposition had responsibility for the police.

So, it was with reference to that that the NCA was talking about a possible failure of vigour in following up various matters. I am not pointing a finger at the previous Government, and nor would it behove those who were members of that previous Government to try to point the finger at us. At all times we have been prepared to respond to any demands for inquiries, resources or recommendations from the NCA. In fact, the NCA came here at our behest and indeed we are now picking up the recommendations of the National Crime Authority in the announcement made by my colleague yesterday.

I assure all members that we will pursue these things with the utmost vigour, because it is vital that confidence is retained in our Police Force. I still say that, despite this

cloud over certain officers, our Police Force is the best and most respected in Australia. I ask members opposite not to inflame the situation to a point where there is an unwarranted lack of confidence in our police. I am afraid that occasionally they get pretty close to that mark.

SUBMARINE PROJECT

Mr De LAINE: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology detail to the House several matters relating to the submarine project? Will he inform the House of the current status of the project; the effect of the much publicised industrial disputation at the construction site; and how much involvement there has been with local industry? And will he clarify claims that the bow and midship sections will be built in Sweden? In debate in this Chamber last night the member for Mitcham suggested that the bow and midship sections would be built in Sweden as a direct result of the industrial disputation.

He also questioned the level of South Australia's share of the project. The honourable member's comments were similar to those made recently by the Australian Small Business Association, which questioned the arrangements relating to construction of the midship and bow sections of the submarines and suggested that South Australia was not sharing in the benefits of the project.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I must say, listening to the member for Mitcham last night, one was torn between two thoughts: first, that the member was expressing some wishful thinking that the submarine project would not succeed in South Australia, because it is quite clear from comments that he has made on a number of occasions that he does not really wish it to be a success for South Australia. Another image that occurred to me was that from the poem about Hanrahan who said, 'We'll all be ruined.' Here is the member for Mitcham saying, 'We'll all be ruined', even though we have done a good job: we won the contract, and we are actually getting on with the job.

The fact is that a number of comments made by the member for Mitcham last night were significant misrepresentations of the actual situation. I am not allowed to use another word, even though that is what they were—the other word that I am not allowed to use in this place. He said, for example, that the bow and midship sections of the first submarine are to be built in Sweden as a result of the industrial disputation that took place earlier this year. That is patently incorrect. In fact, I interjected last night and said that that was incorrect, and he said that he had it in his papers up in his room. That is where he had the information. I called on him to quote it chapter and verse in the House, not to have me go up to his room to see his etchings or something. I wanted him to quote chapter and verse in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister at this stage is clearly debating the matter rather than responding in predominantly factual terms.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will resist the temptation to debate the inane comments of the member for Mitcham last night—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—but certain matters must be put to rights. The Federal Minister for Defence indicated late last year—calendar year 1987, not 1988—that, because of the complex nature of the bow and midship sections of the first submarine, it would be built in Sweden and that

ASC production people would go to Sweden to pick up the necessary training skills so that similar sections could be built in Australia for future submarines.

That was not post-dating the industrial issue that occurred earlier this year; it predated it by many months. One of the original propositions of the Kockums submission to the Federal Government was that that would be necessary. In respect of the number of days lost in that industrial dispute, I remind members that it was put significantly out of context. If one reads some of the overseas articles relating to that issue, in Sweden itself comments were made that what was really happening was taken out of context. A fundamental fact needs to be borne in mind: not one day's work was lost during those industrial disputes early this year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Not one hour.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As the Minister of Health says, not one hour's work was lost. Hanrahan opposite wishes it was otherwise: he wishes that lots of days had been lost, but the facts do not support his contention in that regard. The next statement made was that we were getting our fair share of the work in South Australia. There are two significant phases: one is the construction of the facility to build the submarines, and the other is the construction of the submarines themselves. Concerning the facility to build submarines, we have seen created 260 jobs for the ASC headquarters and 400 jobs in the construction of the submarine site. None of those jobs would have been here in South Australia without that contract coming here.

Secondly, when the construction of the submarines is under way, there will be 700 jobs in that project. That is just with the prime builder of the submarines. Look at the other subcontracts that have already been awarded. Some overseas contracts have been awarded but, of the contracts awarded to Australian companies allied with overseas contracts, South Australian firms, such as Fairey, British Aerospace, Thorn-EMI through its South Australian activities, and Nilsen, have between them won \$80 million worth of work in the contracts awarded up to the present, and that is only a small proportion of the total that will come within the full life of that contract. The Australian Submarine Corporation has committed itself to 70 per cent of Australian industry involvement. We have previously made the point that the South Australian firms will win a great share of that work if they provide the quality product that is needed and we as a Government will support their providing the best quality they can. Indeed, the Centre of Manufacturing is one such activity to ensure that the highest quality is available from South Australian firms.

South Australian firms are winning work. South Australians are winning jobs. What we promised would happen is happening: the successful construction of the submarines. The furphies and the untruths being raised by Hanrahan, the member for Mitcham, are just not sustained by the facts.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Without prejudicing ongoing investigations, but recognising the entitlement of not only the Opposition through confidential briefing but also the general public to know the facts relevant to the NCA report on the South Australian police, can the Premier say whether any of the allegations against individuals in that report refer to individuals who are not members of the South Australian Police Force?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I congratulate the honourable member on still holding her place on the front bench despite

my calls for her sacking. The answer to her question is that I have checked with the Minister of Emergency Services, to whom the question should have been addressed (although I am happy to answer it), and I understand that no non-police persons are referred to in that report.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order, even though I have previously warned him, which would mean that a further caution or call to order could lead to his being named. The Chair is being as tolerant as possible in the circumstances. The honourable member for Hartley.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr GROOM: How does the Minister of State Development and Technology view the Federal Opposition's plan to reduce immigration from Asia, and does he believe that the recent policy statement of the Federal Opposition, led by John Howard, will adversely affect South Australia's and Australia's efforts to increase trade and attract business migrants from Asia? The Federal Liberal Party Leader (John Howard) recently called for a 'one Australia' policy and made comments that suggested a cut in Asian immigration. Since then, both the National Party Leader (Ian Sinclair) and the National Party Leader in the Senate (Senator John Stone) have clearly stated their desire to alter the mix of people coming to this country by reducing the number of Asian immigrants.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member very much for his question, because it is indeed important.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hear two interjections from the other side: one is that it is last week's question and the other questioning its relevance. On the first point, it is not last week's question but an issue of the future. If we are able to maintain the successful growth rate that we have seen in the Business Migration Program in this State, we must have some cooperation in this country from the Federal Opposition, and goodness knows where the State Opposition stands on this matter. If we are to see the ongoing inflow into South Australia that we have seen in recent times continuing in the future.

To date some 200 families have settled in South Australia under the Business Migration Program, bringing with them \$160 million worth of investments representing a broad range of industries from the primary sector through manufacturing to the services sector, a significant proportion of those people having come from Asian countries. If we are to see that trend continue in the future, we need the present hysterical debate being fermented by the Opposition to be killed off.

With respect to the relevance of this, I would have thought that this is relevant to the investment climate in South Australia, so much of which is being talked about at the moment—the degree of investment and development that we have in this State and the need to encourage more investment funds to come into this State. It is starting to have an impact upon the image of Australia as a destination for business migration capital. The headline to an article carried in the Kuala Lumpur paper last week makes the point:

Racist thinking will only make it hard for Aussies.

The article states:

Australian racists, some under the guise of politicians and academics, were making immigrants feel inadequate, insecure and even subhuman.

John Howard has made the point that he wants business migrants from Hong Kong, but all the rest can go home is the implication of his attitude. It cannot happen that way: a policy must be one based upon equity, justice, fairness and the long-term interests of this country. The State Opposition has a wonderful opportunity to decide where it stands on this matter. It can say 'Yes,' it does want to support investment programs in this State; 'Yes,' it is pleased that the Government is seeking success in its business migration program.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, having given the House part of last week's ruling, would you perchance like to give the balance of the ruling which would put away this tomfoolery by the Minister?

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept that last remark.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat. The Chair is finding it extremely difficult today and is being given the impression that some members are deliberately setting out to flout Standing Orders and antagonise the Chair as much as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is extremely difficult for the Chair to give rulings on anybody when I cannot hear what is being said. It is also difficult to give a completely fair ruling when I do not have the exact wording of the question in front of me. My understanding is that the question is about the effect on the investment climate in South Australia of policies on immigration currently being followed. Provided the Minister adheres to that general subject area and does not go on at too great a length, I believe that he is within Standing Orders and within the practices of the House. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I recall that it was in the Estimates Committee in 1986 that the Deputy Leader asked questions about the effectiveness of the Business Migration Program which this State had in place using State taxpayers funds. At that time the Government was being adjured to make that program more successful in order to increase the amount of business migration into South Australia. We accepted the point and at that time were already working on that point. Indeed, as figures (which I will incorporate in *Hansard* at a later date by means of supplementary tabling) will show, we have seen a remarkable growth rate in business migration into South Australia from various parts of the world, both Asian and non-Asian. The point is that we, on behalf of all South Australia and the economy of this State, are not now being assisted by the Federal Opposition's stand in this matter. The State Opposition has a great opportunity to assist South Australians in getting a better investment climate by making quite clear what it thinks and, I would hope, by opposing the Federal Opposition's stand.

Mr Groom interjecting:

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

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question is addressed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Following the answer given by the Premier, will he say how many South Australian police

officers are, or will be, under investigation? Following his revelation yesterday that a number of actions have been taken by the police since last November to provide better protection to police informants, did the NCA report reveal shortcomings in previous procedures and, if so, have there been any cases over the past five years in which police informants have had their identities exposed as a result of police corruption? In particular, can any of the major drug-related crimes during this period be linked to the exposure of informants?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government will not play a game of 20 questions with the Opposition in relation to this matter. I am not prepared to be more specific than the Premier has already been about the identification of individuals who may be named in the report and allegations that might be around the place.

Mr S.J. Baker: How many?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have already indicated that it is not many. Further, I have already indicated that they are allegations and, for the most part, they are allegations which have been before the notice of the Police Department previously. The NCA, in its wisdom, suggested that further investigation would bear some fruit in relation to these allegations. As I say, most have already been investigated.

Yesterday I placed before the House a document (I think the third of the three documents I tabled) relating to protection of witnesses. This document has been generated within the South Australian Police Department and, so far as I am aware, it was put together without the benefit of studying the NCA report, because it was not necessary to do so. I am satisfied with the procedures that are now in place. However, I am not aware of any problems having occurred in the past involving previous procedures. From my reading of the report I do not recall the NCA's being critical about this matter. I hope that members who have questioned me before about the protection of witnesses are reassured by the statements contained in the document which was tabled yesterday.

PLAYFORD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr M.J. EVANS: My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister endorse the curriculum guarantee given to students of Playford High School by the Director of the Northern Region of the department, and will he confirm that the guarantee will ensure that any student who entered upon a course of study in 1988 will be allowed to complete the program, notwithstanding any decline in subject enrolment or as a result of the amalgamation process and that, in particular, students will be allowed to continue their chosen subjects at the Playford High School site in 1989?

The proposed amalgamation of the Elizabeth and Playford High Schools arises from the Joel Committee report of February 1988. While parents and students at Playford remain concerned at the implications of the closure of Playford High, one of the main outstanding issues is the provision of adequate resources to allow students to complete a course of study which they have already commenced. A guarantee in similar terms is also required for students now enrolled at Elizabeth High School.

A recent newsletter to parents from the Northern Regional Office simply states that there will be a curriculum guarantee, leaving the school community unsure of the terms of the guarantee. A report to the Regional Director on the implementation of the Joel report recommends a curriculum guarantee in the terms sought by the parents and students.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I place on record my thanks to the honourable member and to all those people in the Elizabeth education community who have worked for quite a long time to restructure schools in that area in order to improve education offerings for those young people in that district. That process has been very constructive and exciting. We are all looking forward to the outcome of that process.

I am pleased to confirm the curriculum guarantee that was given by the Area Director of Education to the students at Playford High School and their parents. I can confirm that the amalgamation process will not result in a restricted curriculum being offered to those students at Playford High School in 1989.

LABOR POLITICIAN

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier advise whether a South Australian Labor politician was investigated by police over a relationship with a major heroin importer earlier than several years ago? Last night I received a written reply from the Premier to a question I asked last Thursday. My question had referred to a report in the issue of the *Weekend Australian* dated 28/29 May which raised allegations that a senior South Australian Labor politician had been the subject of a drug related investigation, and that documents relating to this matter had been shredded.

The written reply that I received from the Premier last evening states that the Deputy Commissioner of Police has advised:

There is no evidence to indicate that a senior South Australian Labour [sic] politician has been investigated for several years.

One interpretation of the answer is that earlier than several years ago there was such an investigation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, that is not correct. It was an attempt to answer. It is a bit grubby of the honourable member to try to raise this matter. I was taken by surprise by the question last Thursday, and wondered what possibly it could refer to and on reflection I thought I knew what it might refer to. I think the honourable member knows what it might refer to, namely, matters that were dealt with some time ago where there was no hint of problems, corruption, or anything like that whatsoever, yet the honourable member obviously spread his murky little trail before the House. Anyway, I should have taken the honourable course which is to say that I am aware that the honourable member really is trying to do a bit of muckraking, which is beneath his dignity, and therefore I will ignore it.

We made the inquiry as I thought. Fair enough, let us assume that the question was asked in good faith and try to get an answer. We got an answer very quickly from the Deputy Commissioner which says:

There is no evidence to indicate that a senior South Australian Labour [sic] politician has been investigated for several years.

That is the answer to the question that the member asked. There is no inference that anybody was investigated at all. There is no evidence to suggest that any such documents were shredded. That answer having been given, there was silence until today. Instead of getting to his feet and saying, 'I appreciate the answer and I am pleased to know that the question I launched last week without notice, hoping to cause a bit of a stir, has been resolved satisfactorily.' No, the honourable member sits there, looks at the wording and says 'Wait a minute, I can think of another way of spreading a bit of murk and muck. I will ask the question in a different way. I will get some sort of response to that.' I simply say that the answer to the question is that I am not

aware of any such investigation at any time, several years ago or whatever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member for Coles for repeated interjections. The member for Briggs has the call.

HOLDEN COMMODORE

Mr RANN: Is the Minister of State Development and Technology confident of the success of the new Holden Commodore being launched today and being manufactured for the first time at Holden's Elizabeth plant? I understand that production of the VN Commodore is now under way at the Elizabeth plant and that the car has been designed to win back the market leadership lost to Ford in 1982. The production move of the Commodore to Elizabeth, has resulted in 500 new jobs in the northern suburbs. I understand that Toyota will market the car internationally from next year, a move that could result in more South Australian jobs.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly the marketplace will automatically determine the success of the vehicle, but very impressive to most are the investment decisions made by the Holden motor company in respect of this vehicle and the benefits South Australia receives from that series of investment decisions. An amount of \$350 million has been invested in the design, development and production of this vehicle. By all accounts it looks to have great opportunities in the marketplace, not only within Australia but internationally. I understand that the VN Commodore has commenced production at Elizabeth at the rate of 120 vehicles a day, and that will increase to 320 a day by December this year. Early in 1989 a long wheel-base version will be added, and this will be followed by a utility in late 1989.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Holden ute's back.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, the Holden ute is back. These vehicles will not be badged for Toyota. Production is scheduled to reach 430 a day by December 1989. The Holden Motor Company has introduced a second shift to handle the increased volume, as a result of the decision to build all of the VN Commodores at Elizabeth in lieu of the previous 50-50 arrangement with the Dandenong plant, and the second shift has increased employment by 300 people. The VL Commodore is still in production at Dandenong, at the rate of 30 vehicles a day, and that will be maintained until October this year. It is expected that the Holden Motor Company will build at least 10 000 Commodores a year at Elizabeth and they will be badged by Toyota. As the honourable member has mentioned, that will result in overseas sales as a result of Toyota marketing efforts. These vehicles will create 500 extra jobs.

That is a very significant addition to production here in South Australia. Certainly, the automotive market is a very delicate one, both nationally and internationally, and we are seeing some other effects in the automotive component industry as a result of changed plans. For example, the Ford SA 30 vehicle that is being deferred in Victoria is resulting in a job impact in South Australia.

As to the question about the VN Commodore, Holden is making a marketplace decision to the tune of \$350 million. It is confident, and I believe that it is building upon strength in South Australia. The Government believes that that confidence is not misplaced confidence in the capacity of this economy to produce for the international marketplace. Indeed, I am looking forward to visiting on Sunday with my family the Holden plant at Elizabeth on its family day,

and I believe that the member for Briggs will also be there, as well as the member for Napier, at which time we will get the opportunity to see, with the employees of that factory, some of the activities that are now taking place at that plant.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what plans the Government has to ensure the safety and security of radioactive products mined at Roxby Downs while they are being transported from the mine to a port for shipment? Will the declaration of nuclear free zones in some local government areas, particularly Port Adelaide, pose any impediments to these plans? Have any measures such as use of helicopters been proposed to keep these products under continuing surveillance while they are being moved by road through South Australia?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Not in the least, because my two colleagues and I on this part of the bench had agreed that the first person who was asked a question by the Opposition would get a cup of coffee from the other members. I may or may not invite the honourable member to accompany me. In answer to the question, no, it is not intended to run armed convoys from the mine to the port, with attendant helicopters and goodness knows what else. The convoys will be perfectly safe, with containers holding steel drums of yellowcake, so that if there should be an accident of some kind or another and the casing should break the steel drums should still be perfectly safe. I do not anticipate any accidents whatsoever.

HOME OWNERSHIP MADE EASIER

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the Government intends to continue with the State refinancing scheme that was introduced in 1983 under the State's Home Ownership Made Easier program? Over 90 per cent of people in my electorate are buying their own home. Over the past three years I have referred a number of these people to the Housing Trust to take advantage of the scheme. My constituents have told me that, in these tough economic times, when many families are under stress, to do away with this scheme would be insensitive. They have asked me to seek the Minister's assurances that this scheme will continue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Perhaps members saw a segment on Channel 10 news last night that dealt with a case exactly like this. One of the problems with people buying homes in these modern times is that, unfortunately, there are marital breakdowns, and the settlements under the Family Court are usually such that the house is sold. In many cases, the custodial parent with the children is, in effect, forced to sell that house where they have been living and attempt to find alternative accommodation.

One of the benefits of this scheme is that the State Bank, the Housing Trust, and the State Government, through the availability of money over the years, can provide concessional loans to allow that sole parent with the custody of the children to stay in the family home. I place on record the sensitive way in which my own departmental officers (officers of the South Australian Housing Trust) and those of the State Bank have dealt with these matters. They are

dealing with clients who are facing not only the crisis of the family home being sold over their heads but also the trauma of a marriage breakdown. Those who saw that news item last night would agree, I am sure, that in that case not only were the children given the opportunity to stay in the family home, at the same school, and close to their friends, but we were also able to avoid the necessity of those persons going on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list.

I can reassure the member for Fisher and the House that that program, on which we spent \$30 million, has helped over 1 000 families since its inception, and that we will continue that program as long as there is a Labor Government in South Australia and a Federal Labor Government in Canberra. Unfortunately, after looking at the housing policy the Federal Liberal Party released yesterday, I cannot give the same reassurance if there is a change of Government in Canberra. I can describe the Liberal Party policy in three short words: unbalanced, superficial and empty; because it is, in effect, aimed at the selfish ones in our community. The Liberals are continuing to eliminate public sector housing from their program.

They will dismantle the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement and, more importantly perhaps, they are saying that all emergency services, all supplementary support services under the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement will be under review. When the Liberal Party says that a program is under review, I think the record shows that it intends to abolish it.

CITY WATCH HOUSE

Mr OSWALD: In view of a letter written more than 18 months ago by the Minister of Correctional Services to the late Kingsley Dixon, will the Minister of Emergency Services accept full responsibility for the Government's failure to deal with problems of overcrowding at the City Watch House? I have a letter in my possession which reveals that more than 18 months ago the late Kingsley Dixon wrote to the Government to express concern about conditions at the Watch House.

In his reply to Dixon, the Minister of Correctional Services acknowledged that the Watch House 'was not designed to hold prisoners for prolonged periods', but said the responsibility lay with the Minister of Emergency Services.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I refuse to comment on a letter written by one of my colleagues to someone else, of which I have no knowledge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair called the Leader of the Opposition to order because he was being particularly vociferous. He was not the only person on either side of the House who was being disruptive, but at that time the honourable Leader of the Opposition was the most vociferous. The honourable member for Newland.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs say, following the review of the Government's new retirement villages legislation, how the scheme is working and whether it will be extended to cover private hostels receiving Commonwealth funds? The Attorney-General promised to review the working of this Act after 12

months operation to ensure that it was protecting senior citizens and to see whether that protection should be extended.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My colleague states that since the commencement of the Retirement Villages Act on 30 June 1987, the Government has closely monitored the effect that it has had both on promoters of retirement villages and residents of those villages. When introducing the legislation the Attorney-General undertook to keep its operations under review and to initiate amendments if it was found not to be operating in the intended manner.

After 12 months of operation it appears that for the most part the legislation is performing its major function of protecting the security of tenure of residents of retirement villages. A number of difficulties have arisen in specific instances but these have been able to be rectified by giving exemptions to individual operators in specific circumstances subject to certain conditions. At this stage no substantial amendments appear to be necessary and the Act has found favour both with the providers and consumers within the industry.

At the time of commencement of the Act an exemption was issued for members of the voluntary care sector in relation to hostels where they were in receipt of recurrent funding from the Commonwealth. This exemption was for a period of 12 months and was on the basis that the Commonwealth would be introducing a new system of regulation of those hostels by contract that would regulate the same areas as the Retirement Villages Act and cause voluntary care sector operators to comply with two regulatory regimes at an unacceptable cost. The Government was informed by the voluntary care sector that the Commonwealth regulatory regime would be in place within 12 months and thus the future of the exemption could be reassessed at that time.

However, the Commonwealth regulatory regime is still not in place and the Attorney-General has determined to revoke the voluntary care sector exemption as at 30 September this year but provide the voluntary care sector with a number of specific exemptions which have been justified. He has also undertaken to review the exemptions given to that sector should it be found that there are necessary costs incurred in any overlapping between the Commonwealth and the State regulatory regimes. The Government will continue to monitor developments within the industry to ensure that a suitable protection regime does exist for the elderly residents of retirement villages without being unnecessarily burdensome to the providers of these facilities.

ANTI-SMOKING 'QUIT' BADGE

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister of Health confirm that all sporting clubs receiving financial assistance from the Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Fund will first have to agree to display the anti-smoking 'Quit' badge. This fund made its first allocation to the South Australian Olympic Games team last week. I have been informed that the fund initially sought to impose as a condition of this support that all South Australian members of that team wear the 'Quit' badge on their outfits. The Olympic Council refused to agree but, while the support to our Olympians will proceed without that condition being met, I have been told that all other clubs who receive money from the fund will have to wear a 'Quit' badge similar to that on the uniforms of the Fitzroy Club in the Victorian Football League.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question. The short answer is 'No'. I do

not know whether or not that is a fact, but I will find out. This matter seems to be of deep interest to the honourable member and, if it is not a fact, I think that it is an excellent idea. After all, sporting clubs have no hesitation, when taking money from tobacco companies, in displaying whatever it is that the company wishes to display. Indeed, they would display anything provided that someone paid for it. The idea seems excellent. I am sure that it is not original and that the fund has already thought of it. Nevertheless, I will remind the fund of the honourable member's suggestion as regards the specific question that he asked and provide him with a response later. I thank the honourable member for his suggestion.

SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Transport say whether he or the Government is considering introducing reduced speed limits in built-up areas as a road safety measure and whether he may be considering legislation to provide for such a power to be given to local government? My thoughts were directed to this area of road safety by an article in the *News* of last Monday and a follow-up in the *Advertiser* yesterday, referring to the fact that this addition to road safety is being considered for introduction in New South Wales.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I, too, saw the article to which he refers and, as a consequence, I asked the Department of Transport to obtain from its counterpart in New South Wales details of its recommendation to the New South Wales Government. It turns out that the recommendations cover a whole range of speed limits: to increase the speed on some country roads from 100 km/h to 110 km/h, and on some of the major arterials from 60 km/h to 70 km/h; and to reduce the limit on local roads from 60 km/h to 40 km/h. Where the reductions were recommended, that action has already taken place in South Australia. A reduction in the speed past schools to 40 km/h is also recommended. Surprisingly, that has not previously applied in New South Wales, I am advised; in South Australia it is 25 km/h.

The other condition applied to the reduction of speed limits is the implementation of the residential street management scheme, as it is known in South Australia, or, as it is called in New South Wales and other States, the local area traffic management plan. When applications are made to the Government—and if it can be demonstrated that implementation of the street management plan, (which consists of roundabouts, humps, etc) in a local road will reduce the speed environment—the 40 km/h signs will be erected.

The Government is very much involved in trying to devise a system that will effectively reduce the speed of traffic on local roads where it can be certain that there will be general compliance with that reduced speed limit. It is not good enough to put up a sign in a speed environment where motorists travel in excess of 40 km/h and then expect them to travel at 40 km/h. We do not have enough police and local government inspectors to police these roads. It can be very dangerous to encourage people to believe that the speed limit is 40 km/h when, in fact, 85 per cent, or most of the motorists on that road, do not conform.

There are no applications immediately before the Government from local councils seeking a reduction in the speed limit in their areas. However, the Government is well aware that a number of local government authorities are in the process of working through a proposition to put before it.

The honourable member asked whether the Government has any legislative proposals in this area. Later this session I will put before the House a measure that will enable us to reduce the speed limit in an area from, for argument's sake, 60 km/h to 40 km/h. Currently, the Act only allows the establishment of a speed limit in a particular street; it does not allow the establishment of a speed limit in a whole area. Legislation will be brought before the House to provide the Minister with that authority and, in turn, he will be able to provide it to other authorities.

I have not provided local government with the authority to establish speed limits in their own areas because a multiplicity of speed limits could be established throughout South Australia. There must be some uniformity: motorists must understand that certain road environments will have certain speed limits placed upon them. However, if one moves from one local government area (particularly in the metropolitan area) into another local government area and the speed limit changes, that only causes confusion and does not help road safety.

So, a number of matters are currently being looked at. The Government is very interested in what the New South Wales Government is doing. We are seeking to provide a safer road environment for motorists, pedestrians and all road users in South Australia. I assure the honourable member that his question is very important and the Government will do what it can to provide road safety in South Australia.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr LEWIS: My question is to the Premier. Has the Government made a final decision on the site for the Entertainment Centre and, if so, when does the Premier intend to announce the decision which will confirm that the proposal to locate the centre at West Lakes has been scrapped in favour of a central city location on the eastern side of the Morphett Street bridge in order to integrate the centre into the ASER project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There has been an intensive investigation following my announcement last year that the Grand Prix Board would take up the issue of the Entertainment Centre to look at the costing and siting and to see whether we could package something affordable. That is the big problem. We have asked for private sector support from entrepreneurs who are interested in taking up this project. We have a fantastic site at Hindmarsh, which the Government has acquired and is preparing. Either that site, or the value of it in lieu of some other site, can be addressed to the project. So far it has proved frustratingly difficult to package something that is affordable. However, I hope that before too long we will be in a position to announce something. I cannot give the honourable member any more information at this time.

WORLD EXPO

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism in another place, seek from his colleague the estimated visitation numbers to date to, and the performance of, the South Australian pavilion at the World Expo in Brisbane? On a recent visit to Brisbane I spent three days observing the South Australian Expo stall at various times of the day and evening. I also consulted in excess of 60 visitors to the South Australian pavilion as to their opinion of the South Australian pavilion. Not one had an adverse remark about the South Australian pavilion

or its stall. My question seeks information from the Minister as to whether my personal impressions as to the success of the South Australian exhibition are correct.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Tourism in another place. I have visited Expo and I have spoken with the excellent young South Australians who are working at the South Australian exhibit, so I would like to say one or two things about some of the attacks that have been made upon them. I speak with some experience having seen the World Expos at New Orleans and Vancouver.

I am totally amazed by the capacity of members of the Opposition to be totally negative about anything that Australia or South Australia does. There is a cultural cringe which I do not understand. I recall that the Hon. Mr Davis very forcefully criticised the Australian exhibit at the New Orleans Expo. I visited that exhibit, which was one of the most popular exhibits there. The overwhelming majority of people who visited that exhibit did not know the difference between South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland—they were interested in Australia. The same thing applied at the Vancouver Expo. We heard criticisms from members opposite about the Australian exhibit at Vancouver. However, it was extremely popular, if not the most popular exhibit after the US, Canada and the USSR.

The Australian exhibit was enormously popular. People visiting that exhibit did not make distinctions between States in Australia; they were interested in Australia. Now we have the Queensland World Expo and members opposite once again involve themselves in this criticism of the South Australian (or, in the first instance, Australian) exhibit. I spoke to these young people who took the opportunity to tell me that they were bitterly disappointed with the statements being made about them, particularly by the shadow Minister of Tourism.

One young person told me that she had taken the trouble to write to the *Advertiser* and, within one or two days, her letter appeared in that paper. The letter expressed the concern of the young South Australians who are representing us so well in Brisbane. They are very concerned when members of Parliament—people who represent South Australia—return from Brisbane and bitterly criticise the South Australian exhibit. I can tell those members opposite who did not have the opportunity to attend previous World Expos that some of the international exhibits at Brisbane were exactly the same as those at Vancouver, if not as far as back as the New Orleans World Expo. They contributed absolutely nothing towards educating or encouraging people to invest in or visit those particular countries. They were purely exhibits.

About 90 per cent of the people who attend an Expo go there to be entertained for the day. They do not come out of the Expo and say, 'I must go to Queensland, Western Australia, or Kenya' or anywhere else. They go there to be entertained, but the South Australian exhibit has also encouraged people to visit this State. It is people friendly. Visitors attend and talk to young people, who can encourage people to visit South Australia. Visitors are not blinded by a big video or expensive exhibition which means nothing to them. They go there and talk to people about South Australia, which has an extremely effective exhibit.

While people are queuing up for three hours to visit the New Zealand exhibit, 10 000 or 20 000 people have attended the South Australian exhibit, spoken to the young South Australians, looked at the videos, tasted the wine and had a look at what we have to offer. At the same time, people are waiting to get into one or two of the other exhibits.

What we have done for South Australia is excellent and I am absolutely certain that, when the Minister of Tourism responds to my colleague's question, she will support what I have said today. We ought to support and be proud of the young people who represent us in Brisbane rather than coming back here and badmouthing them. The shadow Minister of Tourism has done it; the shadow Minister of Transport has done it; I think that the Hon. Legh Davis has done it; and just about every Liberal Opposition member who has visited Brisbane has taken the opportunity to come back here and bag and can the young people in Brisbane who are looking after the best interests of South Australia. It is about time that these people were proud of, and defended, this State rather than spending all their time knocking things. Fancy knocking the young people who represent us in Queensland. These members say that they are trying to encourage investment in South Australia. What a farce! Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That, pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927, members of the Public Works Standing Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House tomorrow.

Motion carried.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act 1930. Read a first time.

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: 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

Historically 'rateable land' was land suitable for horticulture and viticulture that could be irrigated by water gravitating from an irrigation channel or pipemain. Rates were only charged against rateable land and the base rate was calculated on the basis of the area of rateable land in each holding. A fixed quantity of water per hectare was provided in return.

In 1974 the Kingston Irrigation Area system of channels was replaced with sealed pipemains and metered supplies. Subsequently other irrigation areas converted to pipemains. In order to promote the more efficient use of water allocations, irrigators were permitted to use them to cultivate land that had previously been non-rateable land. The advent of efficient pumps had facilitated the irrigation of land beyond the rateable land limits. The basis of rating an area of rateable land has begun to erode.

Another step towards efficient use of water resources was implemented about the same time. Water allocations were redetermined, taking into account the type of planting. Thus vines, for example, drew an allocation of 10 700 kilolitres per hectare and fodder 14 700 kilolitres per hectare. Given these changes, it was a further logical step in the direction

of efficient water use to permit irrigators to transfer allocations to other irrigators who could better use them.

The base rate has continued to be set at a fixed rate per hectare of rateable Land, regardless that additional areas had been planted or that there were differential allocations or that allocations had been transferred. It is reasonable and equitable to abandon this method of setting the base rate and relate it instead to allocations, by expressing it as a fixed percentage of the total allocation of each holding. It is proposed to fix the percentage at 50% as this most closely resembles the current level of base rates. This method of rating does not apply to the Loxton irrigation area or reclaimed irrigation area.

The comprehensive drainage system is designed to control perched water tables and/or the level of the groundwater mound, to ensure that the crop root zone is not waterlogged. It is considered that most irrigators contribute to the problem and would be adversely affected were it not controlled. Drainage rates are payable only by those irrigators whose holdings are directly served by the comprehensive drainage system. There is a perceived inequity in the fact that many irrigators who contribute to the drainage problem and benefit from the drainage system do not contribute to the cost of maintaining it. Recovering both water supply and drainage costs through a single rate will rectify this inequity.

This Bill, which was originally introduced on 30 March 1988, will provide the power to do this as an alternative to the current practice. It is proposed to adopt this option subject to the advice of the various Irrigation Advisory Boards. The thrust of these amendments is to provide the Government with greater flexibility to deal with these rating issues in conjunction with the Irrigation Advisory Boards.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes consequential changes to the arrangement provision. Clause 4 makes amendments to the definition section of the principal Act. Clause 5 replaces Part V of the principal Act. Section 54 defines terms used in the new Part.

Sections 55 and 56 set out the powers of the Minister in relation to the supply of water for irrigation, domestic and other purposes. Section 57 places obligations on the owner of land and section 58 enables the Minister to carry out those obligations at the expense of the owner if he fails to perform them. Section 59 establishes a landowner's entitlement to water in accordance with his allocation. Section 60 provides for allocations and variations of allocations. If an owner reduces the area under cultivation he can request the Minister to reduce or revoke the water allocation with the result that the liability to pay the minimum rate set out in section 65 is reduced or removed completely. If, at a later date, the owner wants to increase the crop, he can apply for an increase in the allocation, but the Minister can only grant the application if sufficient water is available.

If additional water is not available the only way an owner can increase his share is by purchasing the whole or part of an allocation from a neighbour. The Minister can review and change allocations every five years but must always base a change on the water requirements of the crop growing on the land.

Section 61 provides for transfer of allocations with the Minister's consent. Division IV provides for recovery of costs by rates. Section 63 (2) will enable the Minister to recover the cost of draining land as a component of the water supply rate. Alternatively, section 66 enables him to declare a separate drainage rate. Section 64 enables the Minister to declare different rates. Section 65 requires the payment of a minimum rate even though no water is used. Any amount so paid is paid on account of the water supply rate (65 (2)).

Sections 67 and 68 provide for the reduction of rates in certain circumstances. Section 69 provides for liability to pay rates. This replaces a similar provision that has been in the principal Act since 1983. Section 71 protects the Minister where he is unable to supply water because of an insufficiency. Section 72 provides for records. Section 73 provides for the supply of water by the Minister to non-rateable land. Section 74 provides for the drainage of water from non-rateable land and section 75 enables the Minister to discontinue the supply of water to or drainage of water from land.

Clause 6 repeals sections 119 and 120 of the principal Act in consequence of earlier amendments. Clause 7 inserts a transitional provision.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 August. Page 166).

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): At the outset, I want to say that my remarks will be—

The SPEAKER: Order! I assume that the honourable Deputy Leader is the lead speaker.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The Leader will make some pertinent remarks during the debate on the motion. Of course, we support the Bill, which will spend a lot of money in the Public Service. Some of that money will be spent on wages for Government employees who are monitoring the efforts at Roxby Downs. The absurd efforts of the Premier to distract attention from his own shortcomings in the recent economic debate are nothing short of pathetic. His suggestion that the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning should resign, because she asked some legitimate questions about the Government's failure to grasp the nettle every time some problem arises, was ridiculous.

The fact that the Government has been so timid and has shown such cowardice in the face of any opposition to any proposal and that the Premier seeks to shrug off his responsibility and suggest that the shadow Minister retire is nothing short of laughable. Let me remind the Premier of his own activities. His Party knocked O-Bahn and said that it was no good. There he was, cutting the ribbon on opening day and saying what a wonderful project it was. The present Government said that the Torrens Linear Park was no good, but off the Premier goes, trotting along on his morning runs in that area and thinking what a wonderful place it is.

To cap all its efforts, there was the fierce opposition and dirty tactics when this Government tried to block the Roxby Downs project. However, the Premier will visit Roxby Downs in November, along with his public servants and others whose wages are being paid, to see that that project continues. Up he will go and he will say, 'Isn't this wonderful.' Let me quote the Government's record: it is the absolute height of hypocrisy. We just heard a lecture from the Minister of Transport about knocking, but every time the former Liberal Government proposed expenditure on anything, the then Labor Opposition would knock it. If we have learned anything about knocking, we have learned it from the present Government. This is what the Premier had to say about the mirage in the desert. He and the former Minister of Mines and Energy said that uranium would go into bombs. I will quote from *Hansard*.

Mr Tyler: Let's have something original.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is original enough. It is very pertinent to the Premier's efforts to shrug off his responsibility in the current development debate. I am always overjoyed when Government members interject during my speeches, because it shows that they do not like what I am saying: the truth hurts. In relation to Roxby Downs, *Hansard* states:

Mr Gunn: The honourable member says he does not support it.

Mr Bannon: No.

Mr Gunn: He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

Mr Bannon: Yes.

Mr Gunn: As Premier, you would stop that project?

Mr Bannon: I am opposed to it.

The then Government, of which I was a member, sought to negotiate the arrangements for Roxby Downs and, on 21 February 1981, a report in the *Advertiser* stated:

In Roxby Downs in South Australia we are looking at a project which will not be coming on stream for another 10 years or so.

Mr Tyler: When are you going to write a new speech?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is new stuff. The article continues:

The French nuclear program will have been scaled down by then...

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They don't like it: the truth hurts. They used every trick in the book to kill off Roxby Downs. The Premier stated:

The French nuclear program will have been scaled down by then and we might find there will be no market for any uranium from Roxby Downs. This virtually leaves Japan as the only market for uranium. The implications for Roxby Downs are enormous.

A report in the *Advertiser* of 15 May 1981 referred to:

A statement in the aftermath of the election of the Mitterand Socialist Government, which was widely expected to lead to a scaling down of the French nuclear program.

This, of course, did not occur. It was Mr Mitterand in true socialist style telling the electors a pack of lies before the election and then going on regardless. This is what now Premier Bannon said then:

We will have to see what that Indenture Bill says. What licence is it going to give to the company? I have suggested to those companies concerned that if they lend themselves—and I don't think they have, I think they're the unfortunate victims of the current Government trying to distract attention from its own poor performance—if they lend themselves to being made a political exercise around an Indenture Bill, then that is going to jeopardise whatever prospects of development they have.

Wonderful support! On *Nationwide* on 28 September 1981, Premier Bannon stated:

Further activity at Roxby Downs, at least to the stage of a final definitive feasibility study or pilot developmental project report, is able to proceed without an Indenture Act.

Like fun! BP, which was putting up most of the funds, was getting nervous about this political agitation against the project. If the Indenture Act had not been passed by 30 June 1982 BP would have quit the scene and we could have waved goodbye to the Roxby Downs joint venture. It was very nervous about what was going on with the activities of the Labor Party, the campaign against nuclear energy and the false reports fed to the media by the now member for Briggs—the boy wonder who unfortunately has been passed over for political preferment. He was very active at that time feeding false information to the media.

Premier Bannon now brags about the value of this project to the State, but when we were desperately trying to get it up and running members opposite voted against it in this House. The only way to get it through was to have someone with the courage of his convictions, Norm Foster, who is

now a leper in the Labor movement, cross the floor. He, not Premier Bannon, ought to be the one up there opening this project. If anyone from the Government side of politics should be doing the job, Norm Foster should be. The project would never have got off the ground if the Indenture had been defeated. BP would have quit the scene and Norm Foster knew that only too well.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Did he get back last weekend?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Did Norm get back into the Party last weekend? Stony silence! The answer is obviously 'No'. Premier Bannon further stated:

Profitability may ultimately depend on the size of the State Government's contribution to infrastructure costs. Royalties will produce no direct net benefit to the State Treasury if they have to be used to amortise the State's investment.

If the project proceeds on the optimum predictions of the consortium it would employ an estimated 2 000 people full time and up to an additional 3 000 at the apex of the construction and development stage. The project would have a marked but relatively transient multiplier employment effect during construction and development and a permanent multiplier effect on manufacturing employment, probably amounting to several hundred jobs. Later, the Premier stated:

Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, dismissed the future of the Roxby Downs mining operation when he met with a delegation of Port Pirie Friends of the Earth members recently. The proposed gold, copper and uranium mining operation was dismissed by Mr Bannon on the grounds that depressed prices for these minerals were making the project unrealistic.

They are the Premier's words. A report in the *Port Pirie Recorder* of 23 November 1981 stated:

The State Development Council strategy for South Australia provided absolutely no support for the Tonkin Government's vision of Roxby Downs as the answer to South Australia's economic problems, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday.

Here is the fellow who has the gall to get up in public, when legitimate questions are asked about some of this Government's projects which run completely counter to a whole host of its planning regulations, and suggest that the shadow Minister should resign because she is knocking. This fellow did nothing but knock everything. He had questions about the Hilton Hotel. He had questions about the international airport that the Liberal Government got up and going. He had questions about the linear park. He knocked hell out of the O-Bahn and knocked more than hell out of the Roxby Downs venture. Government members used every trick in the book to defeat it and voted against it solidly in this place. What hypocrisy!

The Premier does not have the guts to take on the fringe groups and get some real development going in South Australia: he runs to water the first time a head bobs up. The member for Newland is very busy at the moment. I went to a public meeting and there were great plans for development of the Anstey Hill park. I had a bit to say, but she was really walking the tightrope. I almost gave her something to help her balance. The Government had the idea that it was getting a reputation for being anti-development, so it was going to work out an acceptable project for Anstey Hill park. Then 10 days later the whole thing was canned—nothing!

What happened down at the seafront with the marinas? We have the worst facilities in Australia for the boating community. What happens? A marina is proposed within the electorate of the member for Bright, who is busy with his newspaper now. What happened? A meeting was held with 600 people making a noise and the project was canned—it did not even get off the ground. I have a press clipping quoting the Premier as saying that Jubilee Point is the king hit—here is a wonderful new project! The Premier stated that it would have wonderful economic benefits for the State and encouraged the project. About \$2 million was

spent, yet two and a half years later he says, 'You cannot go ahead, bad luck, go back and try again.' If the Liberal Government had shown that crawfish, cowardly, gutless attitude on the Roxby Downs venture, which met with far more fierce opposition than anything this mob have ever encountered—much of it generated by the Labor Party, as were a lot of dirty tricks—the proposal would not have succeeded.

I was amused by the Minister's answer today that there are no worries if a drum of yellowcake falls off the back of a truck. It was a different story from the Labor Party and John Scott at Thebarton who stated that the shocking yellowcake would poison the community. Councils were encouraged to proclaim nuclear free zones in the belief that it would save the public from radiation poisoning. However, the Minister got up today and said, 'There are no worries about a drum of yellow cake falling off the back of the truck—it will not hurt you.'

That is not what we heard from 1979 to 1982 when we were fighting desperately to get Roxby Downs off the ground. We were told that half the population would be poisoned and so we would have nuclear free zones. Even my friend Mayor Jones from Port Pirie is not as silly as a lot of these other nut cases in the Labor Party. He is a friend of mine—in fact, he is not a nut case at all. We had considerable trouble with settling ponds in Port Pirie and our Government voted \$1 million to clean up that mess, whereas the Labor Government during its 10 years in office did nothing. What hypocrisy!

Money will be spent from this Supply Bill to help this project along and to keep the Public Service paid, and we have a Premier who has the gall to suggest that we are a lot of knockers in terms of expenditures.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, you have not heard these quotes. We put them all together just to indicate what members opposite will be getting from now on until the Premier gets up there and throws his chest out and says, 'What a wonderful project this Roxby Downs venture is that I've got for South Australia.' What a load of garbage! In the *Advertiser* of 27 November 1981, the Premier stated:

The Tonkin Government is panicking in order to get the Roxby Downs Indenture through the Parliament before Christmas. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said that negotiations between the Government and the Roxby Downs partners had reached an impasse over electricity prices.

Again let me tell the House that had that Indenture Bill not gone through Parliament by 30 June 1982 the project would have collapsed and BP would have withdrawn. It was putting up hundreds of millions of dollars for the project. Western Mining was keen, of course, but it was not putting up the cash. However, BP was, and BP had had an excursion into the mining industry from its traditional activities and had had its fingers burnt. BP was asking a few pretty serious questions in London about these new ventures into which it was moving. I can tell honourable members, I believe without any fear of contradiction, that had the Indenture concerning the project not gone through Parliament before 30 June 1982 it would have been gone.

In early June 1982 that mob over there, to a man, voted against it. Let us not have any of this fancy footwork that the Premier is now engaging in, like 'But I went off to the Federal conference and got them to change their mind. They spat on me, they vilified me.' What a load of garbage. He knows darn well what would have occurred if they had not changed their policy. Of course, what they came up with was a nonsense, namely, that Roxby could go ahead but Honeymoon and Beverley had to be chopped off, and so did uranium enrichment, but Roxby could go ahead because

Labor knew that it would lose the election if it did not agree to that. It is as simple as that.

The Government has never yet been willing to debate the uranium issue on its merits. The Premier gets lauded for his wonderful performance in Tasmania as Federal President. What was the view on this matter? It was, 'Don't debate it, sweep it under the carpet, don't face the issue.' The Premier has never yet—and never will, while he follows this cowardly attitude to issues—debated the issue on its merits. Let me press on with statements made previously. This is what the now Premier said on 2 December 1981:

Well, our policy has to be qualified by the constitutional requirements and, for instance, section 92 does not allow State Governments to unilaterally cancel contracts. That is why I say it ceases to be our initiative if the Indenture Bill gets through and the contracts are written.

He can thank his lucky stars that it did get through because we would not have had the project if the Indenture Bill had not been passed. That is why I say that the forgotten player in all of this is Norm Foster. If anybody ought to go down in Labor history as a hero in relation to the biggest mining development to hit Australia this century, it is Norm Foster. However, what did they do to him? They cast him off. If anybody ought to be up there in the front row at the opening of this giant mine, it is Norm Foster. If ever they want someone to name a park or a street after up there in Roxby it ought to be Norm Foster.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know; I told Morgan that he ought to. He hadn't thought of it. I told Morgan at Western Mining that he darn well ought to, I can tell the honourable member that. But the Labor Party members would not. They would still have Norm behind the door.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I bet they would not have him there—too much embarrassment for them. Let me continue with the Premier's comments. If one did not have a sense of humour one would go mad with the hypocrisy of it all. I repeat what he said:

It has to be qualified by the constitutional requirements. Section 92 does not allow State Governments to unilaterally cancel contracts. That is why I say that it ceases to be our initiative if the Indenture Bill gets through and the contracts are written.

He is off the hook! The following question was put:

If we had the situation where the Indenture goes through but the project goes beyond the evaluation and feasibility stages into full production and if a Labor Government comes into power some time in that period, then whatever has been written, whatever contracts have been agreed upon, will they be honoured by the Government?

Mr Bannon replied:

Well, I am afraid we would be in the position, whether we liked it or not, of having to accept the Act that had been passed.

Dicken he wouldn't, otherwise he would lose the election. The former Leader of the Opposition was quoted as follows on the Channel 7 news on 2 December 1981:

In his fresh claims, Mr Bannon said an assured and sufficient water supply for Roxby Downs was an area where there were still far more questions than answers. He said that 6 million to 7 million litres of domestic water would be required for a proposed town of 9 000 people and about five times that amount for mining and milling. He said that underground water was not suitable for domestic use.

Apparently, he was an expert on every damn thing, while knocking this project. The report continued:

'There was a suggestion that the mine operators themselves might be willing to meet the costs of extending the pipeline that provides Murray water for Woomera', he said. 'However, there is some question whether this could be too large a drain on the Murray.'

A report in the *Weekend Australian* of 5-6 December 1981 stated:

The South Australian Government's radiation protection and control legislation has been described as a 'smoke screen' by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon. Mr Bannon said yesterday the legislation was an attempt to placate public opinion.

This is the fellow who reckons we are knocking a bit. The report continued:

'This is evidence that the Tonkin Government is concerned over community disquiet on uranium', he said. 'This proposed legislation should be read in conjunction with the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill.'

Well, of course it should. A report in the *Advertiser* of 8 December 1981 stated:

... for according to John Bannon it is just as likely that his Party would be obstructing the Indenture Bill if the Roxby Downs site promised no more than copper, gold and rare earths.

This was pointing out that the Labor Party would be opposing the proposal if Roxby Downs promised no more than that, that it would oppose it even if there was no uranium. The new twist was that even if there was no uranium the Labor Party would not be for it. I just ask members opposite to think for a moment of the absurdity of that. Here was a company willing to take all the risks, to put up hundreds of millions of dollars, yet the Labor Party was still going to oppose the proposal even if there was no uranium. The report continued:

'What it all adds up to is that Western Mining, with the Indenture Bill, are wanting a one-sided deal', he said. 'We're not seeking to cancel out any hope of Roxby Downs for the future. We simply know that the deal that the Government wants to make now is premature.'

As I have said, if the Indenture had not gone through it would have been goodbye BP and goodbye mine. There is nothing surer. He further stated:

Western Mining wants a guarantee of so much infrastructure, the cost of which would be enormous to the State; a particular rate of royalties, with so much charged for its water, so much for its electricity; all those imponderables will be spelt out for the company. The company will then proceed with the pilot stage, at the end of which it will decide whether to proceed or not, after this State has spent a lot of capital on the project. Now, the facts are that the State will have made a firm commitment of money and I'll bet my life the Indenture will not give guarantees of what production and return there will be in the mine.

Here is honest John. Is this not knocking? I ask you! The report continues:

John Bannon believes, from what he has heard at the Roxby Downs site, that Western Mining will in fact put the study 'on ice' in 1984 (at the end of the pilot study).

The indication here was that the project would not go ahead even if the Indenture went through (and the Labor Party did vote against it), that Western Mining would put the project on ice. Of Western Mining, Mr Bannon stated:

They will just sit back and watch the prices.

Referring to Mr Bannon, the report further stated:

As he sees it, Roxby Downs, far from being the saviour of the State's economy, could well be a total disaster, if money is spent on it without any commitment of return—money that he believes could well be spent on existing industry.

That was one of the more stupid statements, amongst a whole lot of very stupid statements made by the then Leader of the Opposition. The fact is that of course the Indenture tied the company down more strictly than it did the Government. The Government agreed to spend \$50 million on infrastructure normally provided by the State for schools, a police station and a hospital. Nothing else was involved—not the roads, the water or electricity. The company had to pick all of that up, and that was for a guaranteed production of 300 000 tonnes of copper per year. If the company produced only 150 000 tonnes of copper per year the Government would have spent only \$25 million. At this stage the

project is kicking off at about that size—a bit less. So, in 1982 money, all the Indenture required was that the State spend something less than \$25 million for an investment currently calculated by the company at \$850 million.

The Democrats got on this bandwagon, along with the Labor Party, and said that we were wasting the State's money and that we had promised too much. I would say that that is absolute garbage. It is completely false. The Premier's statements at that stage were completely false as he tried to knock this great project.

I remind the House of the efforts of that genius on the Labor side, Hugh Hudson, when he was negotiating the petrochemical plant which was announced *ad nauseam* year in, year out come election time, when the State promised \$300 million of infrastructure plus subsidised fuel prices to get that very doubtful project off the ground. If ever we were taken to the cleaners to try to get something going, it would have been with that petrochemical plant, in terms of what Hugh Hudson promised. When we came to Government, the first question I was asked was, 'Will you make the same promises?'

Promises having been made, I felt honour bound to keep them, but if ever we were spending a great heap of taxpayers' funds to simply get a project off the ground, it was when that ill-fated petrochemical plant was being proposed. Now this Government has the gall to suggest that because we were promising \$50 million of infrastructure for Government instrumentalities only—and it did not even include all of those undertakings: we were not going to pay for the roads, power or water—we were making promises and getting nothing from the company. What absolute hypocrisy! In the *Advertiser* of 9 December 1981 here is what was said by this Premier, this man who did not knock anything in Opposition:

One question mark is whether the royalties collected will exceed the interest payable on necessary public investment in services provided in that inhospitable northern region. If in fact the State has to pay out more to get the show on the road than it gets back in royalty payments, we are moving backwards, not forwards—

Mr Lewis: This is not knocking, it's sledging!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Then he has the gall to try to whip up public frenzy about the shadow Minister because he does not have the stomach to face a bit of opposition out in the electorate. The Premier said we were moving not forwards but backwards, and added:

And, as royalties are collected, we could lose tax-sharing funds from Canberra. The Government never refers to this. In the meantime, necessary public investment in 'people services' is already being cut back so finance can be provided for Roxby Downs services. Looked at in this light, the economic attractions of Roxby Downs are questionable, to say the least, whatever you think of dragging South Australia into the frightening world of nuclear power.

Here is an article about the Leader of the Opposition in the *Prospector* of December/January 1982 stating:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, said the Government was beginning to realise it was not going to 'get the Indenture up' in the February session. 'It is obvious there are further snags developing in the negotiations over Roxby Downs.'

This is a fellow who said we did not need an Indenture anyway. The then Leader is then quoted as saying:

The Government has not been able to secure the proper terms and conditions for the agreement, particularly because they are operating in a highly speculative area. Such is the political capital they have placed on this issue, they are anxious to get something before Parliament.

I repeat that if we had not got it through Parliament by 30 June 1982 there would be no Roxby Downs for the Premier to go and open this year; of that I am absolutely sure. Peter Duncan, writing in the March/April 1980 issue of *Bonython News*, an ALP publication, said:

Without discounting the very real problems involved, it seems clear that the main difficulties with solar energy are social and political, not technological. Finally, we should not forget that sunshine, unlike uranium, oil and coal, cannot be bought, sold and monopolised by the multi-national corporations.

I next quote from the Hon. Barbara Wiese writing in *Labor Forum*—Volume 2, No. 3—1980 as follows:

Mr Hayden foreshadowed the possible mining and exporting of uranium at a Sydney Journalists Club luncheon on Monday. He was asked whether contracts recently signed by the Ranger consortium and Queensland Mines would be repudiated, and if shareholders would be compensated. Although Mr Hayden repeated Labor policy that uranium exporting would be banned, he held out a carrot to uranium companies, saying he was an optimist and that he considered the question of safeguards and agreements to be 'technical problems'. 'I believe, given time, and I would hope not a great deal of time, they would be overcome,' he said. In those circumstances, the mining and exporting can proceed.

Is not history repeating itself? Here we have some of the more rational Federal Ministers suggesting that we ought to have a debate on uranium to come to terms with this nonsense of a policy which was hammered out to let Roxby go ahead, once it had got through Parliament, and which said that Roxby, Ranger and Nabarlek could go ahead—three mines and no others. It sacrificed Honeymoon and Beverley and further refining. That nonsense of a policy some of the more rational members of the Federal Government—notably Senator Button—are suggesting ought to be examined.

Where is the big boss of the ALP, Premier Bannon? 'Shove it off to a committee! Shove it off to a powwow!' He quoted me yesterday, and I even got on the front page of the *Advertiser*—surprise, surprise! My car got on a page a bit further back. 'Push it off to a committee. Sweep it under the carpet. Don't let's discuss it. It's too hot to handle.' that has been his approach to all development projects in this State since he has been Premier. If it gets too hot to handle, forget about it! To suggest that the legitimate questioning by the Opposition of some of the rules the Government is breaking to get one or two things going is holding up the development of the State—what cowardice! What gutlessness!

Let them reflect again on the absolute cowardice, underhand tactics and froing they used to try to stop Roxby Downs. Let it be there to their eternal shame, and let the Premier blush. When the Premier gets up and throws his chest out, let him blush and let him acknowledge that if it were not for Normie Foster—that leper in the Labor movement now—he would not be standing on that dais. If it were not for the Liberal Government and the fact that we got that Indenture through Parliament, no way in the world would he be standing there, and all the activity which that great project has generated over the years would never have come to fruition.

That is what the gutless approach of this Premier would have led to, and that is what the gutlessness he displayed in 1979, 1980 and 1981 would surely have led to. Never in a million years would that project have got off the ground under a Labor Government. Up went the Minister of Mines to open it. I do not get invited up there now.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Knocker? If it were not for old Normie and the fact that he had a bit of stomach (and I got on reasonably well with him), we would never have had the project: I can tell you that. I quote from a report in the *Australian* of 15 October 1980, as follows:

The ALP should make an objective examination of its uranium policy according to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He may do—he has not yet.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what Morgan is up to, but I know what the Government is up to. The Government is taking the credit for something which, if it had had its way, would never have got off the ground.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You had no option. You would have lost the election when it was called if you said it was not going ahead. If the Labor Party had had its way and carried the day, the project would have collapsed. I continue to quote:

'I don't think a major political Party has the right to be either alarmist or to react emotionally on an issue as important as this', he said yesterday. He was replying to a question after he had given a major energy speech to the South Australian branch of the Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia. Political observers described Mr Bannon's uranium comments as his strongest since he assumed the Labor leadership.

The Premier is not noted for strong comments. His forte is not strength: his forte is not leadership. His forte, as I have said before and as he quoted to the House yesterday, is for powwows: sitting down and having a powwow; having a conference; having a committee; having a group to tell the Government what to do or what not to do; sending off a committee to decide what to do with Jubilee Point after the investors have spent \$2.5 million—have a committee, mark you, have a think tank and come back and tell the Government that it should not proceed.

What sort of leadership is that? No wonder this State has the poorest developmental record of any bar none in mainland Australia. No wonder this is a leper colony for developers and investors. No wonder, when we get this gutless approach, this Government by committee, this Government by advice. Send them off, get some eggheads to come up with an answer which suits the political climate of the moment.

The Government does not have the courage of its convictions and does not decide what is good for the State. It shuts the door, sneaks off and hopes that the problem will go away. Finally, it appoints a committee to tell it what it should do. Later, the report continues:

Mr Bannon said it was now possible the mining of uranium could be placed in the 'safe' category. There were machinery techniques and technologies which allowed it to be seen this way.

What on earth is he up to? In one breath it is okay and in the next it is no good. It reminds me of the Hon. Dr Cornwall, who has left this gaping gap in the Labor ministry. That gaping gap does not reflect too well on the rather slim gentleman who has taken his place. The Premier sacked Dr Cornwall from the ministry and told him, 'Goodbye, Dr Cornwall. We no longer require your services. You have done nothing wrong, but you are fired.' How about the contradiction in that statement! The Premier says, 'We'll pay your fines and slander costs, but you are out of the ministry.' Then, because the tide is running against him at the conference last weekend, the Premier says, 'The absence of Dr Cornwall has left a yawning hole in my ministry.' Yet the Premier pushed Dr Cornwall out! What a reflection on the Hon. Frank Blevins! That was even before they had a barny at the conference. Dr Cornwall and Mr Norm Foster were members of a select committee of the Upper House that inquired into uranium development at that time. Norm, if nothing else, is honest.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether I can reply to that interjection. The word 'honest' is not the word that readily springs to my mind in regard to Dr Cornwall. Dr Cornwall and Norm Foster were on that select committee and heard much good evidence. Norm was con-

vinced that uranium mining could be conducted safely. I remember that the good Dr Cornwall made some slight public noises in the media. He just stuck his toe into the water and suggested that maybe uranium mining was safe. Then Dr Cornwall had a phone call from his Labor peers at Trades Hall and within a couple of days he was saying that uranium mining was the most hazardous thing that one could go into. I do not think that Norm made any secret of the fact that he despised the honourable doctor for his stand on this matter. Norm was convinced that uranium mining was safe and he was not going to vote to put people out of work. Indeed, the workers at Roxby Downs did not like the prospect of being thrown out of work as a result of the Labor Party voting 'No' in this House.

The Labor Party closed Honeymoon and Beverley quietly because only about 50 or 60 people were involved in those projects. When I asked a question after those mines were closed, I was told that jobs would be found for those people, but I never found out what jobs they got or what happened to them. Indeed, when I rang the company to find out, I was told that the Government had done nothing for them.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: That's not true.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall not be deflected from my point. The Labor Party was not fussed about closing Honeymoon and Beverley because they were small shows and it did not matter how small enterprises were treated. However, at Roxby Downs Labor had a problem with the Australian Workers Union and Norm Foster was an AWU man. I remember that at the State conference before the vote was taken Norm said that he had not yet voted to put people out of work, and the Government must have been worried because Norm was signalling to the public that he was not happy with his Party's stand on uranium mining and its opposition to the Roxby Downs project.

At the conference, Norm Foster said, 'I have never voted to put my members out of work and I am not inclined to do so now.' That statement must have sent a shudder down the Labor Party's spine. That is what he said. So, in due course Norm decided to resign from the Labor Party and support the Roxby Downs project because he was a man of integrity and was convinced by the arguments of the select committee. However, dear Dr Cornwall decided to stay with the mob, to pull his head in, not to make more pro-uranium noises, and to remain in the background.

Those are the events that led up to the present situation, yet we have this Labor Government trying to take the credit for a project that it would have sunk in the deepest sea had it had its way. A report in the *Advertiser* of 21 February 1981 shows how the Premier tried to sabotage the project. That report states:

... from a personal point of view I believe on masses of evidence that I have been able to examine over the past 15 months that we have probably reached the stage with the equipment that is available, the more sophisticated monitoring equipment and so forth, that you can say that it is relatively safe to mine, to process and to enrich uranium.

Yet, in 1982 the Labor Party voted against the Roxby Downs indenture because in the meantime the Premier and his colleagues had changed their minds. Indeed, the Premier has been all over the shop as regards this project and he is still all over the shop. The Labor Party has not been willing to deal with this issue on its merits and the Premier and his colleagues are still not prepared to deal with it on its merits.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In case the member for Fisher has forgotten, the honourable member sitting

alongside him wrote a long dissenting report saying that the project should not proceed because the uranium would be taken away and put into bombs. What has changed between then and now, when we are told that a drum of yellowcake can roll off a truck and there are no worries because it is safe? What has changed the honourable member's view? He and the hapless Minister for Environment and Planning were on a bus travelling to Andamooka and they would not get out of the bus to look at a ring of stones because by doing so they might offend the Aborigines. However, the Aborigines did not mind.

Those members went into the canteen at Roxby but did not spend much time there with the workers. They soon slunk off when they got the vibes. The member for Eyre will remember that there was a shop steward from Tasmania who told us that he had been a Labor man all his life but hopped into the Labor members who were going to vote against the project.

So, the Deputy Premier said in his dissenting report that the Roxby Downs project should not proceed because the radiological controls were unsatisfactory. However, nothing has been done to change those controls. Indeed, those controls complied with the three strictest codes on earth which were devised by the program governing their international recognition for radiation control.

The Premier should choke on his words if and when he opens Roxby Downs. We could blazon the statements that he made between 1979 and 1982 as Leader of the Opposition against the project. Those statements were made not only by him but by his cohorts and fringe dwellers. The member for Briggs fed reports to the media that were full of misrepresentation attempting to damn the project. Despite all that, here we have a Government which is seeking Supply so that public servants may be paid to monitor activities at Roxby Downs and which will bask in the glory of an opening ceremony for a project that it did everything humanly possible to stop. That was the toughest period of my political life because the opposition was fierce. The legitimate questioning from the—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can take it, it doesn't worry me. I can put up with a fair bit more than gets thrown from that side of the House.

Ms Gayler: How much longer are you going to be?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can see that you are enjoying it, so I will keep going. I like the Government to enjoy my remarks; it spurs me on to bigger and better things. The fact is that we have this whimpering, whining, and whingeing Premier, who has not had the guts to push on with some very significant developments in South Australia because there has been some opposition, suggesting that we in the Opposition are knockers and are to blame for the lack of development in this State. The Government's track record of dirty tricks, misrepresentation, plain opposition and votes in this House against the most significant development project in this State for decades indicates the height of hypocrisy in which this Premier is prepared to indulge.

Mr Becker: What about the member for Briggs?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact that the Labor Party did not promote him into the Ministry reaffirmed for me that within the Labor Party in some circumstances—it is very limited—there is a degree of maturity in its judgment. Not often, but occasionally, the Labor Party shows flashes of maturity by not promoting this man who did so much to damn and misrepresent that project—dirty play is the way I would describe it. The wonder boy did not get a guernsey and he will not get one before the next

State election. With those remarks I cheerfully support the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity of speaking to this Supply Bill which sets out to appropriate some \$995 million. My point in speaking in this debate is to again raise my concerns about the priorities of the Government. Out of a total budget of over \$4 000 million, the sort of projects which I have raised in this House over the past couple of days, which are of particular concern to my electorate, could be completed if the Government had the desire and the will to do so. It is only a matter of priorities. Look out the first floor window and see the amount of money that has been spent on the tank trap at the Festival Theatre. That amount would fix roads in the north of this State where some productivity is taking place, and it would provide an adequate water scheme for the people west of Ceduna who have been treated in a disgraceful manner by this Government. The Premier went there with his media circus in a publicity exercise. What has happened? About what Paddy shot at!

The people over there have absolutely nothing. The Premier had his photo put on the front page of the *Australian* with a person from Minnipa who was complaining about the Vegetation Clearance Authority. That person is still being treated in a disgraceful fashion. The last time I appeared before that authority I was appalled by the way that we were treated—absolutely appalled. One of the members picked up his papers six times—he was not even interested in what we had to say; he wanted to get going. It is within the Premier's control to do something about this situation, to see that there is a bit of justice and fair play.

People have been writing to the Minister of Agriculture about the severe drought conditions west of Ceduna seeking a little assistance for the agistment of stock and the carting of fodder. If the Government had the courage and was prepared to allocate \$500 000, it would solve the problem and give those people some chance of economic survival. But no—it spends \$500 000 to look after its friends, the State Opera. That is not even productive—it does not produce a damned thing of a tangible nature.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I have not come to that. The Government can put \$30 million into a white elephant in New Zealand. As I say, to someone who knows about company law, if a public company was to carry on in the fashion which the Government and those associated with the project has, it would have been charged under the Companies Code. They would have been charged, prosecuted, and barred from holding the office of director in a company for at least five years. Yet, they are still in place administering that white elephant. That is a disgrace to this Parliament and this Government. Millions of taxpayers' money have been appropriated, but those people in the isolated parts of the community, or those groups who do not have the ear of the media, are being squashed again. School buses are being taken away. People are checking up whether there are enough children on school buses, but I guarantee that not a bus would be touched in Fisher.

Mr Tyler: Yes, there is.

Mr GUNN: Let's see it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: We are talking about the \$995 million which this Supply Bill is appropriating. Let us go on a bit further. It is obvious that agriculture is the Cinderella department, because the Minister spends far too much time in recreation

and sport. The PSA said he should be shifted, and he is the one who approached the immediate past secretary of that organisation.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Good for what?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher will have an opportunity to join this debate.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member for Fisher's knowledge of most subjects is limited. His knowledge of agriculture could be written on the back of a postage stamp. The more he interjects, the more he indicates to the people of this State that his knowledge is of little value. It is a pity that he does not apply himself to a subject of which he may have some knowledge.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Fisher to order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: I am concerned about a number of issues affecting this State: first, there are two industries which will make this State—one is mining and the other is agriculture. As well, we need to have continued development and growth. Without development and growth we will continue to have the appalling record of the highest unemployment figures in Australia and, in particular, the highest figure of youth unemployment in this nation—something in excess of 20 per cent. That is an absolute disgrace.

In the areas for which I have been given responsibility on behalf of the Opposition, it appals me that this Government has such little knowledge of agriculture. It is making decisions which will have disastrous long-term effects for short-term gain. I spoke at some length last night about the decision to sell the Northfield Research Centre. I intend to say much more about this as this session proceeds because a great deal needs to be said in relation to that excellent facility which has assembled some of the finest research people in agriculture and associated areas that can be found anywhere in Australia. They are under attack by this Government because of this hasty and ill-conceived decision. Other groups are also concerned about this project, and I have received a letter from the Northfield High School Council. I think that this is an appropriate time to read the letter into *Hansard* because I agree with the sentiments expressed in it and that they are worthy of proper investigation in consultation with the Minister and the Government. The letter states:

Since 1979 the Council of Northfield High School has been seeking the allocation of a small portion of the Northfield agriculture land adjacent to the school to extend our agricultural studies courses. Correspondence has been forwarded to various Government departments, members of Parliament, and the Premier without success. Unfortunately, during this same period the value of the land has increased considerably, both from a monetary and a development perspective. The Minister of Education, Greg Crafter, in response to our April 1987 correspondence suggested that the school council consider obtaining a loan for approximately half a million dollars to purchase the identified land!

However, this is not within the financial capacity of this council or its parent bodies. Even in view of their generous current and past commitments, which is reflected in the quality of the facilities and of graduating students, and the full enrolment enjoyed by the school at a time of general decline—an indication that the school satisfies more than basic community needs.

Current agriculture activities within the school include, for example, horticulture, animal husbandry, viticulture, poultry and produce production as specific aids to curricular studies. It is anticipated that the additional land of approximately 4.4 hectares would enable the inclusion of broad acre and cereal production studies at least, within our curriculum as well. In addition, Northfield High School hosts the Australian Sheep Dog Trials each year. While Smithfield, Gawler and Kapunda also provide some agriculture studies, Urrbrae and Northfield High are the only schools within the inner metropolitan area which provide this service. While we realise that our courses will never compare

with those of Urrbrae's, we believe we have the potential to do better than we are at present if we can increase our facilities; and, indeed, perhaps we should do so to provide on the northern side of the city an opportunity which is so richly available at Urrbrae on the southern side. We believe we should request your reconsideration of our appeal again at this time, because redevelopment of this huge land holding along our eastern boundary seems to be imminent. We have a unique opportunity if we act now.

While there is some need to provide a major centralised education facility for agricultural studies, like Urrbrae, it would seem to be more cost effective to operate two sites on opposite sides of the city particularly as the value of the land surrounding the Urrbrae facility has a far higher value due to its close proximity to highly desirable residential suburbs.

I will not read the rest of the letter, because I believe that what I read clearly indicates the suggestions put forward by the Northfield High School are not only worthy of consideration but also should be given urgent attention by the Minister, the Government, and the Education Department. I am looking forward to inspecting those facilities so that I can further discuss them with those people who have written to me and a number of my colleagues.

In recent times members opposite have been very silent about the referendum questions on which we will have to vote on 3 September. I wonder whether they have considered the ramifications of the so-called one-vote one-value exercise. Are they aware that, if this question passes in the affirmative, it is probable that a redistribution of electoral boundaries of every Parliament will be required? That will cause chaos. People will not know who their member of Parliament is. It will cause extra expense, confusion, and dislocation. Further, it would be a completely ridiculous situation.

I hope that that referendum is soundly defeated and I am doing everything possible to ensure that that is the case. It is a great con that the Government is attempting to inflict on the community. The notion that one-vote one-value is a fair political system is absolute nonsense. If any person believes that it is fair, then obviously they have not taken the trouble to look at political history. In New South Wales Nick Greiner had to obtain 52 per cent of the vote in order to win. You call that fair! In South Australia the Liberal Party has to win more than 50 per cent of the vote. That is the so-called one-vote one-value system and that is not fair.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the naive member for Fisher, who will not be here after the next election anyway, thinks that that is a fair, reasonable, and just exercise, then he is deluding himself.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr DeLaine): Order!

Mr GUNN: I am happy to debate the issue with the member for Fisher on any platform he chooses, because he cannot justify the situation. The facts speak for themselves, and now his Federal colleagues will inflict electoral chaos on the States if the referendum question passes in the affirmative. Are members opposite aware that, if the one-vote one-value proposal is successful, electoral redistribution will be required for every Parliament? That is what the Federal Government is inflicting upon the people.

The other particular matter about which I am concerned is that there have been attempts by the Commonwealth Government to inform the people unfairly about the referendum in the material that has been circulated. I always thought that, when referendum questions were put to the nation, both sides of the case had to be given equal time and equal opportunity to be considered. It appears that the Commonwealth Government has broken the ground rules. If it wants to start those sorts of games, it will find that, in the future, others can repay the compliment. I believe that

it is dangerous to introduce such a precedent and to try and manipulate the system to the advantage of the Government. It will pay the penalty for that sort of political exercise. I say to those people like Mr Hullick, who races around the State and tries to keep all the local government people at the barrier, because they are jumping off his ship quicker than he can keep up with them—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Again, the honourable member has reflected on people serving in local government. It is people like the honourable member who delude the people about the true facts of this exercise which the Commonwealth is trying to inflict on them. Part of the exercise will involve paid councillors, compulsory voting and politics. The Labor Party will use its machine to manipulate and to enter into local government. I challenge the member for Fisher to deny that that is what it is about. That is the whole purpose of the referendum question relating to local government. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has been able to deceive a number of people—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am not interested in what the member for Fisher says. I know what certain people in local government are saying, because they attempt to big note themselves. I know the people involved and I know what Mr Hullick has said. I have no hesitation in saying these things to Mr Hullick's face. I will say it to you, Mr Acting Speaker: I refer to the conduct of the current Secretary-General of the Local Government Association when the minimum rate question was being discussed in Parliament. They deliberately deceived their own members and let their own side down, and I have little regard for what they did. I have a great deal of regard for the local government people in my own electorate with whom I have a close working relationship and for people who are untiring in their efforts on behalf of their local communities, but I strongly resent the misinformation and the misguided views that the Local Government Association is conveying to its councils, because politics has entered local government. If that is what the member for Fisher wants, let him go out and tell everyone. That is what we will have: politics in local government.

In relation to regional government, there will be no small councils like Carrington and Hawker. Rather, councils in Port Augusta, Whyalla, and those larger areas will dominate the countryside of South Australia. We will have the concept as it applies in Brisbane. It is about time that the Premier and the Minister of Local Government had the courage to tell the people about their real aims. Members opposite should read the speeches and lectures that Whitlam made some years ago, because the plan is set there.

Mr Lewis: And Hawke.

Mr GUNN: And Hawke and others. I will get those speeches for the benefit of the member for Fisher and I will read them to him.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Obviously, he did not understand them. In conclusion, I am concerned about the way that this Government has treated agriculture. I sincerely hope that the Government treats agriculture more realistically in the forthcoming budget.

I support the expenditure of \$995 million, and sincerely hope that there will be a change of direction by the Government so that those people in isolated communities receive fairer treatment than they have had in the past. I realise that there are not a lot of people living there, but they have rights like the rest of the community. I call on the Premier to give an assurance that there will be adequate road fund-

ing; no more cut backs on school buses; country hospitals will not be closed; the Laura, Blyth, and Tailem Bend hospitals will remain open; services will not be taken away; and other facilities needed will be given a fair hearing. I support the proposal.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Before I address the question of budgetary management by the Government I will briefly respond to comments made by the Minister of State Development and Technology today. During Question Time the Minister made a number of accusations about the sourcing of material that I had previously mentioned regarding the construction in Sweden of bow and midship sections of the submarines. I will read from the national security record, which summary was placed after the contract was signed with Kockums and ASC. It states:

The Australian Submarine Corporation's strategy for Australian industry involvement includes:

- Sourcing of equipment and material from Australia.
- Fabrication and outfitting of all sections of all submarines in Australia, mostly by sub-contractors.
- Final assembly of all submarines at the Australian construction facility.
- Submarine design work in Australia.
- Supply education and training.
- Introduction of a state of art, completely integrated management system.
- Co-ordination with Commonwealth needs.

That was the tender document that went forward when the Commonwealth Government agreed to Kockums' proposition. It was a strong selling point for the Australian Submarine Corporation, because other tenders had greater validity than the Swedish proposition.

Members must remember that Swedish submarines are not suitable for our design specifications—they had to be modified—whereas at least two other countries have submarines more suitable for our purposes. Therefore, their design rules were more applicable to the Australian situation. The reason the Swedes and Kockums in particular were successful related to two points, one being the promise of 70 per cent of the submarine contract being sourced to Australia. It included all of the items that I have just read to the House—every one of those items. We know that there has been a massive slippage in some of those items, not the least reason being the actions of unions at the ASC site.

When the Minister says that Mr Beazley says that we might have to build the midships and bow sections in Sweden, the Swedes were saying that unless we get our act together they will have to take away some of the contract work. That is exactly what happened. That is the vein in which the Minister for Defence passed the message down the line. We know that the Swedes had some difficulty in accepting that Australians could build the submarines. They said that they wanted to be a partner in the process and be involved. Importantly, they wanted to be assured that Australia was capable.

When it became evident that there may not be the appropriate response from Australian manufacturers, they then said to the Minister for Defence, 'Unless we get more cooperation and have more guarantees, we may have to build these components and parts in Sweden, we may well have to build the whole first submarine in Sweden, or the bow and midships section for all submarines in Sweden'. The warning was there. It was not that Mr Beazley had made up his mind that these parts would disappear—he was given a warning. The union movement in South Australia reacted accordingly, and showed its innate deficiencies, thereby affecting the submarine contract. That is the truth of the matter, and not what the Minister reported to

the House today. I have kept in touch with people who know something about this contract.

The Government has, over a period of time, tried to misrepresent the process of opposition in this State, and time and again we hear, 'Look, we had better share the blame'. The Government wants to take away the acrimony of failure. We are seeing the incredible spectacle of the Premier of this State standing up before the media and trying to blame the Opposition for his own failings. These matters will be debated when I address my substantive motion on 25 August. Let us not have any more of this. Let the Premier of this State, who has never taken responsibility in the past for his failings and now wants to spread the blame for the same failings, stand up before the people of South Australia and tell them the truth for a change.

The truth is that his Government is incompetent, his Ministers are incompetent, and they have failed to make the right decisions of benefit to this State. They are always on about the quick fix; they are always on about making a deal. When it gets a bit tough and they have to take on some of their friends, whether it be in the conservation or union movements, they are found lacking, irrespective of the benefits that would accrue to the State if a strong decision was made. We will obviously see more of this Premier standing up, when the heat is turned up by the press (which is very rare) and squirming in an attempt to spread the blame when indeed it belongs fairly and squarely in his court.

One of the important things about Supply debates is that they really relate to the process of Government. We saw an example today of the Premier saying, as he did before the ALP conference, 'Look what the terrible Greiner Government is doing over in New South Wales'. I am sure he will use the New South Wales excuse on a number of occasions. I warn the Premier that it will fall on fairly barren ground. I will outline to the House exactly what situation faced the Greiner Government upon coming to power in New South Wales. A State public sector audit has just been completed. The total liabilities of the New South Wales Government when Premier Greiner came to power totalled \$46,184 531 000. What an incredible record for a Labor Government! I guarantee that the Premier will not table that report before this Parliament. I guarantee that he will not because it represents a massive failure on behalf of the New South Wales Government, whether it be under Premier Wran or Premier Unsworth. They have indeed put that State into extraordinary debt.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, as my colleague the member for Chaffey says, it is bankrupt. I do not believe that any firm in Australia could sustain the debts now before the New South Wales Government. The present liabilities of the New South Wales Government total \$17 billion. Most of them are made up of employee provisions which have not been accounted for in the budget. That is the same message that I keep giving the Government. I put out a press release to indicate that the superannuation 3 per cent productivity claim was unfunded. For some reason it did not get a mention in the press. However, that superannuation, which is a handout to employees in the State public sector, will cost the State Government \$50 million in the first year. It is unfunded; it is not accounted for. Yet, every private employer who is involved in the superannuation 3 per cent productivity scheme has to make provisions from day one.

All employers are required by law to do that. But not the Government; it wants to accumulate debts. It will be \$50 million in the first year and then a theoretical interest is applied to that. So, within six years the rate of escalation

will be \$100 million a year. That is simply the rate of escalation and not the amount owing—which will be well over \$400 million. That is the debt that will be building up in the State Treasury. It mystifies me why that story has not been told.

In New South Wales that superannuation and a number of other areas of accumulated liabilities account for \$13 billion of the \$17 billion of current liabilities. But it gets worse. The total borrowings of the New South Wales Government are \$24.7 billion. One does not have to be a mathematical genius to work out that that is an extraordinary amount of money that is flowing out on interest each year. If it was at 10 per cent we would be talking about \$2.47 billion having to be provided each year to meet the interest debts. But, of course, interest rates are much higher, and it is more like 15 per cent on average borrowings, and so we are talking about \$4 billion each year having to be provided from taxes and charges to meet the interest bill.

After adding up the long-term leasing liabilities and other liabilities we come to a total of \$29.2 billion in non-current liabilities, and when those are added up we have a total liability of \$46.184 billion. Against that liability there is accumulated funds and reserves of \$17.7 billion. By my calculations, there is a shortfall of about \$28.4 billion. We will see teachers march. We may well see some other changes taking place in New South Wales which will not be to the liking of the populace.

How can governments continue to accumulate debts of that nature? How can they possibly provide the level of services and amenities demanded when the cost of servicing debt is so high and when no provision has been made for current liabilities? It is totally irresponsible, and that irresponsibility is reflected in the activities of the South Australian Government. It is totally irresponsible for governments to accumulate debts such as those I have described on the free wheeling and dealing undertaken to get elected and to then, at some stage, be unaccountable.

The former Government in New South Wales was accountable. Not only was it thrown out of office because basically it was corrupt but it could not work the State's transport system, in relation to which I understand the debt is of the order of some \$1 billion. It could not operate its hospital system. The Government could not operate anything properly in New South Wales. The level of service had deteriorated to such an extent that the Unsworth Government was resoundingly defeated at the last New South Wales election.

The day of accounting will come. The day will come when the media actually understands that a Government cannot continue to incur increasing liabilities and not make provision for them. It is not fair to the children of tomorrow. They should not have to pay the debts that we incur today. No-one in this Chamber would advocate that when we retire we should suddenly load our children with all our debts. Members in this House would not advocate that policy, and yet members opposite are very strong supporters of the former New South Wales Labor Government which was—

Mr Rann: Remember Howard's \$9 000 million deficit?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Briggs needs a new calculator. I would say, however, that the Hawke Government's performance has defied all description in accounting terms. If I remember correctly, when the Hawke Government came to power the national debt was some \$35 billion. I understand that it is now about \$115 billion. That is an extraordinary performance for such an apparently adept Government. In South Australia we have a Premier who

thinks along the same lines. He says, 'Let's accumulate the debts, let's give people what they think they want,' and he thinks that in so doing he can win elections. He says, 'Let's accumulate debt because we know that we will not have to pay for it; we know that someone else will have to pay for it.'

However, I would remind the House that, in terms of budget interest costs, in 1981-82 (the last full financial year that a Liberal Government was in power in this State) the level of interest paid out of the State budget was \$224 million, while in 1987-88 it is \$575 million. That is almost a three-fold increase in debt servicing by the Government. It has come about—and I do not think even members opposite would deny this—because of the grand borrowing experience of this Government. There is no capacity within the Government to call a halt; it does not give a damn that in 10 years today's children will have to face these debts.

The Premier talks about this magical deficit: he says, 'Well, when we came to power we had an accumulated deficit of \$65 million.' As an economist I suggest to the Premier and perhaps to the people who report these figures that that figure becomes fairly meaningless in terms of the capacity of the Government to have paid it off within the first year of Government, given the massive increases in taxes and charges that took place during the first year of the Bannon Government.

I will refer on another occasion to the debt structuring of this Government and the liabilities that have been incurred by the Government and about what price will have to be paid by future generations, particularly those who will be managing this State in the late 1990s and beyond. On this occasion I simply do not have sufficient time to go through the ledger of misappropriation by this Government. However, there will be another opportunity for me to do so, at which time I hope that someone somewhere in the media will tell the story to the State as it deserves to be told. We cannot afford to keep mortgaging our children's future. We need some responsibility in government.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I and other members on this side of the House support the funds which we are seeking in the course of this debate to appropriate for the purpose of ensuring the smooth conduct of Government business and good conduct in the administration of affairs in this State. In the process of making that statement of support, let me say how much I am appalled by the way in which the Government fixes its priorities in applying those funds. In recent times, in the course of a grievance debate and the Address in Reply, I have had the opportunity to put before the Chamber some of my concerns. I have now become aware of an even greater number of instances which need to be drawn to the attention of members so, in the shortest possible time, let me state quite simply the problems to which I hope some of these funds will be applied.

It is just not fair that Government instrumentalities and departments are allowed to nonchalantly and with complete impunity take their heavy vehicles out on to rural local roads and rip the guts out of them and tell local government bodies and local ratepayers that it is just too damned bad and they will have to pay the bill to repair them. On the eastern side of Keith over the past few weeks the Electricity Trust, during the construction of yet another high tension powerline to complete the grid for the interchange of interface transformers with the Eastern States electricity grid, has ripped the guts out of a road to such an extent that the locals cannot get to their properties—they simply cannot get along the road.

It is not as if the road must be traversed at two or three miles an hour or in a four-wheel drive vehicle because two-wheel drive vehicles would find it impassable—it is worse than that: the road has deteriorated to such an extent that one cannot get along it in a four-wheel drive Subaru. Vehicles become bogged and drivers are left to free themselves and meet the cost of doing so. Yet, in the process of making appeals to the Electricity Trust the Tatiara District Council has been told to fix the problem itself.

More particularly, the ratepayers who want access to their homes and properties have been told, 'Tough—you'll have to walk.' Is that fair? Is there any honourable member in this place who believes that that is the way in which Government should conduct its business when dealing with its citizens, that that is the way it should proceed as a matter of convenience for the majority here in metropolitan Adelaide who will enjoy the benefits (doubtful though they may be), of interface with the interstate power grids? Those people have to suffer. I do not think it is fair, and that is why I draw this matter to the attention of members.

I also have found in the past 24 hours that there is a proposal to close not only the Narrung police station but also the Narrung school. That school has been at Narrung for longer than I care to remember, and probably longer than most members in this place have been alive. The people of Narrung are concerned that the school is to close. I do not know what will become of the children who presently attend that school. I guess they have one of two options: first, to go to the Point McLeay school or, secondly, to be bussed all the way into Meningie. For young children from reception through Year 4 I think that is pretty crook. It would mean that some of them would have to leave home before 7.30 a.m., and it is unlikely that they would return home before 5 p.m. That strikes me as being pretty unreasonable. That was the sort of thing that I had to suffer: I do not believe that it is legitimate for children in this day and age to have to do that.

I also draw attention, on behalf of the people I represent, to the ridiculous proposition put forward by the Minister of Agriculture and referred to by the member for Eyre in the House today. I refer to the proposal to dispose of the Government land at Northfield. While the Government may own that land, most of the projects and the facilities and equipment used in the research or other investigative trials which are undertaken there are provided not at taxpayer expense but at the expense of the industries concerned. A deal may have been struck in some instances, where the Government agreed to subsidise the funds collected voluntarily by industries for the purpose of constructing those facilities. However, that does not mean that it is now legitimate for the Minister of Agriculture unilaterally—without consulting the Advisory Board of Agriculture or any farmer organisation anywhere which has contributed funds to those buildings and the establishment of research projects and trials—simply to scrap the lot. I can think of nothing more philistine.

I also draw attention to the inappropriate use of the moneys from these resources: it is to be applied to the Department of Environment and Planning and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. When I hear this Minister supporting the view that certain areas of land ought to be set aside for world heritage listing, I go back to my basic principles as to what is ideal in that regard and what is not, and on what criteria we ought to make such decisions. So, when I heard the proposal that we should lock up thousands of square miles of the Nullarbor as a world heritage listing area, I thought 'For what purpose? Why are we doing that today? What will the proposal mean?'

Certainly, it will mean that we will have to outlay more money from what we are appropriating in this instance to effectively and responsibly manage the area, but it sickened me to hear people who are supported by the Minister claim that it is an absolutely pristine area, that it is beautiful and unsullied, as though no-one has ever walked across it. Maybe that is the case and people have not been there, but it certainly bears no resemblance whatsoever to the composition of native flora and fauna found there prior to European settlement. That has been utterly screwed up by the invasion of rabbits in the past 100 years and the destruction they wrought on the native flora and fauna through the competition they posed as feral animals. In fact, the balance between rare species of native flora and fauna which occupy that area has been destroyed. I can think of nothing more ridiculous and wasteful on which to spend taxpayers' money. We should be spending it on the kinds of things to which I have alluded.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the short time available this afternoon I wish to refer to the expenditure on our ports and harbours and, in particular, my concern for the maritime fleet which uses those facilities. For some years Australian shipping has been under pressure and, to illustrate that, I will refer to some of the information provided to me about this problem by the Seamen's Union of Australia. Australia is a great trading nation in world terms, but it is no longer a trading power because it is not a maritime power. Over the years that power has been eroded. Australia is an island continent, so most things that we need to sell to, or buy from, other nations must come by sea.

I believe that we are the twelfth largest trading nation in the world and the fifth largest exporter in gross tonnage. Despite these figures, I understand that less than 4 per cent of our exports and imports are carried by Australian flagged vessels. That means that 96 per cent of our trade to and from our shores is heavily reliant on foreign flagged ships. This has an effect on our balance of payments, because the freight paid to overseas shipping, I believe, comes to about \$5.3 billion. That goes overseas to the ports of register and foreign owners.

Many of these ships which carry our cargo come from flag of convenience countries and they owe no allegiance to anyone. Ships are registered in these countries because of the concessions available to ship owners with respect to the operation of their ships. In many cases they operate sub-standard ships and their seamen are from areas where conditions are not as stringent as they are in Europe, Australia and America.

Unfortunately, because of this difference in the manning and conditions of shipping, pressure has been brought to bear on Australian ships over the years to take adjusting action. The Industries Assistance Commission has considered the matter of coastal shipping, and its draft report deals with using flags of convenience shipping to service our coast, but that would have a greater effect on the Australian situation and bring about the deregulation of coastal shipping. Significantly, most of the serious maritime casualties and disasters of recent years have concerned ships under flags of convenience, for example, the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Amoco Cadiz* with their massive oil spills.

The export earnings of ship operators in 1986-87 totalled \$4.52 billion, and nearly all of that went overseas. The foreign shipping companies pay no Australian tax and very little in Australian salaries. Some of these companies operate in this country, but most of the income of ships sailing under flags of convenience goes overseas. If we do not employ Australian operators and give jobs to Australian

seamen, whose families and kids live here and whose life is invested in this country, they will not be able to pay their taxes and support themselves and Australia.

An interesting example of Australian cargo being carried on an Australian ship is the case of the *Island Pacific*, of 231 850 tonnes. This Australian ship was instrumental in helping the steel industry in Newcastle lift its game by modifying the cost of moving iron ore to that operation. The positive situation in the shipping industry is that the officers, seamen, cooks and others who comprise that industry are aware of the dangers and are making positive approaches and taking positive action to improve the situation.

These efforts have included the reorganising of crew duties so that the crew works as a team. Attempts have been made by means of better career prospects and training projects to make the job worthwhile. The number of unions has been reduced and fewer crew members have been employed to man each ship. In this way all those engaged in the shipping industry have shown themselves willing to make sacrifices and adjustments so that their occupation may be preserved.

One criticism made is that crews cost too much to operate Australian ships, but that is not true today. One method whereby costs have been reduced is the employment of the two-crew system. After all, this works on land at such places as Moomba where one crew is flown up to relieve another crew which then returns home for a spell. So, this is an accepted principle of work today and its implementation presents no outstanding difficulty in the case of shipping.

Crew members on the *Canopus* have contacted me. Australian crews account for only 14 per cent of the average operating costs of a vessel. It has been estimated that half the freight costs of a ship go to pay port authorities. Such authorities include our own Marine and Harbours Department which boosted its fees only recently and has boosted them every year for the past few years. Stevedoring costs in port also represent a substantial part of the total cost of shipping. These statements are supported by an article in the *Weekend Australian* of 23 January 1988. Australian ships are manned under Maritime Industries Development Committee standards. That committee which comprises representatives of shipowners and unions, ensures that the operation of Australian shipping is in line with similar organisations in OECD countries.

In fact, an Australian vessel with 21 men would be less costly than a 16-man crew on a Japanese ship. That is supported by an article published in the *Daily Commercial News* of 1 July 1987. The Maritime Industries Development Committee has set up a system of flexible crews, including members below decks, engine room personnel, pantry men, and deck crew. The system is changing and the crews are prepared to work flexibly as a unit. For example, five years ago there were seven unions at sea, whereas today, with the recent amalgamation of the Seamen's Union and the Maritime Stewards Union, there are only three operating at sea, and there is a likelihood of that number being reduced further. As is happening in many other countries such as Japan, the movement is towards a single union. Such a trend must surely help reduce costs and make the manning of ships more effective.

Industrial action in the shipping industry has been drastically reduced since 1982 when 1 593 days were lost, until only 14 days were lost in 1986. Those figures are supported by an article in the *Weekend Australian* of 23 January 1988. So, there has been rationalisation in the industry. The size of ship crews has been reduced by about one-third since the 1960s. With the modification of labour, most crews will number 20 or fewer by the end of the century. Australian

seamen pay taxes and spend their wages in this country, whereas foreign seamen generally do not. The Seamen's Union says that, because 96 per cent of the export and import trade is carried under foreign flags, there is a trade deficit of over \$2 million and that figure is still growing. That was the figure some years ago, so it could now be well out of date.

If we had more shipping, our trade deficit would fall. The Industries Assistance Commission is considering our coastal shipping. If foreign ships are allowed on our shores, between 4 000 and 5 000 Australian seamen out of a total of 9 000 will lose their jobs. This would result in the loss of up to \$200 million in wages, which would mean that the Federal Government would lose substantial tax revenue. In this regard we must also consider the shore jobs that go with the shipping trade. As many as 500 related jobs, such as ship repairing and provedoring, could be lost. The Seamen's Union says that, if we use foreign flagships and foreign seamen to do the work around the Australian coast, it is almost the same as bringing in foreign employees to work in a South Australian factory and having them paid different rates of pay under different conditions from Australians who are working nearby. In fact, this issue has been picked up in the current immigration debate. So, these people are fearful—

Mr Becker: Many people may lose their jobs.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, people fear that they may. That may not be true but people see it that way. Another matter to be considered is how rail subsidies disadvantage coastal shipping. I remember in the 1970s when cellular container ships were trading very well on the coast of this country, but they have gone. It was interesting to see that within a matter of months of those ships being taken off the run, freight rates went up by 30 per cent. So, this shows that they acted as a freight rate rationaliser.

The Australian National Line, which was our major Australian shipping line and the largest coastal operator in Australia, has only one coastal vessel left. In the past few years the ANL has requested a massive financial injection to save the line. Traditions and matters in relation to the maritime industry and shipping have to be looked at. It is important for an island nation such as ours to have ships. The problem in the balance of trade could be rationalised by the use of our own ships—money would come back into the country. I refer to the strategic situation.

None of us wants to worry about strategy, but we do in times of crisis and disaster in this country. I remember when the Darwin situation arose and we looked at the proposal of bringing in overseas ships to provide accommodation and take goods and materials to that city. I believe that the Seamen's Union has a good point and I intend to go further with this matter and introduce legislation during private members' time to support the union and the industry and to expand Australian shipping because it is a very important factor in the future of an island nation.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this Supply debate I wish to link my remarks to corporate affairs. Members are aware that the Federal Attorney-General (Hon. Lionel Bowen) has made overtures to the States to refer State company law to the Federal Government. Various attitudes have been taken on this matter and I understand that the South Australian Government is prepared to acquiesce in his wishes in certain circumstances. Those circumstances have not yet been met, but in the future it is possible that they will be and that we shall see company law coming under the umbrella of the Federal Government. Therefore, the special committee of inquiry which has been

established by the Senate to look at the duties of company directors bears special significance to what may or may not happen in South Australia.

In recent times the Australian investing public has seen some quite extraordinary events as far as the sale of shares is concerned in the Bond and Bell groups of companies in Western Australia. We have seen the extraordinary spectacle of a director of the Bell group of companies admitting on television that he had no idea of the decisions which had been made in his company and that the Chairman of the Board had apparently been making decisions without referring those decisions to the directors for managerial approval.

The events which commenced an inquiry from Henry Bosch into the activities of these two companies eventually meant that the Bond group of companies had to make a further bid to the rest of the minority shareholders in the Bell company, at the same price of \$2.70 per share which was offered to the Chairman of Directors for his shareholding. Notwithstanding the fact that the final result will mean that all shareholders will be treated equally, there appears to be a very large gap in our company law which would allow a Chairman of Directors to contemplate the sort of activity that was contemplated in this set of circumstances. I believe that the Senate Inquiry is also looking at what personal responsibility directors have in relation to the decisions that they make. There has been some suggestion—

Mr BECKER: A point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I fail to see what this has to do with the Appropriation Bill before the House. I appreciate what the member is saying. As a shareholder of the Bell group I am waiting for my cheque to come from the Bond Corporation, but I cannot see what this has to do with the Appropriation Bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine): It is a Supply Bill, not an Appropriation Bill, and the honourable member can link his remarks as he sees fit, but I ask him to narrow his field down somewhat.

Mr FERGUSON: I do not think that the members of the Opposition could have heard my opening remarks because what is happening in this set of circumstances may directly reflect on South Australian legislation and on what may happen to directors of companies in South Australia. This, of course, will have a direct effect on the appropriation to the Corporate Affairs Commission.

Mr BECKER: A further point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I cannot see the link with the appropriation legislation and I ask that you rule that the honourable member is not talking to the Bill before the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I think I can see a reasonable link, but I ask the honourable member to try to narrow it down a bit further.

Mr FERGUSON: Recent legislation has imposed new rules, higher penalties and gaol for wrongs that directors may commit. It appears that the law is very lenient on unqualified and lazy directors. In fact, it has been said that it is better to be an unqualified lazy director than a highly qualified diligent one. In this respect the law has not kept up with the modern business practices and remains locked in the past. Some of the rules might seem more appropriate to the 1890s than the 1980s.

During the latter part of last century, neither the law, nor apparently a sense of obligation, persuaded the Marquis of Bute to attend to his company's affairs. The Marquis had inherited the office of President of the Company (a bank) when he was just six months old. During the next 38 years he showed little interest in company affairs. He attended only one board meeting. During some of these years frauds had been perpetrated by bank officers. Crimes were made possible by failure to observe statutory rules. The liquidator

of the company considered the Marquis remiss in his duties and sought to make him liable for neglect. The court of Chancery hearing the case thought otherwise. Mr Justice Stirling stated:

Neglect or omission to attend meetings, is not . . . neglect or omission of a duty which ought to be performed at those meetings.

The case was a further confirmation of a view that it was better for a director to stay away from meetings than attend and be inattentive. It is arguably still the law today. By contrast, in the United States failure to attend meetings is no excuse.

Almost anyone can still legally become a director in Australia. The person must not be under 18, bankrupt or guilty of other specified offences. A person more than 72 years old may not be a director unless certain conditions are fulfilled (for example, a resolution appointing him or her must be passed by at least three quarters of the members voting).

Apart from these exceptions, there is almost an open field of persons eligible for appointment. In some ways the more skill a director has the greater his or her potential for committing a breach of a director's duties. A director need show no greater skill than may 'reasonably be expected of a person of the director's skill or experience'. A director can also rely on other officers or experts and is not bound to give continuous attention to the affairs of the company. So, the following position put by Trebilcock in 1969 appears to be the law:

It is unfortunately the case that the fewer a director's qualifications for office, the less time and attention he devotes to his office, and the greater the reliance he places on others, legally the less responsible he is.

There have been moves in Australia to increase directors' duties of diligence. States in the United States impose an objective standard of care. The standard of care in most States is that of a 'reasonable director', while others impose a stricter standard: 'that which would be exercised by a prudent person in his own affairs'. Neither of these standards has been adopted in (or even adapted to) Australia. As the law currently exists in Australia, a director's duties include:

1. A duty to act honestly and in the best interests of the company.

This duty is to act only for the interests of the shareholders as a whole. There is no duty to act in the interests of employees unless the duties of the employees and shareholder coincide. In fact, a director should not act in the interest of employees if such action is against the interests of the shareholders. This can lead to results that seem to adversely affect society. For example, in *Dodge v. Ford Motor Co.*, Henry Ford was halted in his proposal to plough back company profits in order to increase employment and 'spread the benefits of the industrial system to the greatest possible number'. Two shareholders successfully forced a payout in increased dividends. The court ruled that the board's prime duty was to the shareholders. A director, however, may owe a duty to creditors of his company. It now seems to be the law that directors of insolvent companies must act in the interests of creditors. Directors of solvent and financially stable companies would seem to still owe their primary duty to shareholders.

Directors of particular companies may owe a duty to other groups. For example, directors of a trustee company owe a duty to beneficiaries of the trust. Directors of a company that belongs within a group of companies evidently still owe their primary duty to that company. This appears to be the case, even if the company is wholly owned by another. The law also states:

2. The directors also owe a duty not to allow their personal interest and duty to conflict.

Directors may in some circumstances provide funds, security or a guarantee to the company at a profit. To do so properly, however, they must obtain the sanction of the shareholders; otherwise, they are in breach of their common law duty and will be liable to account to the company for their profit. Directors are under a duty not to use the power of dealing with themselves to their own advantage.

Some of a director's duties are laid out in the Companies Code. Relevant sections are 228 to 235 and 237. The primary provision of section 228, to some extent, recounts the common law. Subsection (1) provides:

A director of a company who is . . . directly or indirectly interested in a contract shall, as soon as the relevant facts have come to his knowledge, declare the nature of his interest to a meeting of the directors of the company.

This requirement is cumulative on any other of the director's fiduciary duties (that is, the duty to act in good faith).

It would appear that the United States is far more advanced in the protection of shareholders' rights as far as the company structure is concerned than is Australia. It can be argued that a director can escape his responsibility merely by disassociating himself from the decisions which are taken at a meeting by non-attendance. If one is to contrast this situation with, say, a trade union executive where the law specifically sheets home the responsibility for decision making on the executive body of that organisation, whether or not they attend, in certain circumstances, then we can say that the Senate Committee of Inquiry into the Activities of Directors is a very necessary investigation.

I have referred to the increase in statutory responsibility placed on directors, which in some quarters has been described as taking away the fun of being a director. Noted business writer, Pierpont, recently stated that he was 'fully sensible of the harrowing conditions endured by fellow directors'. He stated that directors 'suffered' for their calling by 'grinding through four hour lunches, livers menaced by cirrhosis, and surviving weeks in the living hell of first-class international hotels'.

Nor are fees and perks a director's only compensation. Pierpont also noted that the directors of two companies (the directors were identical in each case) could have made, and probably did make, millions on options for shares offered to them at a price guaranteed below the market rate. So any Australian directors in title only may still receive something for nothing.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I propose first to refer to your statement last Thursday, Mr Speaker, about the conduct of Question Time. You said that you had been concerned about the gradual diversion of Question Time away from its original purposes and the Opposition agrees that this has happened. The purpose of Question Time is for members, particularly Opposition members, to raise issues of current or relevant concern and for the Government to impart the information requested by each question, but continually and consistently the Premier, in particular, has refused to do this. I will say more about that in a moment, but first I refer to the timing of your statement.

You commented on the nature of explanations given in asking questions. On the day prior to your statement the Opposition asked nine questions, five of which—more than

half—were not accompanied by an explanation. On the same day, the Government also got up some nine questions: all but one had an explanation. If there is criticism to be levelled at any side for the nature and length of explanations, it lies with Government members. Opposition members have made a practice this session, when explanations have been necessary, to keep them short and completely relevant to the question. This is an example I invite you, Mr Speaker, to note.

It is only possible to conclude, based on the experience of this session so far, that your remarks last Thursday were directed more at Government members, including Ministers. If we look at the ministerial answers, we find that more often than not the answers have either refused to address questions (where they have come from the Opposition) or have been used as deliberate political point-scoring attempts by Ministers responding to Government members. For example, on both Tuesday and Thursday last week the Government attempted to question the Opposition's attitude to the referendum questions.

If this was not enough, the member for Fisher also wasted a grievance debate on the same issue. It is not surprising that these attempts rated not a line in the paper. Not only were they pathetic, they were a complete waste of time as well. If we consider the Premier's contribution to this farce last Tuesday, he was asked a question by his former Press Secretary. I invite the House to note the actual question. The member for Briggs asked:

Does the State Government officially support the 'Yes' case in all four referendum proposals, even if the success of the 'Yes' case involves an electoral redistribution before the next State election?

Now, I defy anyone to find in the Premier's answer, which went on for well over five minutes, any reference or direct answer to that question. There is no statement by the Premier of the Government's intention.

There is a recall of the recent history of the public debate about electoral reform in South Australia, and references to the work of the Constitutional Commission, to John Howard, Maggie Thatcher, former Premiers Dunstan and Hall, electoral boundaries in Queensland, the fate of the Whitlam Government and my term as Mayor of Kadina. But there is not one word in direct answer to the question of whether he will initiate an redistribution of electoral boundaries if the referendum returns a 'Yes' vote on the question relating to this issue.

Of course, if the Premier does not directly answer questions from a person as close to him as the member for Briggs, the Opposition can hardly expect any better treatment. In fact, we fare much worse. It is rare, indeed, that we get any answers from the Premier. Take, for example, the brief and to the point series of questions we asked the Premier about the former Minister of Health. On the first day of the session the member for Victoria asked the Premier whether he would give a guarantee not to support the former Minister's return to the Ministry in the next Cabinet reshuffle. The Premier replied that the answer to the question could be found in a press statement he had already made on this matter. But his press statement made no reference to that point at all; it contained no answer. It did not say whether the Premier would support the former Minister's return to Cabinet, which had been the point of our question. Last Tuesday, the member for Morphett asked this precise question:

On what date did Cabinet first approve an indemnity for the former Minister of Health, and was that indemnity conditional on the former Minister making an apology to Dr Humble?

Being deliberately evasive, the Premier chose to ignore the question and, instead, to refer to the indemnity the Cabinet

gave the former Minister on the day he resigned. The point of our question was to establish the fact that, had the Premier, in originally discussing this matter with the former Minister in 1986, insisted that the Hon. Dr Cornwall apologise to Dr Humble as the price of any indemnity, taxpayers would have been saved a great deal of money.

Last Wednesday, the member for Morphett pursued this question of an apology by the former Minister, asking the Premier to reveal the terms of an apology offered by the Hon. Dr Cornwall in 1986 so that taxpayers could determine whether that apology had been appropriate in view of the facts subsequently established during the trial. Again, the Premier did not answer the question. If the Premier had been firmer with the former Minister from the start, taxpayers would not now be facing a bill of more than \$200 000 for his irresponsibility.

I also refer to a question asked last Wednesday by the shadow Minister of Housing and Construction. He wanted to know why the Premier believed it was appropriate for the former Minister of Health to resign from Cabinet when he had also signified, by providing the Hon. Dr Cornwall with an indemnity, his belief that the former Minister had been acting reasonably in his capacity as a Minister when he slandered Dr Humble. This is one of the key questions the public is asking out of this whole affair. Why is the Hon. Dr Cornwall no longer a Minister, if taxpayers are paying his costs and damages?

The Premier cannot have it all ways. Does he believe, in fact, that a member of his Cabinet is acting reasonably and responsibly in the course of his or her ministerial duties by calling a press conference, defaming an innocent citizen, refusing to apologise afterwards, then using the resultant trial as a political exercise? On Saturday, at the ALP Convention, the Premier showed that these are the standards of ministerial behaviour he is now endorsing. He seconded the motion of support for the former Health Minister. He effectively answered the question he had ignored in this House.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall is entitled to assume that he has an automatic right of re-entry to the Cabinet at Christmas time. I do not believe that he deserves any such present. No member of the Party in Government is entitled to lecture this House about standards of behaviour and attitude to Question Time when this Government is prepared to condone the behaviour of the former Minister of Health.

In response to your statement, Mr Speaker, the Opposition will continue to believe that we do not get a fair go in this Parliament while the Premier maintains this attitude to accountability and to legitimate questioning. The Premier and his Ministers are just not prepared to be accountable to the public through this Parliament. We even have the extraordinary state of affairs now where the Premier tries to hold the Opposition responsible for some of his Government's major failings. He tried to blame the Opposition for the Cabinet decision to indemnify the former Minister of Health. He claimed that, had we given our agreement to guidelines for handling matters like this, the controversy would not have arisen. How the Opposition can in some way be blamed for the legal costs taxpayers now face, arising from the consistent failure of the Hon. Dr Cornwall to hold his tongue, defies even the most flexible imagination.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: He had more than two chances, particularly during the trial. Now the Premier says the Opposition is to blame for the lack of development in South Australia. Yesterday he was being very kind and said that we are all to blame for the lack of development in South Australia.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Exactly. The Opposition would be quite happy to take over the responsibility for helping to attract more investment in South Australia. In Government in the past, we have done this much better than Labor, as I showed in my Address in Reply speech yesterday. In Government after the next election, we will do so again. But, in the meantime, the Premier should stop thrashing around for excuses. Trying to blame the Opposition will only compound the problem. It will only confirm the weakness of his approach to this vital matter.

This is the core of the problem: a lack of leadership, a lack of resolve, a lack of consistent principles and policies which potential investors can look to in making their long-term commitments. Indeed, no-one more than the Premier has done more over the last decade to divide the South Australian community on this issue. His attempts to subvert the Roxby Downs development are well known.

I remind the House of some of his other attempts to impede and oppose development in South Australia, and encourage interstate and international investors to have a negative attitude about South Australia. I refer, first, to the O-Bahn system. In a press release he issued on 25 August 1980, the present Premier described the former Liberal Government's decision to choose the O-Bahn system as 'cheap and short-sighted'. He said O-Bahn was 'totally untried, cumbersome and fairly inefficient', that it has 'many technical problems which had not yet been resolved', and that there was doubt 'whether O-Bahn could cope with the numbers of passengers that had to be hauled'.

What the Labor Party wanted instead was a system which would have cost twice as much in capital cost as the O-Bahn. But, of course, all this did not stop the Premier from officially opening the first stage of the O-Bahn in March 1986, when he said:

This system has the potential to increase its passenger capacity to meet foreseeable future demands, so it can continue to soak up demand for transport and arterial road space in the long term.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: It is what you call flexibility.

Mr OLSEN: I think hypocrisy would be a better way to describe it rather than just straight flexibility. Another major development pursued by the former Liberal Government was the Stony Point liquids project. Here again, the Premier whinged and whined about that project. In a press release of 5 February 1981, he called for more evaluation before a firm decision was made. Had we waited for his support, the project would not now be returning millions of dollars in royalties for the benefit of all South Australians. And need I say it, the Premier did not hesitate to open this project as well when it was completed.

His attitude to this whole question of development, before he became Premier, was so negative and destructive in regard to South Australia's long-term interests that he once published a document describing South Australia as the 'branch office State'. That was in March 1981. Interestingly, in his contribution to the current development debate, published in the *Advertiser* last Saturday, the Secretary of the Metal Workers Union, Mr Tumbers, used the same terminology. He said, 'We are branch offices of companies which operate in other States or overseas.' Here was Mr Tumbers adding his agreement to what is becoming readily apparent, namely, that under the present Government South Australia has gone backwards.

Yet, the Premier's only response is to call pathetically for the resignation of a shadow Minister, when no-one has contributed more than he has to the anti-development attitudes in Adelaide over the past decade. The Premier has been without courage, commitment or consistency in his whole approach to this issue. Now he is becoming desperate as the next election approaches. Not only did he try to

blame the Opposition for the Hon. Dr Cornwall's behaviour and for a lack of Government leadership in the development debate but he also devoted a considerable part of his address to last weekend's ALP convention to what a Liberal Government would do in South Australia after the next election.

Government leaders who are confident of their own performance and who do not feel threatened by the Opposition are not diverted like that. But the Premier knows that, increasingly, South Australians are losing confidence in his Government. They believe that the Government has failed to provide decisive leadership on key issues like development and like upholding proper standards of ministerial behaviour—and there are others.

A major issue concerns protection of the family. Once, there was a recognition that the family was the foundation, the basic building brick of society. The family was seen as a unit within which to obtain strength and comfort, to seek guidance, to learn right from wrong, to appreciate the need to balance our rights as individuals with our obligations and responsibilities, to protect our own property and to have respect for that of others, to receive encouragement to work hard at school, to understand that reward will come if the effort is put in first, and to pursue tolerance and cooperation.

At one time the teacher and the police officer were friends of the family. The teacher's role, indeed right, to impose discipline when necessary was supported. However, now teachers have little control over deliberately disruptive students. Younger people were encouraged to respect the firm word of the friendly policeman on the local beat. Now, too many regard the police simply as enemies. These are just some symptoms of community fragmentation, of declining respect for our neighbours and our basic institutions. There are others, such as the rapidly rising crime rates, uncontrollable drug abuse, and the presence of AIDS in our community. These are all symptomatic of family and certainly community breakdown.

Labor has ignored the social and economic value of people being encouraged to meet and to maintain family responsibilities. Labor's tax policies mean that much more of a family's earnings are confiscated, eroding its range of choices and weakening family responsibility. In the health area, Labor has lessened each family's control over, and therefore its sense of responsibility for, health services. It has attacked the direct relationship between providers and consumers, which once ensured better targeted, better value and higher quality services.

In education, Labor has reduced parental choice, both within and between the Government and non-government school systems. This Government's attitude to school discipline is a further denial of choice to parents. In social welfare, there are far too many instances where present structures encourage families to break up rather than to stay together. Many members of this House would be familiar with complaints from parents whose 15 year olds have been told that they can leave home because the Government will look after them.

Labor policies, which have left interest rates at record levels have denied many families the opportunity of home ownership and, therefore, have further weakened family ties. The rigidities in our industrial relations system, which Labor is determined to retain, prevent the wider use of more flexible work patterns and therefore prevent many women, in particular, having hours of work which are more appropriate to their family needs. These attacks on the family come from a combination of Federal and State responsibilities, but they are the direct result of Labor pol-

icies, which every Government member in this House is forced to support.

It is time that South Australia again had a Government which recognises the central importance of families to individual and community welfare. It is time that the basic values that only families can pass on from one generation to the next are once again brought to bear on Government policies and decisions. If we do this, if we ensure that in all areas of Government policy-making the interests of families are considered, we will again foster an environment in which individual responsibilities can be met and in which families can flourish and prosper. Certainly, at the next election—

Mr Robertson: Oh, good grief!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr OLSEN: At the next election, the Liberal Party will certainly be fighting for the rights of the family. We will raise as a major election issue family rights and the matter of Labor's neglect of them. To do anything else would be to put further at risk the quality of life in South Australia. The Labor Government wants families to have less responsibility so that it can have more control over our everyday lives.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, the policy direction of members opposite clearly indicates that that is the case. The next Liberal Government will encourage families to seek and accept more responsibility. The framework of our policy direction will achieve that objective. This will ensure that people are more free and that they have much more incentive to pursue their own aspirations. We will once again see that the family becomes the basic unit of society. We will reverse policies which compound problems rather than assisting and supporting families. We will assist families facing difficulties. We will ensure a responsible balance between the rights and obligations of parents and children. Above all, we will fight for the value, the integrity and the quality of family life.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Victoria.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Well, I can assure the member for Briggs that he would never be a danger, at any stage during his career in this Parliament, however short it might be.

Mr Robertson: A shining star.

An honourable member: Is he naturalised?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank goodness that we believe in the 'one Australia' policy.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, when you have control of the House, I wish to raise a very serious financial matter, which is of deep concern to all members of this Parliament. It relates to the circular regarding the *Government Gazette*, which has emanated from none other than the Speaker of this House, and which was distributed to all members of the House of Assembly. There is a sort of mark I and mark II, and it depends on the advice the Speaker has been given from the Treasurer.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, I did not know that, but when I came to this prestigious House I had as my inheritance from the former member 30 people on the *Hansard* mailing list.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: More than the 30 people voted for me or else I would not be in here. Coming from a different background from some of the members on the other side of the House, I assiduously went through that list and took off those people who I thought, because of the great cost to the taxpayer, did not really deserve or need *Hansard*, and culled the list from 30 to 17. I thought that was my first stroke of genius in helping this Government to look after taxpayers' money, and I felt very happy with that. That was \$1 800 in one stroke, so I felt happy with that and I thought that, as I go along in this position, each year I might add to that list the people in my electorate who are interested in getting *Hansard* and in reading some of the more generous things which are said in this place and some of the more factual. I would hazard a guess that not many of them come from the other side of the House. It became obvious to me when mark I of the Speaker's circular was issued that, somehow, my acting in a responsible manner was putting me at a disadvantage. So I wrote a letter to the Speaker, but when I arrived yesterday I got the Speaker's circular mark II. What I really wanted to do—

Mr Becker: Are you looking for mark III?

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, I am not looking for mark III. What I want to do is show how the Speaker has been put in an absolutely untenable position by the Treasurer of this State and by officers under him, no doubt, who cannot even advise the Speaker of the House what *Hansard* costs or how we can take some people off and put some on, and this most prestigious Speaker is put in a position where he not only has to eat humble pie but has to issue the sort of circular he has been forced to put out—and I really feel for him. What I thought I would do in the time available—

Mr Becker: You are not reflecting on the Chair?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Of course not—I am reflecting on the Treasurer. The situation is absolutely ridiculous. Being a great believer in the Westminster system of government—although some of the members opposite are trying to drag that down—I thought I would read a little of the history of the Speaker in the House of Commons. I quote:

The roll of Speakers, from Sir Thomas Hungerford, who was appointed Speaker in 1377 and was the first to be so designated is almost unbroken. Earlier presiding officers were variously styled 'parlour', 'prolocutor', and 'procurator'—

which are quite magnanimous terms for any Speaker. It goes on to say—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is of great interest to the Chair, so I would ask members on both sides to cease interjecting.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I know the problems that you have had this week in trying to keep this House in order, Mr Speaker, and I wanted to give you the support you need to carry through this circular. You are obviously not getting it from the Treasurer. I continue:

It was often an unenviable task, and at least nine Speakers are known to have died a violent death.

None of us would want that to happen to our Speaker. I continue:

On the other hand, the Speaker frequently turned out to be a King's man, and in the Tudor period he is described by Stubbs as being 'the manager of business on the part of the Crown and probably the nominee either of the King himself or the Chancellor. He frequently held high office in addition to the speakership. That is the point I am making, Mr Speaker, as I go through this circular.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am coming to that. There are some quite high offices which Speakers have held, and I think that this Speaker is destined for those high offices because of the assiduous fashion in which he is going about trying

to save the taxpayers' money, and the Treasurer of this State is not assisting him in any way. What the Speaker has been forced to put out to us, and I will read some of it, if you do not mind, Mr Speaker, is this:

Several members have approached me seeking a *Government Gazette* for use in their electorate office. As I pointed out to them, there is no provision in the Budget for the additional expenditure that would be incurred in adding this to the other publications provided to members. In an endeavour to provide members with a *Government Gazette* from within the existing Budget, I suggested to several members that this could be done by members in effect 'exchanging' the funding of two *Hansard* subscriptions for one *Government Gazette* subscription. Each member has an entitlement to 30 *Hansard* subscriptions... However, the amount of funding provided to Parliament for this is not based on that maximum entitlement. It is based upon the average—

entitlement of the members. Fancy having a Treasurer who compiles a Budget and does not budget on the maximum allocated to each member! Who in private enterprise would ever do something like this? And when the poor old Speaker tries to cut down on—

The SPEAKER: Order! While the Chair appreciates the sympathy, of sorts, being extended by the member for Victoria, I ask him to be very careful in his choice of words because, although I assume that he is delivering his remarks in good spirit, he inadvertently may be reflecting on the authority of the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, I am very worried about the word 'poor' and also exceedingly worried about the word 'old' and I withdraw both of those. No way did I mean to reflect on the Chair. I can see the Deputy Speaker getting quite upset over there and I am glad he is not in your position now, as it would have been even worse because he has just had the flick, as you know, for that higher office that may have been bestowed on the Speaker of this House. The circular goes on, of course, to say that the Budget was brought down not on the maximum but on the average of members. Here we have the Speaker trying to introduce his directive with bad advice from the Treasurer, and being asked to request members to consider whether we cannot cut down on one and have two *Hansards* off the list and one *Gazette* on, or one *Hansard* off and one *Gazette* on. We have to be very reasonable and do it in a sensible way, because we do not want people acting in a non-constructive manner.

All of this has been brought about because the Speaker of this House has been given bad advice by the Treasurer of this State and not been given the facts. He has been put in the most invidious position and I think it is quite outrageous that it should happen and that he is forced to do this—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Speaker is forced to try to sell this to honourable members. I have referred to the prestigious position the Speaker holds and I noticed when I looked it up in the dictionary that prestigious comes from the Latin words 'praesto' meaning prompt and 'digitus' meaning finger producing quick finger or juggling, and I am afraid that that is what the Speaker is being asked to do.

As I have only one minute left, the higher position that you, Mr Speaker, are destined for is that of Treasurer of this State, because it is quite obvious that you have the taxpayers at heart and are trying to do something for them. It is quite obvious that the advice given to you by the Treasurer is absolutely outrageous, and I want to finish by referring to some of those people in the House of Commons who have not only been Speakers but who have gone on to be Chancellors of the Exchequer. I will not have time—

The SPEAKER: Order! That list was obviously exceedingly short, because the honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I would like to discuss this evening some problems I have had with the Minister of Housing and Construction in respect of his administration of the Housing Trust. It is a matter of great concern to me because, obviously, the Housing Trust plays an important role in my electorate of Elizabeth and it is a matter of great concern to a large number of my constituents; also, I might say, to those of the adjoining electorate of Napier, which the Minister himself represents.

The first aspect which I mention is the Housing Trust's budget. The Trust is a statutory authority and, therefore, while it comes within the ambit of the investigation of the Estimates Committees each year the Government has never been in the practice of tabling a budget for the Housing Trust in substantial detail for the consideration of the Estimates Committees.

I consider that this has been a serious omission by Governments of all political colours over the years. However, recently it has been of more serious concern because of the rapid escalation in Housing Trust rents and the significant escalation in the trust's administrative costs.

Hitherto, the trust has operated on very much a break-even situation, but over the past five years, for many reasons that are beyond the control of any Minister, the trust has started to run on a deficit. There are many reasons for that situation, one of the most significant being the increased interest cost that the trust has had to bear. It has responded to that as best it can, but the end result is that the trust's budget, its interest component, and its maintenance costs are rising rapidly and the trust has been forced into deficit.

As a result, we have seen massive rent increases and I will come to that matter in a minute. These concerns have generated enormous interest in the trust's budget, yet the Minister has refused absolutely to table in Parliament and the Estimates Committees of the House full details of the trust's budget for the coming year. That refusal was contained in a reply to my question in the previous session.

Then, also in the previous session, I asked the Minister six months ago why the trust's budget was such a secret. After all, each year the Auditor-General's report gives the House, in retrospect, 12 to 14 months after the event, full details of the trust's expenditure, yet we are not given the details of its proposed expenditure in advance of that expenditure being incurred. That is the critical part. The Minister has not responded to that question which I placed on notice. Why not? After all, he has had six months to reply, and he has replied to other questions that I have asked, many of those replies being, appropriately, in some detail. So, why is there that selective failure in this case? Perhaps the Minister cannot answer the question, and I can understand that.

My first question concerned what aspects of the Housing Trust budget the Minister has determined shall be kept confidential, and why. If the Minister refuses to table the budget, there must be a reason. It would be of great assistance in offering the Government and the Minister constructive criticism on the way in which the trust manages its affairs and constructive advice on how the pressure on rents might well be ameliorated, if the Minister were to provide us with the necessary information.

It makes a mockery of the Estimates Committee process if the House is denied the very basis of that information. I invite the Minister, as I invited him in my question on notice, to reconsider his attitude and compare it with that

of the Minister of Health. For many years, the Minister of Health has tabled in this House a so-called Blue Book in which he provides extensive details of the operation of a statutory authority, the Health Commission, which is substantially larger than the Housing Trust. I fail to see why, if the Minister of Health can give the House that kind of detailed information concerning an organisation with a budget of \$1 billion, the Minister of Housing and Construction cannot tell us what is happening in the Housing Trust. After all, this subject is of great interest not only to members here but I am sure to all my constituents and to many of his.

That interest is principally focused on rent increases. Before the so-called rent freeze some years ago, I asked the Minister whether the increases that he had just announced were truly a rent freeze or a rent deferral. At the time such increases were alleged to be a rent freeze.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: There was an election coming.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Certainly they were advanced at the time of an election and that cannot be ignored by Housing Trust tenants. However, a genuine rent freeze would have been more welcome but, as it turns out in the light of history, the increases proved to be rather a rent deferral because, since the expiration of the so-called freeze, we have seen, in the words of Mr Edwards (Manager of the Housing Trust) a 20 per cent increase in Housing Trust rents in real terms—in other words, 20 per cent plus the CPI increase. That is a response to those budget pressures that I have already discussed.

Ms Gayler: And the Commonwealth cuts.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Yes, interest rate pressures and Commonwealth changes, and the Commonwealth Government will come in for its share of criticism in a moment. One can determine Housing Trust rent increases of up to 44 per cent for individuals if one takes into account the so-called poverty trap, and this has not received adequate attention either from the State Government or the Commonwealth Government. If one considers those constituents and Housing Trust tenants who are on social security means tested benefits (that is, about 60 per cent or more of Housing Trust tenants), one must realise that they are in a real poverty trap, considering the combined effects of the social security means test, whether as regards the age pension, unemployment benefit or supporting parent benefit, the rent means test applied by the Housing Trust, and income tax for those who are fortunate enough to have an income greater than the taxation threshold.

When the combined effect of all those programs is taken into account, an individual Housing Trust tenant may be worse off as a result of an increase in income. That position which devastates many tenants is not the fault solely of the Housing Trust. It is the combined effect of a series of Government programs and means tests which have left constituents of mine worse off as a result of an increase. That is an intolerable position and it is essential that the State Minister confer with his colleagues to ensure that the Commonwealth and State Governments work together much more closely in eliminating that kind of poverty trap.

I am concerned about the failure of the Minister, so far as I am aware (and I certainly apologise in advance if I misrepresent him here), on another aspect. On 24 September 1987, at page 531 of *Hansard*, the Minister confirmed that the trust was moving towards the offering of home improvement loans to enable aged home occupiers to raise the necessary finance for home repairs and alterations, but I have yet to see the introduction of that vital scheme. I hope that it is not too far away and that we can discuss it again in the Estimates Committee this year.

I now refer to the sale of Housing Trust rental properties to their tenants. While the Minister originally was ideologically opposed to this type of sale, it would appear that this concept has recently gained considerable favour not only with the trust but also with the Minister. Private enterprise land agents have recently been appointed to help boost sales of these properties to tenants. That is a commendable move and I know that agents Casserly and Mitchell in my area are doing an excellent job in selling such properties to tenants and advising them accordingly.

However, although the Minister says that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement does not allow him to offer a discount, I believe that there is certainly nothing in that agreement that prevents the State Government from offering concessions on stamp duty or even abolishing stamp duty on the sale. The Government is already offering a concession on the Housing Trust's administration fee and I congratulate it on that step, but that expires in a matter of weeks and that is unfortunate because the administration fee is a substantial bar.

There is the complex question of titles, especially in respect of double units. During the Estimates Committee debate last year, the Minister undertook to report back to other members and to me on a more innovative use of land titles registration to reduce the cost of double unit sales, and I commend that concept to him. I regret that he has not yet seen fit to provide that information. Sales dispose not of the State's assets, only of its liabilities.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: During Question Time earlier today, in response to a question from the honourable member for Coles, I advised the House as follows:

I understand that no non-police persons are referred to in the report.

That is, the NCA report. I have since received advice from the Attorney-General and have conferred with the Minister of Emergency Services and now wish to advise the House that the answer to that question should be 'Yes'. I am not in a position to provide information about the identity or numbers of such persons for reasons acknowledged by the honourable member in her question.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 319.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this grievance debate on the Supply Bill. At the outset I refer to Question Time today and the final question which was about South Australia's exhibition at World Expo. The Minister of Transport, as the question was directed to him, indicated that he was very upset with the attitude taken by the Opposition in drawing attention to some of the shortcomings of South Australia's stand in its section of the pavilion. I draw members' attention to the history behind our participation at Expo. I refer to a

question from the member for Briggs on 8 September last year when he asked the Premier:

Is the State Government reviewing its decision not to invest in a South Australian pavilion at next year's Brisbane Expo?

That question was asked less than a year ago. The member went on to explain various items and, in his reply, the Premier said:

... on the present evidence and the present propositions before us, we will not be present at the Expo, because it simply does not represent value for money for the State.

The Premier also said:

However, at the moment the value is not there.

He later said:

... our display would not necessarily expose us to new international markets.

It was at that point that the member for Coles interjected. Her exact words are not recorded in *Hansard* but following that interjection the Premier said:

I think that there would be a far more effective way of attracting Queensland investment than by having a stand at the Expo, quite frankly. That is not how we will pick up investment, and the honourable member should be able to see that from a cursory glance...

Today we had a tirade of abuse from the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism, accusing the Opposition of not having the interests of South Australia to the fore, and for being so bold as to attack the South Australian stand at Expo. Yet, we find that the responsibility lies 100 per cent with the Government because in September last year the Premier made it quite clear that, at that stage, South Australia would not be exhibiting at Expo. I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 13 November headed 'South Australia will join Expo 88 but at a reduced cost'. The introductory paragraph states:

South Australia will join Expo 88, but it will have the smallest exhibit of all the mainland States.

That is not surprising as we left it to the last minute; we literally failed to catch the bus. If anyone is to be blamed for the fact that the South Australian stand at Expo does not meet the requirements normally expected to be met at an international Expo, it is the Premier and his Government. It is an indictment of him and his Ministers for not getting their act together much earlier. The member who asked the question said that he had visited Expo and that he had asked a certain number of people what they thought of the stand. According to the member, they all reacted in a positive manner. That is very good. I hope that people would react in a positive manner, but unfortunately many negative comments have been forthcoming and I know that so many people from my electorate—

Mr Tyler: Have you been there?

Mr MEIER: No, I have not, but many people in my electorate who have visited Expo have said that it was very good. However, when asked what they thought of South Australia's stand they said that it was an embarrassment to the State. My constituents said that. I can report only what they have reported to me. They have been there and have seen the South Australian stand. That sort of embarrassment should not occur.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Fisher, interjecting all the time, is trying to fish something out. Obviously, he is embarrassed. I believe that the member for Fisher has visited Expo.

Mr Tyler: I have seen it.

Mr MEIER: Given the way that he is carrying on, he is trying to apologise for the Premier and the Government for not saying a year earlier, 'We will be in there from the word 'go'. It is quite obvious from the comments from members

opposite that this is an embarrassment to them. Comments from my constituents indicate that one important product that could be used in Brisbane is Price's Cornish pasties, which are famous throughout South Australia. The bakery is located at Kadina and it serves the Copper Triangle, all of Yorke Peninsula and the rest of South Australia. One of my constituents who was at Expo during some rainy weather said that, if there had been a Price's pasty stand outside the South Australian stand, it would have sold thousands of pasties. I spoke with the manager of Price's and asked him whether it would have been possible to have a pasty stand at Expo if he had had sufficient warning. He said, 'Yes, without any trouble at all, but we were not approached; we were not asked'. This is a further indictment of the Government.

I will not continue with that matter other than to say that I wish that the Minister of Transport would be more careful with his words. He indicated that the Opposition endeavours to knock occasionally. We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition give an outstanding speech earlier today in which he indicated that the Opposition learned its knocking from the previous Opposition, (the now Government), which knocked the O-Bahn, Roxby and other developments left right and centre. It is a shame that the Government is not prepared to occasionally accept some constructive criticism.

In the few minutes remaining to me I want to bring to the House's attention a problem with respect to the Children's Services Office and the draft policy document on rural services as it may affect kindergartens throughout this State, particularly in rural areas. I inform the House that many rural kindergartens are very concerned at the implications of the proposed modifications. In effect, one proposal is to reduce services to about 56 kindergartens throughout the State. That, in itself, is cause for alarm. I say quite openly that there is also a move to improve and provide services to preschool children where currently no services, or very few, are provided. That is commendable, but why should we axe about one-fifth of the 56 kindergartens in this State in order to establish a service elsewhere? It will cause real hardship in many years if this suggestion proceeds.

I will provide a few examples. Can you imagine the Director of a Kindergarten being called on to serve 0.2 of one position. What person with suitable qualifications would want to apply for such a position? If the Government goes ahead with its planned reduction in kindergarten services, that is what will occur in the case of several kindergartens in this State. Many kindergartens will be downgraded by a certain amount in relation to their directors and possibly other staff members at a time when child-care and kindergarten services should be on the increase rather than on the decrease. Because of the time constraint, I will not be able to detail what I wanted to establish, but I will point out at another time how the Government must rethink seriously this proposal before going ahead with major cuts to the kindergarten services in this State.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I will pursue the development debate which has raged around the Premier's ears over the past week. Before doing so, I draw attention to the Premier's palpable sense of insecurity which has evinced itself in the House over the past weeks in his criticism of the Opposition front bench. At one stage the Premier accused the Opposition, particularly the front bench, of being a weary group. It caused me to go to the record and make some calculations about the present Labor ministry. If my calculations are correct (and I believe that they

are, because they have been checked and doubled checked), the ministry that was in place before the Hon. Dr Cornwall got the sack and before the Hon. Roy Abbott and the Hon. Ron Payne resigned or were pushed sideways or downwards, as the case may be, had a total accumulated service of 88 years. If I ever saw a weary and long-serving group, it is that ministry. It had been there far too long. When one takes the three removals and the three new Ministers, the accumulated service amounts to 63 years. By comparison, members of the Opposition shadow ministry, many of whom are very young and relatively new to the ministry, have a total service in the ministry of 13 years. I feel as fresh as a daisy and very ready to take up my position on the opposite benches.

In relation to the development debate, clearly, the Premier is thrashing around like a piece of chaff in the wind. He does not know which way to go; he wants to get the developers on side. He is very anxious about the conservation vote and, consequently, he attacks anyone in sight—and I happened to be the first person in his sights. I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that one of the most patent discouragements to development in this State is his Government's abuse of section 50 of the Planning Act. Neither developers nor investors know when the section 50 axe will fall next. Why should anyone risk their money with the threat of section 50 hanging over their heads in this State? It is obvious to everyone that the Government is willing to stop anything from a small church in a suburban street in Unley to a large broadacre housing development in Salisbury simply by using section 50 of the Planning Act. Under those circumstances, who can feel safe with South Australia's planning laws? The cases of Unley and Salisbury have badly undermined the confidence of developers, financial institutions and local government in the justice and certainty of the State's planning process.

I have letters on file which indicate the extreme dissatisfaction of local government, the Royal Australian Planning Institute (South Australian Division), the Local Government Planners Association of South Australia and of the Urban Development Institute of South Australia. All organisations condemn outright the Government's use of section 50. In fact, the Royal Australian Planning Institute and the Local Government Planners Association said that the Unley case has done much to 'undermine the confidence of councils and developers in particular that there is certainty and natural justice in the operation of the planning system'. It also states:

... confidence must be restored to ensure that the Government's important long-term development strategy currently being finalised can be implemented effectively, unhampered by misused planning powers.

That is not the Opposition speaking: that is the planning professionals of South Australia condemning the Bannock Government on the ground that it has completely undermined confidence in the justice of the planning system. If ever there were an indictment of a Government, that is it and there is no way on earth that the Premier can escape from that fact. It is no use pointing the finger at the Opposition. Heaven wishes that we had as much power as that which the Premier has credited to us to affect development adversely. Only the Premier and Cabinet are responsible for those decisions.

The two members opposite are right to look shamefaced and to be silent, because they participated in each decision, both of which have been condemned outright, not only by the planning fraternity but also by financial institutions. The Premier has no-one but himself to blame. Instead of tackling the Opposition and seeking my removal, he should listen to my pleas for a halt to the abuse of section 50.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles has the floor, not the Minister of Housing and Construction.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: There is an unhappy silence amongst Government members when I refer to section 50, and their only response is to drag up—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not sure whether I heard correctly, but it could well be that the honourable member for Coles was trying to incite out-of-order interjections.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: No, never; I would not dream of doing that, but the only response by Government members was to drag up a vote which, from recollection, is about five years old. I point out—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland is out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:—that it was a conscience vote. For any member of this House to denigrate another member on the basis of a conscience vote is, in my opinion, beneath contempt. I note that the Minister of State Development and Technology is nodding in agreement. He is one man amongst few in the Labor ranks who has the courage of his convictions to exercise his conscience when given the opportunity to do so.

In the brief time remaining I will deal with an issue raised by my colleague the member for Goyder in respect of staffing formulas in kindergartens. I refer to the impact of the Government's staffing formula on primary schools, particularly primary schools in my electorate, and on junior primary schools. The decisions that have been taken in the department and which have been actively supported by the Minister (if indeed the Minister can be said to be active in any sense; he appears to us to be a most passive Minister) will have an extremely adverse effect upon schools. To select an arbitrary date in April as the date for average enrolments which will determine staffing entitlements—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I think that the member for Newland should study the documents, get the facts right, and speak to the principals and parents in her electorate. She would then realise that, if the schools in her electorate are anything like the schools in mine, they will suffer a reduction in staffing of at least two teachers during the current year. The staff at the schools I spoke to (Thorndon Park, Burnside, Magill and Stradbroke primary schools) said that they would all be affected adversely. The concept of vertical grouping, which is so important to small children from reception to grade 3, will virtually be destroyed as a result of this decision. It will be impossible for there to be stability and continuity of teaching and for teachers to continue with their children from reception up to year 1, 2 and, if necessary, year 3. The whole notion of monitoring a child's development, staying with that child in those early formative years, and of encouraging gifted children by enabling them to study at the level which is appropriate for them right from reception onwards will be destroyed completely by this staffing policy.

It is no use the member for Newland accusing me of misusing information. This information has been provided by the Institute of Teachers. It is well for her to prattle like a parrot the word 'rubbish'. The Institute of Teachers, the principals of the primary schools—

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is very interesting. The Institute of Teachers, which came up with \$35 000 for a campaign to re-elect the Labor Government, is suddenly no longer a friend of the Government. It is a fine indication of why that institute feels completely betrayed

by the Bannon Government in relation to staffing not only in primary schools but also in high schools. So many promises of this Government in respect of education have been broken that it is no wonder the institute has dumped the Government.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): First, I wish to correct a statement that I made in my Address in Reply contribution last week.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It relates to an incorrect statement that I made. I should have said:

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 dollars.

The General Manager went on to say that that represents an operating loss of \$94 million and a contribution to ownership of \$33 million, making up a total deficit, or cost to the taxpayer, of \$127 million. That does sound bad in today's figures. In the same document he also points out that, if we pursue only the current initiatives, on his estimation the STA's deficit cost to the taxpayers of this State in 1990-91 will be \$150 million in 1986-87 dollars or approximately \$195 million in 1991-92 dollars, that is, if no initiatives are changed at all.

That represents a cost of \$18 000 per operating hour today or \$29 000 per operating hour in 1991, which is four years down the track. The General Manager of the STA also said that the STA's deficit of \$127 million per annum is equivalent to \$380 per household, which is nearly as much as one pays in council rates. Therefore the General Manager clearly recognises the massive cost of public transport today and in the near future to this State, even if the Bannon Government does not.

I return now to the capital expenditure of operations as it relates to the STA. The PA Consultants 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 the methods of project specification and control which the authority has employed on major projects. For example, first, the method of specification and tendering previously adopted by the authority for the 2 000 series rail cars means that shortcomings in the performance of the railcars was the direct responsibility of the authority. Secondly, 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 and would have been likely to be more cost-effective.

I note that the original budget cost of \$25 million for the rail signalling system is now \$44.5 million. Thirdly, over the years the authority has purchased a variety of makes and models of buses with a resultant need to increase stocks of spares, duplicate some equipment and devote additional time to staff training. As well the Crouzet ticketing system has significantly increased in cost from the contract price. The basic Crouzet contract cost at the February 1985 price was \$4.86 million. Foreign exchange cost was \$3.28 million; additional equipment purchases were \$810 000; adjustments for inflation amounted to \$700 000; and direct costs to the STA for ancillary equipment and installation work totalled \$1.05 million, giving a total of \$10.7 million or an extra cost factor of more than 100 per cent. Depending on final payment of all costs to Crouzet, some minor adjustments may occur to foreign exchange and inflation-related costs.

The Minister made comment to that effect on 6 April 1988. As can be seen, the foreign exchange component has significantly increased the cost of the system.

The next point is the massive increase in borrowings that have occurred in the life of the Bannon Government. These borrowings have increased from \$125.45 million in 1982-83 to \$234.66 million in 1986-87 (or 87 per cent). In this same period the overall STA operating deficit has increased quite rapidly. The rate of growth in these interests costs and servicing charges as compared with inflation is a further example of the lack of policy constraints on expenditure both of a capital and recurring nature. The increase in costs of the O-Bahn project, the blow-out in cost for the ticketing system from \$4.5 million to \$11 million and the signalling system from \$25 million to \$43 million have resulted in significantly increased costs to the STA. The interest costs as a result of these borrowings have increased from \$10.8 million in 1982-83 to \$25 million (or 126 per cent) in 1986-87.

It should be further noted that the transfer of debts to SAFA in March 1984 caused an increase in interest rate from an average of 10.3 per cent to 12.2 per cent at that time. Thus the Bannon Government is making extra profits for SAFA at the expense of STA. It is difficult to estimate the exact amount from annual reports, but it is between \$2 million and \$4 million per year. Personnel (staff) costs are usually the largest single component of a budget. The STA budget is no exception although the essential information required to accurately calculate the total outlay on personnel (both salaried and wages) is not identified in the annual reports. What is clear is that, like all other aspects of the STA operations, growth is a feature of the STA establishment, at a time when automation, in all its forms, is claimed to reduce staff numbers and improve productivity.

It is important to note that when the Bannon Government came to power in 1982 staff numbers were declining. This trend continued into 1983, but then reversed and has been on the upward trend ever since. The overall number employed in 1981-82 was 3 443, dropping to 3 486 in 1982-83 and increasing to 3 699 in 1986-87. It should be noted from annual reports that there has been a significant increase in staff in the management, personnel and engineering sections while traffic operations has been fairly tight. It should be further noted that, in all sections except finance, significant increases have been noted in salaried administration functions with a total increase in the traffic section due to administration increases.

To summarise the STA situation, the identified market is between nine and 10 per cent of all journeys undertaken by the community. Patronage measured by total journeys has fallen from 69 million in 1983-84 to 60 million in 1986-87, or 168 000 per week. All modes of travel—bus, tram and train—have seen a decline in patronage. The total cost of providing services has risen from \$117 million in 1982-83 to \$172 million—an increase of 47 per cent in the life of the Bannon Government. The net cost of providing these services has risen from \$75 million to \$107 million, and this year it will be over \$120 million. This net cost has risen from \$1.4 million per week in 1983 to \$2.7 million this year or \$18 000 per operating hour. There has been an accumulated cash shortage of \$70 million in the past five years. Total borrowings have increased from \$125 million in 1982-83 to \$235 million (or 87 per cent). Total interest costs have increased from \$10.8 million to \$24 million—an increase of 127 per cent.

Capital expenditure has increased since 1982-83. The cost of debt servicing of capital has been a major element in this increase in the deficit. Investments have not always

been cost effective, and I refer, for example, to the 2000-series railcar, the signalling system, the Crouzet system, and the variety of buses purchased. There has been a net operating cost increase in every mode at a rate higher than the inflation rate. Fares for two zones have increased from 70c in 1982 to \$1.50 in 1986, and now to \$1.80 in August 1988—an increase of 157 per cent. The weekly ticket has increased from 58c in 1982-83 to \$1.15—representing an increase of 98 per cent. The gross fares only match inflation increases if one includes the Government concessional subsidy, nearly 60 per cent of all passengers receiving concessional fares. Finally, the declining number of people employed in 1982-83 has now been reversed to a situation where we now have an increasing number of personnel; a significant increase has occurred in salaried staff.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I want to comment on the ministerial statement released by the Premier and Treasurer this afternoon. Very few members who have spoken to the second reading explanation of the Bill presently before the House actually referred to the financial affairs of the State, let alone the matter of Supply and, after all, that is the reason for this debate. The Supply Bill provides finance for continuation of the Public Service operation until the State budget is presented to Parliament and is passed through all stages—and that will not be until October or early November. The Premier took great delight in claiming full credit for the fortunate situation in which he finds himself, and he said:

I am now in a position to report that the final result of the budget for 1987-88 gave a consolidated account surplus of \$4.3 million, an improvement of \$48.7 million on the budget estimates. This means that the consolidated account deficit of \$63 million inherited from the previous Liberal Government—

which, I might add, included about nine months of Labor Government involvement, when it spent like a person with no arms—

has now been completely eliminated and replaced by a surplus of \$4.4 million.

The Premier explained—although he did not go into any great detail—how the surplus was arrived at. He said:

Firstly, actual expenditure in 1987-88 was \$4 833 million, a very slight increase over the estimated expenditure of \$4 818 million.

It is a \$15 million increase although it represents only 0.3 per cent of the budget. The Premier further stated:

Secondly, total receipts for 1987-88 were \$4 867 million, an increase of \$63 million above the anticipated \$4 804 million. This represents a slight increase of 1.3 per cent.

However, one can see what happens when playing with such huge figures: a slight increase of only 1.3 per cent or of 0.3 per cent means that we are starting to talk in terms of tens of millions of dollars. The Premier went on to say:

The main area of growth has been stamp duty receipts, which are \$43.1 million higher than budget. Property conveyances have accounted for \$38.7 million of this growth. Revenue gains from underlying improvement in the level of real estate activity were reinforced by several large property transactions in 1987-88.

Of course, there have been numerous sales of properties in the central business district and in the higher bracket in the housing market—but not, regrettably, in the housing market that the workers of this State can afford. However, there has been a huge turnover of commercial and industrial properties in every capital city in Australia, as the various investment organisations and property trusts, including insurance companies, rearrange their investments following the share market crash. But, of course, the interesting side of even our own small State budget is that the stamp duty on share transactions largely accounts for the remaining improvement in stamp duty receipts (up to \$3.4 million on budget).

Of course, had Santos taken over the South Australian Gas Company it might have been even higher and the shareholders of Sagasco would have been even better off. The whole point is that the State benefited from two major areas—speculators and investors. Mr Marcus Clark can talk about entrepreneurs, but entrepreneurs are working in the city of Adelaide. That is where the State has picked up some \$63 million, most of which has come from stamp duty on property and investment transactions. So, the entrepreneurs are well and truly alive in the city of Adelaide.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am not against them one little bit; I am all for them, because it is the best thing that has happened to this State since sliced bread. I believe that what Marcus Clark said is quite right. I agree with him. They are not given a fair go—but what can one expect in a socialist State? It is about time that Marcus Clark woke up to that one. If they are given a go we will get the results. Of course, the figures in question are not as great as those that apply to other States.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am glad that the Minister of Housing and Construction is here. The member for Elizabeth had a swipe at him earlier in the debate about Housing Trust rents. He knows that they have gone up 44 per cent since the last State election; as a matter of fact, they have gone up 36 per cent since February 1987. My goodness, I get cross—and I hope the people in the southern suburbs of the metropolitan area get cross when they read statements like the following statement published in the *Southern Times Messenger*.

A spokesman for the Housing and Construction Minister, Terry Hemmings, said that Mr. . . . is lucky that he is in a Housing Trust home; he has a reasonable standard of accommodation, and he is charged rent that the Government considers reasonable and fair.

That person is hurting and so are tens of thousands of people in the metropolitan area, because of the huge increases that have been forced on them through interference in the Housing Trust by this social justice Government. The Government has not done a damn thing for them. It has taxed them and has ripped into them. It has poured increases on these poor people, people on fixed incomes who are not in a position to cover these increases. The Government has really given them what-oh. I can well remember when Murray Hill increased Housing Trust rents and the way that members opposite ranted and raved and carried on.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I was not happy about that, either, but by golly what the Government has done is absolute murder. Playford set up the Housing Trust and we were proud of it, and you have destroyed it.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BECKER: You know that members of his own Party have been to see you. They have come to me and told me of your reaction and the way you carried on. They have been to see the Premier—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister to order for his repeated interjections, and I also call the member for Hanson to order for referring directly to a member opposite as 'you': he must direct his remarks through the Chair. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: Housing Trust tenants are hurting. They have also been to the Premier and, of course, they have been told the same thing that the Premier keeps repeating, namely, that if the Liberals get into office Housing Trust rents will go up even higher. That is absolute garbage.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: They would.

Mr BECKER: The honourable member would not know; how would he know until we have got into Government? He has no idea; he could not know because it is hypothetical. I am glad that the former Minister of Mines and Energy is on the back bench. What you did to the South Australian Gas Company, to the shareholders of the Gas Company, was absolutely criminal. I do not care what anyone says, you did not give them a chance; you robbed the shareholders of the Gas Company.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell has been out of order, and the member for Hanson is again referring to members opposite as 'you'. He must direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair can manage without the assistance of the Minister of Housing and Construction.

Mr BECKER: There is no social justice from the Government. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Light and I visited the City Watch House. I was appalled at the stark and cold conditions and at the antiquated standards of accommodation for prisoners there.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: And they were all your constituents, weren't they!

Mr BECKER: No, but at least I was not frightened to talk to a few of them and to ask them if there was anything that we could do to help them and make them a little more comfortable. I am pleased that the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service was going to visit them and to take in some fresh fruit. There was one person there who was a vegetarian and who had not had any fresh fruit or vegetables for the seven days that he had been there. One prisoner had been there for 11 days, and another for 13 days. They had been sentenced and were waiting to be transferred to their respective prisons. Naturally, they were being affected by the conditions in the City Watch House.

It is appalling to see such conditions remaining in this modern day and age. This country is proud to contribute towards and be part of the United Nations, yet we cannot provide accommodation for offenders which meets modern western standards. It is a blight on all of us that we allow this situation to continue. I have received a string of complaints about the Taj Mahal—the Remand Centre—where the remandees all live in an air-conditioned environment. Those complaints must be attended to. Whilst it is a beautiful building, it is not right that there should be no fresh air and that remandees should have to eat terrible stuff such as frozen food; one can understand why they complain about food and the conditions they have to tolerate when some days they are allowed only one hour in the fresh air. They are allowed to walk in a little exercise yard. It is unfair to expect people to live in an air-conditioned environment; it is unhealthy.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Last week the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council met again and, reiterating their long-term objectives of coming to grips with the salinity problems of the Murray-Darling Basin, representatives referred to a number of projects which need to proceed. One of the projects is the Chowilla salinity mitigation scheme, which is a scheme not unlike the Woolpunda scheme inasmuch as it involves not an irrigation induced groundwater salinity problem but one which has been created by developments of another kind: first, the construction of Lock 6; and secondly, the construction of the Lake Victoria water storage.

Over a period we have had the hydraulic effect of both constructions tending to raise the water table in the area of the Chowilla flood plains, thus contributing greatly to the groundwater intrusion into the Chowilla Creek area, flowing into the Murray and contributing a significant amount of salinity to the Murray below Chowilla Creek. The E&WS Department has put out a draft environmental impact statement on a number of options which could be put into effect in an endeavour to greatly reduce the amount of salinity entering the River Murray from that area. The draft environmental impact statement states:

This environmental assessment is therefore more strategic than tactical for several reasons. It is not realistic to fully assess impacts of the multitude of theoretically possible schemes. Instead, several broad salinity mitigation strategies have been examined. These are: interception of groundwater; lowering Lock 6 pool level; raising the level of creek entrances; completely isolating the anabranch from the river by banks and dams; and selectively managing surface flows through the anabranch by various combinations of regulated and unregulated weirs and banks.

They are the main proposals put forward by the State Government in an endeavour to come to grips with the problem. The preferred option being put forward by the Government is one which is really a hybrid of a number of proposals to which I have just referred. The environmental impact statement refers to the preferred strategy and states:

The E&WS prefers a strategy that regulates the surface flows through the anabranch, particularly one that incorporates the capacity for disposal of impounded salty water to an evaporation basin out of the river valley. This affords the greatest flexibility for management of excessively saline discharges.

Fundamentally, the preferred option requires banks built across the creeks so that the creeks no longer flow below a flow rate in the River Murray of 35 000 megalitres a day. In many instances, the Government is proposing to use the Chowilla Creek area and the other creeks of the region (such as Salt Creek, Punkah Creek, Deep Creek and Hypurna Creek) as salinity collection areas from which they will pump this saline water away to an evaporation basin. The concern that I and many people in the Riverland have is the impact that that will have on the ecology of the Chowilla area. It is one of the remaining areas in South Australia of good stands of native trees, principally box trees and river red gums.

The impact statement also refers to the likely impact of the preferred option or a number of the options, and I refer to the comments made in the draft impact statement as follows:

It is important to note that some impacts of schemes cannot be predicted with confidence, or at all, and may only become apparent during monitoring studies once a scheme is in place.

That is not good enough. We have been through this on many occasions, particularly here in South Australia. We do not want a repeat of the Disher Creek evaporation situation, the Bulyong Island situation or what occurred on Katarapko Island, all areas which have been used for saline drainage disposal and where the natural ecology has been absolutely decimated. To proceed with a proposal which, even though it might have the best cost benefit ratio as far as removing salinity from the river is concerned, has consequences which at this stage are quite unknown as regards the environment and long-term impact on the vegetation of that area, is totally unacceptable.

We have a moral obligation with the experience we now have and the disastrous impact that some previous salinity schemes have had on the environment generally along the Murray in South Australia (and, certainly, the same must be said for Victoria and New South Wales), and we can no longer just proceed with the option which has the best cost benefit ratio. There is an option, and that is an interception scheme using the technology of well pointing, which will

have no adverse environmental impact whatsoever on the area. It may not have quite such a good cost benefit ratio as far as interception, the cost of that interception and diversion of the saline waters away from the area are concerned, but one must take into account that the Murray-Darling Basin is estimated to be worth something like \$10 000 million annually to the economy of this nation, and for us not to be prepared to put some of that economic benefit we derive from that resource back into protecting the resource for future generations would be appalling.

We will certainly be condemned by future generations if we continue to go for the best cost benefit option in all instances. The resource—the Murray-Darling Basin—has the economic capacity to put into effect the best option. Certainly, there is the option which was highlighted in the report by the E&WS Department. It is more expensive but it will do absolutely no damage to the environment and will intercept most of the groundwater coming in from Lake Victoria.

In my view, it is not a matter of which option we will go for. It is clear that the Government has a moral responsibility to go for the option that will reduce salinity in the River Murray while at the same time protecting the greatest natural recurring resource of this nation. If it does not, it will be condemned for all time.

One has only to go into the Chowilla area (and a number of members have done so and viewed the benefits of the creeks there) and see some of the gum trees and box trees that have been there probably for up to 250 years to realise the value of that resource and how the adoption of the cheap option would do significant damage to such an area. Such a course of action is beyond my comprehension and I believe that any Government that proceeds down that path will be condemned not only by the present generation but certainly also by future generations.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I hate speaking to an empty House: I get lonely. I draw to the attention of members a couple of important matters that are of interest to my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask members, including the honourable member for Hayward, not to stand around, particularly with their backs to the Chair. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I recently received the following letter:

The residents of Morgan, the holiday home areas between Morgan and Blanchetown on the western bank of the Murray and Blanchetown, have raised a petition for sealing of the main road on the western bank of the Murray. This section of road is the only section of road between major towns along the length of the Murray which is not sealed. The road carries a great deal of traffic especially on weekends and holidays as it services seven major holiday home areas and several minor areas. These areas provide recreation and tourist facilities for thousands of people during the holiday periods.

The road also carries a large number of commercial vehicles which service the fruit growing area of Pelican Point and vineyards. During recent years several fatal accidents have occurred on the road. In the interest of public safety the petitioners feel that the road should be sealed. At the present time the road surface deteriorates within a week of grading due to the heavy volume of traffic. The petitioners therefore request, Sir, that as the Member for Kavel you will honour them by presenting the petition to the House of Assembly when the House sits at the next session.

Trusting that this brief explanation is informative of the reason for the petition, I wish to thank you on behalf of the petitioners.

When I presented to the House the petition referred to, it did not make a big splash even though it contained about 800 signatures which indicated heavy support. So, I thought that I must reinforce the presentation of the petition by reading that letter on behalf of the people who use that part of the River Murray near Morgan.

The other letter that I wish to read into the record has, I believe, been received by all members of this House. I do not know how much notice Government members took of that letter, but I have received copies from all sub-branches of the Returned Soldiers League in my district. The letters are similar, the letter from the Morgan sub-branch stating:

I am writing to seek your personal support for ongoing Commonwealth Government care for war veterans particularly the disabled and war widows. I refer specifically to the Government proposal to transfer Repatriation General Hospitals to the State Governments. On 30 November 1987, the State President, Vice-President and State Secretary of the RSL South Australian Branch met with Dr Cornwall to discuss this very problem. The RSL was promised by Dr Cornwall that there would be no steps undertaken by the State Government to facilitate handover of the Repatriation Hospital without the consent of the RSL.

Unfortunately, since giving that undertaking, Dr Cornwall has fallen on hard times, not to put too fine a point on it. However, I trust that his successor as Minister of Health will honour Dr Cornwall's promise. The letter continues:

We have been given to understand that the Federal Government has been assured that the South Australian Government is prepared to take over Daws Road Hospital in 1990. The RSL is violently opposed to any such move. Current Government figures indicate that the recent high demand for beds at the RGH will not only remain at this level but will continue to increase until at least the year 1997 and that this demand will not return to today's level until after the year 2004. Whilst it is acknowledged that at some stage in the future there must be some integration between the repatriation and State hospital systems, it is the RSL's firm belief that this integration should not take place until such time as the veterans' requirement for hospitalisation at the Repatriation Hospitals is such that it is uneconomical for them to continue as purely Repatriation Hospitals. It is believed that whilst such a heavy demand is to be made on the Repatriation Department the previous Federal Government commitment for the care of the victims of war, which has been reaffirmed by successive Governments for over more than 70 years, must be upheld.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That's a moral obligation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course it is. The letter continues:

Your assistance is sought in bringing this situation to the notice of the Government of South Australia and in requesting the South Australian Government to resist the advances of the Federal Government. I seek your personal assistance that you will oppose any premature handover of the Repatriation General Hospital to the State Government.

I put that letter on record in this House to give it support. The way in which the Federal Government would seek to shrug off onto State Governments its proper responsibilities, in the name of some sort of budgetary restraint or avoidance of expense, is appalling and a complete abrogation of that Government's responsibilities to those who served this country in war and their dependants.

I do not know whether Dr Cornwall's undertaking has been dishonoured. The situation is reminiscent of the sort of undertaking that was given to the people of Laura, Blyth and Taillem Bend some months ago by none other than the Premier in a letter in which he said that the Government had no firm plans to close country hospitals and that the local community would be consulted before any such decision was made. That promise has been blatantly disregarded and dishonoured and that is why the RSL is concerned.

On Friday last, I attended a meeting of the Mid North Local Government Association which was opened by the Hon. Barbara Wiese who I thought made a fool of herself in her opening remarks when she became stupidly political.

At that meeting, the closure of those country hospitals was raised and it is perfectly clear that the Premier has dishonoured his promise. The local community was not consulted and its wishes were not respected or even listened to. I think the exact words of the Premier were that 'the wishes of the local community would be respected'.

They have not been respected; they have not even been listened to. Up until last week the Premier and his ill-fated Minister were not even prepared to talk to the local people. We went through the same process when the Government decided to close the Kalyra hospice in the Adelaide Hills: the wishes of the local community were not given any credence whatever. A set of phoney figures was advanced to indicate what would need to be spent on that hospital—completely phoney—and, as I said, it was closed against the wishes of the local community. In bringing this matter to the attention of the House I give it all the support I can. My colleagues who no doubt have received similar letters would support any move by the Federal Government to continue to assume its proper responsibility for those who have served this country in war, and their dependants. I do not believe that I need say any more in this debate except to reinforce a message contained in these letters which directly concern my constituents.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I want first to refer to an article in yesterday's *News* in the column 'That's South Australia All Over'. It is a small segment entitled 'Relatively Speaking'. The article states:

Relatively speaking, relationships between the ALP and the National Party of South Australia have never been closer. Kym Mayes, Sports Minister, and Peter Blacker, sole NP member in the House, have just discovered that they are second cousins.

To put the picture in its entirety: down the other leg of the family tree is the former member for Murray-Mallee, Mr Bill Nankivell. So, we have a Liberal, Labor and National Party trio and it gives credence to the old saying that one can choose one's friends but not one's relations.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I have said all I intend to say about my relatives. Earlier today the Premier made a ministerial statement on the balancing of the books from the last financial year. I have often said in this House that I believe every Government should be responsible for bringing down a balanced budget and, should it have a deficit, it is constitutionally—certainly morally—bound that that matter be corrected in the next financial year; whether it is done by way of increased taxation or cutting of expenditure is up to the Government concerned.

On this occasion, when the Premier brings down figures such as that I am pleased that that is the direction in which he is heading. However, we must look at the figures that the Government is presenting and look at all the statutory authorities to find out how much money, by way of borrowings, those statutory authorities have been allocated. That money would otherwise be allocated under the Government budget. I do not have those figures, but I will be looking at that position when the Budget comes before the House next week.

I applaud attempts to bring in a balanced budget: that is an ideal that all members of Parliament should look for. This Parliament must satisfy itself that the books are accurate and represent a fair overall picture for the State and not have some of the borrowings hidden, or effectively covered, by borrowings through the respective statutory authorities. I understand that there is something like 250 of them in South Australia, so we can readily see that many millions of dollars could be concerned in that way.

I wish to raise a couple of points. One is that during the last session of Parliament I raised in this House the problem of sight impaired and blind people being serviced by Access Cabs. These cabs were designed by the Government for the assistance of disabled people. However, because blindness is not regarded in the same way as physical disabilities, Access Cabs are not available to blind people in the same subsidised way as they are to handicapped people.

At the time I raised this matter in Parliament, the Minister of Transport was present and he called me over after my speech and said that there were a few differing factors and that, in fact, sight impaired people were given a \$22 a week travel allowance. That was subsequently followed by a letter to the Disability Adviser to the Premier, Mr Richard Llewellyn, who advised that the reason sight impaired people could not have subsidised service from Access Cabs was that they were entitled to this subsidy of \$22 a week.

I subsequently forwarded that letter to some of my constituents who are sight impaired and was advised that the matter should be taken up with the Department of Social Security. We did that, only to find that no such travel allowance exists. Therefore, I again bring the matter to the notice of this House and the attention of the Minister because the advice and reasons that he gave on the previous occasion no longer—or perhaps never did—apply.

In following the matter back through the Disability Adviser to the Premier I find that that advice—and I received an apology from the Disability Adviser to this effect—was not correct at the time. So, I make a plea to the Parliament and to the Government that people who are blind, or are recognised officially as visually impaired, should be eligible for subsidised transport through Access Cabs, in the same way as other people with disabilities. I would be pleased if the Government would take up that matter because I fail to see that a disability of one kind or the other should be treated separately in this instance. It has been stated that sight impaired people have the availability of normal taxis. That is probably right but they do not have the availability of the normal bus run in the way in which a sighted person does. Therefore, their disabilities—unless they are assisted—tie them to their immediate locality as they are not able to venture into wider fields.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned war veterans. I intended to raise that issue because I, like most members of Parliament, have received letters from various branches of the RSL which have experienced some concern about the proposed arrangements for the State Government to take over the Daw Park Hospital and the repatriation system in the next two or three years. This has drawn a considerable amount of comment from returned servicemen and I know for a fact that it has been debated at many of their meetings. I have been approached by many of them, personally and in writing, to keep the pressure on to see that this does not take place. I am advised that the requirement for hospitalisation or that type of accommodation for returned service people will continue to grow for at least the next four years before the actual or anticipated numbers will peter off and gradually decline after that date. At least well into the 1990s the requirement for repatriation services will continue. I share the concern of the RSL.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I take the point that the honourable member for Mitchell raises: Daw Park is not in my electorate, but many of my constituents who require those services often find themselves at Daw Park. If the former Minister believes that I am encroaching on his electorate, I did not intend to do so. I have taken up the matter in writing with the State Minister of Health, the Federal Min-

ister for Health, and the Federal Minister for Veterans Affairs, and I have had personal discussions with the shadow Minister for Veterans Affairs. So, I have taken up the point from the point of view of local RSL people. Mention has also been made about country hospitals. I understand that some discussions took place today.

I have not heard the outcome of those discussions, but I will certainly watch the situation very carefully. At the first opportunity I will seek an undertaking from the Minister of Health, who is now in this House and can be questioned face to face, if I can put it that way, that medical services in the country areas will be kept and at a standard to which we have not only become accustomed but also to which we should be entitled, because we are continually being told that all citizens of this State are equal and, therefore, we should have electorates of equal numerical size. Therefore, we should all have medical services of equal quality in this State. I will push (as I know will the member for Eyre and all other country members) to ensure that the services that we have (and which in many cases have been put there by the hard work, sweat and expense of those community people at a minimal cost to the Government of the day) are not threatened.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise a matter with the Premier and it is opportune, because this afternoon, in his ministerial statement, the Premier indicated that the State's finances were in excellent shape. I hope, that being the case, he will provide a few dollars to the Highways Department so that it may repair the road between the Eyre Highway and Cook. On the weekend I attended the annual school sports day at Cook and those people receive very little from the State Government. They ask for very little, but they are entitled to have reasonable access to the Eyre Highway. I have been advised that that highway is in a deplorable condition. One constituent, who had a new Nissan four-wheel drive, said that the pot holes were so bad that his vehicle's rear window popped out and it cost him \$1 100 to replace it. The people of Cook gave me a petition which I forwarded to the Minister of Transport, but I want to bring those problems to the attention of the House, because that group of isolated people does not make many demands upon the Government and I sincerely hope that this very reasonable request is acted upon very rapidly.

The second matter relates to my continuing concern about the debate which is taking place in this State and nation concerning the handling of grain and the marketing arrangements for wheat on the domestic market. The history of grain growing in Australia has been one of the success stories of this country. The wool, wheat and coal industries have provided the export income which has enabled the nation to manage its own financial affairs successfully. One of the reasons that the wheat industry has been successful is that in South Australia we have had a system of orderly marketing since 1947. One of the former speakers of this House (Hon. T.C. Stott) can take considerable credit for bringing that system into operation. It has been of great benefit to the wheatgrowers of this nation.

A number of people in the community are highly qualified and have tertiary degrees in economics but, unfortunately, very few have had the practical experience of being involved in the grain industry. In my view, the economic realities are that, if they were successful (and I do not believe that they will be), the only people likely to be affected or who will miss out are the genuine wheatgrowers. I do not intend to stand here and support any legislation or amendments to the cooperative bulk handling arrangements that are contrary to the overwhelming desires of the wheatgrow-

ers of this State and nation. My colleagues and I will oppose any attempts that are not in line with the views of the wheat growers in South Australia. I was appalled to learn that the South Australian Minister of Agriculture agreed with the Agricultural Council's decision to support the Kerin plan.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr GUNN: No, that is for the wheat industry.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr GUNN: You can have chapter No.2. That course of action was most irresponsible. South Australia has a lot of marginal country and areas that do not have an assured rainfall. People need some assurance that they will receive a reasonable price for their grain and that, when they have the grain ready to cart, they can get it into the system. In South Australia we have the most effective and efficient bulk handling system in the world, the reason being that we have one licensed receiver which is owned by the wheat-growers; it costs the taxpayers no money, and it is effective and efficient. It has wide scale support. I received a letter dated 7 July from the City of Port Pirie and it states:

I enclose copy of a letter forwarded to the Local Government Association of South Australia requesting that its representative on the Task Force of Review of the Report of the Royal Commission into Grain Storage, Handling and Transport, oppose the recommendations of that commission in regard to the deregulation of port authorities, grain storage, and rail services pertaining to grain export, due to the severe detrimental effect it would have on Port Pirie.

I think one could say that it would have a detrimental effect on the majority of South Australians. I was very pleased to reply to the Chief Executive Officer and say that I agreed entirely with his views.

Last week I also received a letter from the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Inc. which states:

Please find enclosed a proposal from the GCA endorsed by the UFS relating to alternative domestic marketing arrangements for incorporation in the new wheat marketing legislation. You are aware that the UFS is totally opposed to any weakening of the Australian Wheat Board's statutory marketing powers.

This paper outlines our proposals to expand and modify the grower to buyer system in an attempt to introduce more flexibility into the domestic market without exposing our growers to the costs associated with a totally deregulated market.

Trusting this paper will be of assistance to you in determining your policy in relation to this issue. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

It is signed by the Executive Officer of the Grain Section. I entirely agree with the suggestion contained in that letter and that organisation has my total support.

I am concerned that the debate on this issue has not been of a particularly constructive nature. A great deal of incorrect information has floated around the community and certain people are making statements based on inadequate information or research. I suggest to all Federal members of Parliament in this State (and I have spoken to people on both sides of the argument, some of whom need a slight education) that they ought to attend some of the growers' meetings. I think that their education would then be complete.

I again refer to the Premier's ministerial statement which he made today and which indicated South Australia's rosy financial state of affairs. I refer him to a copy of a letter which I received on 2 August and which is addressed to the Minister of Agriculture. The letter states:

Dear Mr Mayes,

The Far West Rural Support Group has been advised by the Acting Director of Agriculture . . . per telephone that our subsidy request on fodder and stock freight will not be put before State cabinet. We ask that you urgently reconsider this decision. The seasonal outlook remains extremely bleak and assistance from your government to agist or lot feed sheep is a practical way to encourage farmers to retain some breeding stock. We assure you our interest in the matter will be continuing and should you again

reject our request we would like to be advised by letter of the reasons for doing so.

During your planned visit to our area in September our group would like to discuss with you long term plans for our area which will keep farmers occupying their land productively.

I wrote to the Minister and made another request but, unfortunately, I received another rejection. I find it difficult to understand that the Government is so ill advised or has such a lack of understanding or appreciation of the needs of those communities that it would reject a request when I believe that the maximum cost would be about \$750 000. It is a reasonable request made by a group of people who make few demands upon the Government. The Government has taken away their school buses and it will not provide them with an adequate water supply and now it rejects these requests. I am particularly disappointed, because I believe that these people have a future. They have had a run of bad seasons, but that will change and they will then be in for a run of good seasons. If one looks at the area, one sees that that is its history.

They are hardworking and dedicated people and I strongly protest on their behalf. I also say to the Premier that if the State Government can authorise and allow the Timber Corporation of South Australia to waste millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, there is no reason why the State Government cannot support a couple of worthwhile projects in isolated parts in this State. I could go on at length about the problems of schools and lack of managements now that financial affairs appear to be rosy. We expect that some of those requests will be met within a reasonable time. The problems of isolation and the great value that agriculture is to the economy of the State cannot be overlooked. Two industries made this country and will keep it: one is mining and one is agriculture. All that they want is a fair go and I earnestly appeal to the Government to ignore some of the crank groups in this community who are continually attempting to make it more difficult for those industries.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I address my remarks to concerns I have on behalf of the Country Fire Services in this State. I am sure that all members would recognise the important contribution the CFS makes in this State, particularly in country areas. I have had the opportunity to become closely involved with CFS brigades in various parts of the Hills and with the people who work on a voluntary basis. They have my total support. I have been concerned about the attitude that the Government has tended to take towards the CFS and the changes needed regarding that organisation. I refer specifically to the matter of funding of the CFS. It is a sham and an absolute disgrace that the Government has not taken action to address the issue of funding for that organisation.

The shadow Minister has indicated to the CFS that we will do everything we can to ensure that the funding situation is sorted out as a matter of priority. I do not want to go into a lot of detail other than to say that I am concerned that the Premier has had on his desk for some time a report setting out quite clearly some recommendations that the Government might consider for the funding of the CFS. I am not sure why the Premier has refused to act on that report and on those recommendations, but that is certainly the case. I urge the Premier to treat this matter with the urgency that it deserves because, whilst the funding is in limbo, frustration exists within that organisation, which deserves the full support of the Premier and Government.

I am also very much aware of the frustrations the CFS has experienced regarding much needed legislation which we are told will provide major changes to the responsibility and structure of the CFS. I certainly understood, and many

of the brigades in my electorate were of the belief, that that legislation would have been introduced prior to the end of the last session to enable it to lay on the table for appropriate consultation to ensure that it was well and truly in place for the next fire season. That was not to be. We have been told that legislation will be introduced in this session. I urge the Minister responsible to introduce it as soon as possible and undertake appropriate consultation with those involved in the CFS and the community generally. I am particularly concerned to learn that the funding issue is not addressed. I realise that it is a separate issue to the legislation, although they are parallel. It is important that the funding side be dealt with at the same time as the legislation. I will be very interested to see the legislation when it comes into this place.

I commend all those involved in the CFS for the time they contribute in a voluntary capacity to serve their community through that organisation. I am sure that they do it because they care about the community in which they live and because they want to share the expertise they have gained through training and firefighting experience.

I could say considerably more on the need for appropriate legislation and funding, but I wish to move to another area. I remind the House, particularly the Minister, that on 23 March I placed questions on notice regarding the CFS. I have still not received answers to those questions. On 2 December last year I placed questions on notice regarding the Metropolitan Fire Services, and still have not received replies to those questions. I do not know the reason for that delay. I can only presume that the Minister does not want to make that information available, but it is a very sad state of affairs when a member of the Opposition is not able to get the information to which he is entitled through a question on notice. I will continue to raise those matters until the information is provided.

I received a letter from the President of one of my brigades, the Bridgewater brigade, and draw it to the attention of the House. It refers to an injustice as seen by that brigade of an association such as ETSA being able to charge voluntary organisations like the CFS a rate double that charged for domestic supply. The letter states:

This letter is to outline a telephone conversation between myself and an employee of ETSA on Tuesday 24 May 1988 regarding the 'S' tariff that is currently being charged this, and all CFS brigades, for electricity consumption. As you are probably aware, the 'S' tariff is a general purpose tariff which is charged to a consumer who cannot be categorised as domestic, business or similar.

As the current charge for 'S' tariff is 23.32 cents/unit, compared with 12.98 cents/unit for domestic supply, I queried the possibility of having our tariff altered. I was told that, 'it did not matter who I spoke to, as 'S' tariff that suited the operation of CFS Brigades, and that the rate applicable to this tariff would be charged'. When I queried the obvious difference in the rates, the reply was 'these rates are set by a committee'. In light of the current low levels of funding received by CFS brigades, I feel that it is an injustice for an organisation such as ETSA to be able to charge volunteer organisations a rate which is double that charged for domestic supply. Your comments on this matter, along with any assistance, would be greatly appreciated.

I put that letter and suggestion to the then Minister of Mines and Energy. The reply I received was less than satisfactory and I assure the new Minister of Mines and Energy that I will continue to raise that issue because I believe strongly that the CFS deserves a better deal. As a voluntary organisation it should be able to obtain a cheaper rate for power supplied.

The last matter to which I will refer quickly is a letter I received from an independent researcher, directed to an officer of the State Supply Department. It relates to circumstances surrounding current negotiations to award a CFS

tender for 90 fire appliances to the Victorian CFA, and states:

Dear Sir,

Several matters have come to my attention which raise a degree of concern as a member of the South Australian public and I wish to request your response to these to clarify my understanding of the situation. My inquiry is independently motivated and not at the request or instruction of any group or client.

The matters deal with circumstances surrounding the current negotiations to award a CFS tender for 90 fire appliances to the Victorian CFA. I feel that investigation of the circumstances should be looked at as a matter of urgency before this tender is finalised as they could have a significant impact on procedures associated with the awarding of it.

My concerns are—

1. That the CFA are not a legitimate commercial tenderer for these 90 appliances for the reasons as follow:
 - a. As a semi-government body their charter and incorporation is for the public service of fighting fires in the Victorian country regions.
 - b. As a Victorian semi-government body it may well be that any appliance manufacturing allowed by their charter would be confined to their own internal departmental use within their own state system.
 - c. Any commercial manoeuvring by the CFA outside their own immediate requirements, and particularly outside their own State, may not in fact be legitimate as it may be outside the CFA charter and be usurping the role of free enterprise commercial operators in the Australian fire fighting equipment industry.
2. That any manufacturing activities of the CFA outside of their own requirements may be contravening section IV of the Trade Practices Act dealing with Restrictive Trade Practices.

Time does not permit me to continue to quote from that letter. However, I urge the Minister to treat this matter with some urgency.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): First, I shall refer briefly to the series of questions that were asked yesterday afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition, by the member for Hanson, as shadow Minister of Correctional Services, and by me in relation to what we found at the City Watch House. I believe that we received a less than satisfactory response from the Minister responsible for these matters, and I refer particularly to the Minister of Correctional Services, who, after it was pointed out to him that these people were living in squalor and being refused reasonable recognition of their rights as individuals, shrugged his shoulders and said, 'So what?'. These people are transgressors. However, at the moment some of them are transgressors in the eyes of the law without having been found guilty, because they are remandees or are on charges not yet processed through the courts. Therefore, they do have a different right to those people who are there as prisoners and who are there in transit from one place to another relative to a new charge or some further misdemeanor.

Of the people whom we saw in the Watch House yesterday some had been there in excess of ten days, and, but for the persistence of members of the Police Force, they would have been clothed in the same clothes for the whole time that they had been there. They have access to a shower but they have no access to any other clothing. When the police indicated that this was giving less than favourable consideration to the rights of these people, Correctional Services officers provided some prison garb. When asked about getting the clothes that the prisoners had stepped out of laundered ready to be used later the Correctional Services officers said that they wanted nothing to do with the matter, that it was a problem for the police. The police were the meat in the sandwich in that circumstance. I believe that the demarcation that was permitted to occur in the argument between the Minister of Correctional Services and the Minister for Emergency Services is one that does neither Minister credit. It needs to be sorted out very quickly.

The Watch House has holding cells and in considering the conditions at the Watch House one must realise that they are not cells for living in. There are empty beds in a number of prisons in South Australia because the prisoners who ought to be occupying those cells in other prisons are being held in these less than favourable circumstances at the Watch House. I wonder just how far we have to go with this foolish idea that if a prisoner is not back by 4.30 he cannot be re-admitted to his own cell, with his own clothes and his own private accessories. If a court happens to run late on a Friday night, prisoners are returned to the Watch House and must spend a weekend in these deplorable conditions before gaining access to their own property and their own cell.

Also, it is not possible for people to visit prisoners while they are in those circumstances. As I said before, we must recognise that those people are there because they transgressed against the law or because it has been alleged that they have transgressed against the law, but they should not be denied the normal rights of a person held in custody. I trust that, although negotiations broke down—and there was an absolute farce yesterday afternoon, between the representatives of the two services—the matter has now been sorted out and a little bit of commonsense has been permitted to prevail, with the responsibilities of the individual Ministries properly addressed. I hope that there will not be a reoccurrence of the circumstances that existed there.

I also make the point that one of the people whom I saw in the cells is a potential deportee, an illegal migrant. He had been in the same cell in the same clothes for eight days while consideration was being given to sending that person to a deportation camp in Melbourne. In fact, we saw two people yesterday who were potential deportees. I suggest that if it has been determined that a person is to be deported it is only fit and proper that they be taken out of the system and sent to their final camp without delay.

We also found that one of the people there was a vegetarian and that no provision whatsoever had been made for the proper feeding of that person. He took what was made available to him from the police canteen during the five working days of the week, while on the weekends he took the food that was forwarded from the Remand Centre. It is just a matter of luck whether there is anything there that fits into a vegetarian diet and, if so, he will feel nourished, but if there is nothing on the plate that he is able to accept then he has to go without.

We also found a person who was under medication and who does not have teeth. It is quite impossible for that person to make use of food as it is made available. I am not talking about a lack of quality of the food but about the fact that it is not in a state that the person can take in. Fortunately, due to the good graces of the gaolers or the attendants at the Watch House his meals are put through a mincer so that that he can adequately nourish himself while in custody. He had been there for a number of days. These are matters which need sorting out quickly, and not at the whim of a Minister of the Crown who does not want to know the seriousness—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He says, 'So what?'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: That is right. The Minister of Correctional Services shrugged his shoulders and said, 'So what?' when I interjected during Question Time yesterday. The final matter that I wish to comment on is my concern for the large number of persons who come through the door of an electorate office, after finding themselves at grave disadvantage because of their inability to find sufficient funds to employ solicitors for the purpose of correcting the problems which they meet in daily life.

One sees a number of cases where parents are denied access to their children because of the attitude of a previous spouse. They are told that if they want access, which has already been provided to them by the court, they will have to make a further appearance in court to have their former spouse placed on a charge of contempt. It is virtually impossible to get a solicitor to appear in the Family Court for under \$500 for one appearance, even to simply lay a charge against a former spouse for failing to fulfill a commitment laid down by the court. Many people find themselves in difficulty after consulting accountants who use debarred solicitors. In South Australia one debarred solicitor in particular is allowing his name to appear on a number of documents passing through the offices of various accountants. I believe that that needs investigation.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Before addressing the major subject of my grievance tonight I refer members to page 22 of the journal, *Engineers Australia* of 19 August 1988, which states that Britain may have to spend up to £8 billion during the next 60 years to combat the rise in sea levels associated with the greenhouse effect. Members have talked about the impact of CFCs on the ozone layer. One of the major problems we are facing is the effect of CO₂ concentrations on our atmosphere, and the picture painted in this publication is grim indeed, and it raises the spectre of alternative energy supplies and the increasing use of uranium energy.

The other brief note I would like to make is in respect of the contribution made by the member for Briggs during the Address in Reply debate. The honourable member was at his sleazy best and one can only assume that he had a fit of pique about being left out of the Ministry. This does not excuse his behaviour, although there is some explanation in that he did not even feature in the line up for the next Ministry. I will give the member for Briggs a few tips. One is that the Premier cannot afford to have him on the front bench because he wants him to run a sleazy, scummy campaign such as he ran for the 1985 election. The second point is that he does not want him on his front bench because he knows what he is like, so the carrot will be dangled to the member for Briggs to put up a good performance for the 1989 election.

Today I received a memo from Mr Phil Saunders, Executive Officer of South Australian Unemployed Groups in Action. It details some of the findings from the Spencer Gulf tour, particularly relating to support for the unemployed. Members here would appreciate that youth unemployment in this State is the highest in the whole of Australia. We have unemployment rates for the 15 to 19 year-olds which oscillate between 23 and 25 per cent. In the Spencer Gulf region they are over 30 per cent. This area has particular problems, not the least of which is the availability of work.

I would like to share with members some observations of the task force that visited centres in the Spencer Gulf region. The task force makes the point that country centres and rural areas have particular difficulties, not the least of which is isolation. For example, a simple thing like a telephone call to Adelaide is far more expensive, and there is a need for more 008 numbers. There is a desire by the people in the region to be visited by Adelaide-based agencies. There is the problem of having to personally deliver unemployment benefit forms if one is under the 20 kilometre limit, which means that many people have to hitch rides and ride bikes. Lack of transport is a real problem causing dependency on family and friends and delays in payments. It demonstrates a lack of sensitivity.

Transport is also a problem in getting to job interviews. A reduction in local government services is possible as a result of the removal of minimum rate setting, and we have already debated that matter before the House. There are problems common to Adelaide but perhaps magnified in country centres, including isolation, distance, cost of phone calls, cost of transport, lack of the simplest resources, housing shortages and the high cost thereof, income security and education, particularly the availability of courses in this area.

The observation is made that it is difficult to get motivated because of the negatives. The population's voting strength will not give the rural area the extra push for resources over the city. Some of the task forces' notes are in fairly crude form, but I think they make the point that our rural areas do not seem to count on Labor Government agenda. Another observation is that anyone can be enterprising so we must continue to support and encourage them to think about opportunities, which is something that is quite lacking in areas such as this because they do not have some of the social infrastructures that we enjoy here in Adelaide. The criticism is made that Governments put in resources in a haphazard fashion without direction. The report states:

We have got the resources to fulfill the needs of 90 per cent but not using them with efficiency in terms of manpower, skills and commitment.

The report says that money flows through the towns but it is fragmented. There is concern that no source of private investment exists in the three major towns of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta because they are either one company towns or Government towns. Many people want to leave out of proportion to the population. It is impossible to recommend young people to employers because it is not a sure thing that they will hang around. Even up in these centres, when the CES says 'We will send you to a job' there is no guarantee that the person going to that job will want to stay in the job because of the history of the area. It is a vicious circle.

There is a mismatch between the education and training places available and the numbers of applicants. It is difficult for locals to get qualifications to compete for local jobs. Kids who go away to get post secondary qualifications do not come back. Government workers, often without country experience, are imported through internal public service procedures. There is money for labour market programs but the jobs are not there. The report speaks of the sadness of young people having to leave the district for a job being demoralising for the locals and for the many friends and people they have grown up with.

The young unemployed need the support of adults in the community. The report makes the observation not to underestimate what the rural crisis will be doing in the foreseeable future to unemployed and unemployment figures, not to mention family break-ups, young people leaving, husbands looking for work and bank managers being forced to foreclose on debts. We have already had reference to a number of those items in other debates. There is a problem with 'casualisation' of the workforce, and wading through bureaucracy. The report makes the observation that it takes time to go through four Government departments; things just do not happen fast enough. Public servants do not have the background in enterprise.

There are some interesting observations. The centres visited were Kadina, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln. Several solutions are recommended and, although some of them may not fit into my scheme of things, they are worth thinking about because the problems in those areas are magnified to a great extent due to the

lack of resources in the area and the difficulties being experienced by the communities.

I commend this sensitive document because it provides food for thought. It must be remembered that the problems in the Spencer Gulf area are but an extension of the lack of activity in this State. These problems result in the high incidence of crime. For instance, on television this evening an item referred to the high incidence of Aborigines in gaol. All those things are a product of a State economy that is not providing for its own population, and this is particularly felt in those country centres which have no economic dynamic but only areas in rural crisis around them. I commend the document to the House.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I wish to address four matters in this grievance debate. During recent days I have addressed certain matters in this House and some of them need underlining. The first such subject this evening concerns the mismanagement of South Australian parks in general as a result of this Government's ineptitude and indifference, particularly in the Murray-Mallee. I have already commented on this matter where the Government seems hell bent on supporting the weird notions of some people in the conservation movement whom I term 'Greenies'.

When I say that, the House should take account of the fact that I have been a member of conservation organisations in this State for longer than I have been a member of the Liberal Party. Indeed, my commitment to those organisations—be they of the type of the Civic Trust, which is concerned for our heritage, the Nature Conservation Society or the Ornithological Society—has been a longstanding personal involvement because of my respect for the need to retain what we have as unique assets in either the natural environment or the built environment.

Therefore, it is against that background that I comment on the mismanagement of our national parks. On the one hand, the Government has said that it has limited resources available to police the National Parks and Wildlife Act and ancillary regulations, yet on the other hand it is determined to extend the network of parks. One should not bite off more than one can chew: that is my comment in this regard. At present it is not appropriate to extend further the area of national parks in South Australia without ensuring that we first have a good handle on managing what we already have.

It is not a legitimate strategy simply to say that, because we do not have the personnel (or money to pay the personnel) to provide appropriate management for our parks, we should simply drop a fence around them, lock them up, and forever alienate them from the public. That would be preventing public access of any kind and it is not a legitimate strategy. That is not what it is all about. We need a policy that recognises the need for two things.

First, we must ensure that we lock up parts of our natural ecosystems as wilderness areas into which human beings do not go under any circumstances without, first, careful scrutiny being given to the reason for their visit. It must be considered justified that they go there in the interests of science and understanding of those parks. Secondly, national parks need to be there for the purpose of providing people with access to those natural habitats. We are not so far removed from the roots of our ancestors, who were in the first instance hunters and in the second instance hunter gatherers, that we do not all feel at some time a call to the wild. We need to be able to go back to the bush wherever it is, whatever it may represent, and on whichever continent

on earth we as *homo sapiens* may be living. That is natural and understandable.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member for Mount Gambier has it quite accurately: we must have access to those natural surroundings. Even the Japanese, in their highly urbanised society recognise the importance and the value of providing people with the opportunity within a day's journey from their dwelling to get to a place in the open spaces, enjoy it and what it means to them, and then return home. So much for national parks and their present management policies. Notwithstanding the points that I have made, it is not good enough for the Government to say, 'We'll do it if we can and when we can afford it.' That is simply not good enough. It means that the Government is ignoring its responsibilities not only to the present population, the people of South Australia at large, but also to future generations. Those responsibilities involve the control of vermin and pest plants.

The Government must have whatever means are necessary to discharge those responsibilities, perhaps by means of service orders made against people who are found guilty of offences against individuals and society at large and who would otherwise be sent to prison. Alternatively, this end could be achieved by arranging for work for the dole. I do not mind. The important thing is that we do it because, if we do not do it, we will stand condemned by future generations for ignoring our responsibilities and for our real inability to do other than to address the popular political mood of the moment in the course of determining the policy that we pursue. Clearly it is not fair to lock up a park such as Ngarkat *in toto* and to say that it is all needed as wilderness area, Ngarkat being the most substantial park in the area that I have the honour and responsibility to represent.

My second subject concerns the Geranium Area School, to which I referred recently and which has undertaken a most unique and incredibly innovative program of providing the opportunity, through offering board and lodging in the homes of families in the district, of getting student numbers, especially at secondary level, up to a sufficient number to ensure its continued survival. That will be to the benefit of the parents and the children coming to Geranium as boarders in homes in the community in which the school exists, as well as to those students who presently attend that school.

First, there is an excellent student-teacher ratio at the school. Indeed, one could not find a better student-teacher ratio anywhere in South Australia: there is maybe one teacher to every six or eight students. That is an excellent situation. Staff members are totally committed and dedicated to their work. In saying that, I do not wish to reflect unfairly on staff elsewhere. I am simply saying that at Geranium the staff is as good as one could possibly get. Nothing focuses the attention of men or women more than the threat of their demise.

The second point concerning the Geranium school is the personal commitment to the supervision and the sound reports that will be made at regular intervals by the host families of those coming to live in the midst of the Geranium community.

The third point is that residents within that community participate in all kinds of sport and recreation. Everybody and anybody is able to find things at which they are naturally and inherently good. Whether they are, by nature, people more inclined to be introspective or whether they are extroverted does not matter. The opportunities for rapid, personal development through adolescence to responsible behaviour in early adulthood will be greater in a community

like Geranium than anywhere else because of this wide range of activities.

There is no pub in the community and no chance for people to be tempted in this respect. Whenever alcohol is consumed at social activities it is done in the company of people in the family scene aged from 18 to 80. It is not done in cabals of young people drinking and becoming hoons and lairs, engaging in activities of which they would otherwise be ashamed.

Finally, there are no drugs, and there is no chance of drugs, because everybody in that community knows everybody else and nobody would want to be associated with drugs. There would be a sense of shame on the individual and his or her family. One could not wish for a better environment. I commend the school council and the community for what they are doing in advertising the fact that they are prepared to take boarders into their homes to become students in the school, to ensure the survival of the secondary school component.

Finally, I want to say how despicable it is to have roads ripped up by Government agencies for which no compensation is provided to the local community for the damage done.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I take pleasure in speaking to the Bill, and perhaps it would be appropriate, albeit unusual, if, first, I acknowledge that the South Australian Government over the past few years has had at least two major strikes to its credit: one being the Grand Prix, which will soon take place again in Adelaide and which members on this side of the House have been happy to support and attend, and the other being the national submarine project which is currently under way and which ultimately should provide continuing employment in South Australia.

However, on looking at the Governor's speech and noticing the paucity of new developments, realising that once again in allocating Supply money we are virtually funding a whole host of initiatives which were the children of the former Tonkin Liberal Government, one realises that the present Labor Government has been devoid of initiative in the five or six years since it took office. Let me refresh members' memories. Mr Marcus Clark of the South Australian State Bank recently drew to our attention the fact that there is very little new business and economic investment in South Australia. In passing, I take exception to one point that he made which relates to the fact that he dragged the Liberal Party into his argument by the scruff of the neck. I suggest that, had he looked a little more carefully at the investments that have taken place in South Australia over the past few years, many of them were projects which were planned in the three years of the Tonkin Liberal Government and have been put into effect in the past five or six years.

I can see at least one member of the other side of the House who is smiling. I will list 16 projects that were under way when the Tonkin Government lost office. Meanwhile, I also point out that in 1982 South Australia had the distinction of having the lowest taxation structure in Australia, a fact which the Premier is reluctant to admit. The Premier says that he inherited from the Tonkin Liberal Government a deficit of some \$60 million. He has been in office for six years since then. I think it would be equally appropriate if I were to remind the Premier that the then Tonkin Government inherited from the Dunstan Corcoran regime sub-

stantial debts of up to \$200 million which had to be repaid by 1982 and which accounted for a substantial part of the legacy which the present Premier claims he inherited. Among those debts was \$23 million which we simply wrote off as an accrued debt to the South Australian Meat Corporation. Another \$10 million was written off as a loss to the South Australian Frozen Food Factory. Tens of millions of dollars were written off to failed industries which were substantially supported by the Dunstan Government, with very little wisdom, as can be seen in retrospect.

Another point made by the Minister of State Development and Technology is that we have gained 200 people with technological expertise and financial assets in South Australia over the past year or two. I simply point out that that highlights the paucity of endeavour coming to South Australia because over 8 000 immigrants have come from Hong Kong alone in the past two years, leaving Hong Kong with their skills and money because they are afraid of what will happen when that colony is assimilated into mainland China. Of that 8 000 immigrants who have come to Australia, on a *pro rata* basis South Australia should have gained at least 800. We normally work on 10 per cent for South Australia on a *pro rata* population basis. Of course, by the Minister's own admission, we have only 200. So, there too we are losing out.

I go back to the projects that were well under way when the Liberal Government lost office in 1982. The O-Bahn project, which is now praised quite cheerfully by the Labor Party, was severely criticised as being a poor alternative to a light rail system. In fact, the O-Bahn was a pioneer system in Australia. It led to the beautification of the Torrens linear park, which was part and parcel of the former Minister of Transport, Michael Wilson's, project. With the improvement of the transport situation from Tea Tree Gully came a tourist attraction, with the present Government saying that tourists are delighted to ride on the O-Bahn system. So, that is a success story from way back in the early 1980s—a Liberal innovation.

The Roxby Downs project, which the present Premier was pleased to call a 'mirage in the desert' when he was on the Opposition back benches, is soon to be opened: the world's largest mine of any description with tremendous potential for the supply of copper, uranium, gold, silver, platinum, rare earths and a host of minerals for the world markets. That was a Liberal Party initiative which actually led to the downfall of the Liberal Government. Had the Liberal Party gone to an election with that project as an issue in 1982 instead of pursuing, as it did, the passage of the Bill through both Houses, it would certainly have still been in office. But it pursued the Roxby agreement to the exclusion of any personal aggrandisement and for the ultimate benefit of South Australia—another Liberal initiative.

The petrochemical pipeline, which finishes at Stony Point, is another Liberal Party initiative. I remind members that a solution to unemployment came out of the construction of that pipeline. There were hundreds of kilometres of pipeline to construct and very few skilled welders to construct it. With the aid of the College of Technical and Further Education and the South Australian branch of Commonwealth Industrial Gases, several hundred South Australians were trained in the skills of mild steel welding. They put that pipeline together, and the Stony Point success is now bringing in royalties to South Australia, just as Roxby Downs will soon be adding to the State's coffers—again, a Liberal initiative.

Technology Park: I recall when the Liberal Party was in Cabinet under the Tonkin Government that the Hon. Dean Brown, Minister of Labour, went to Europe and consulted

with companies such as Fairey Aviation and British Aircraft and, telling them that we were constructing a Technology Park in South Australia, he invited them to join the venture. Some of them came over here and committed themselves early. Technology Park was well under way when the present Labor Government took office—another Liberal initiative.

The ASER development was another project planned by the Liberals. The full-scale model was available for South Australians to see in late 1981/early 1982, although subsequently the joint venturers were different when the Labor Party took over the scheme. The granting of land rights to the Pitjantjatjara-Maralinga people was promised for years by the Dunstan Government, but it was achieved by the Tonkin Liberal Government. The Moore's building redevelopment, which provided South Australia with splendid law courts, was again a Liberal Party initiative, although it was opened by the present Labor Government. The new city TAFE college, the Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education, was a Liberal initiative. I went to Canberra and obtained funding of about \$23 million, which was firmly committed by Senator Carrick and Senator Wal Fife, both of whom were Federal Ministers for Education. Once again, that was a Liberal initiative which was launched by David Tonkin and his Ministers.

The South Australian Museum redevelopment was planned to be a \$50 million reconstruction by the former Minister of the Arts (Hon. Murray Hill) who recently retired and to whom members on both sides gave great plaudits, but that was his brainchild. The Finger Point scheme was funded to the tune of about \$750 000 by the Tonkin Government and the Kingston Area School to the tune of \$5 million. Both those schemes were put into limbo for a short time by the Labor Government when it assumed office.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Health)**: I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)**: I rise to speak on two matters which are of vital importance to the South Australian and Australian dairy industries. The second of these two topics refers to the South-East and the South-East metropolitan milk equalisation contributions. I suspect that I will not have time to complete my remarks on that topic in the short time allowed.

The first matter with which I will deal affects the whole of Australia. I ask that the South Australian Minister of Agriculture consult with the Federal Minister (John Kerin) before the proposed agreement between Australia and New Zealand is signed. That agreement will facilitate the transportation and sale of New Zealand dairy products in Australia. I have some correspondence from the United Dairyfarmers of Victoria, which recently circulated this pamphlet to dairy farmers along the South-East border.

That organisation expressed grave concern that the agreement between Australia and New Zealand could have adverse effects on the Australian dairy industry. It suggested that all dairy farmers in Australia write to the Hon. R.J.L. Hawke, the Prime Minister of Australia, and ask for at least three things to be included in the letter of agreement between Australia and New Zealand: first, that no opportunity should

exist for any cross-subsidisation in pricing; secondly, that the New Zealand Dairy Board should not use its monopoly powers to discount prices; and, thirdly, that the New Zealand Dairy Board must sell dairy product on the Australian market on the same basis as that produce is sold in New Zealand.

The United Dairyfarmers of Victoria expresses grave concern, because it believes that there is a potential for breakdown in the Australian dairy industry once this treaty letter with New Zealand is signed. It states that the United Dairyfarmers of Victoria, along with the Australian Dairyfarmers Federation and the Australian Dairy Industry Council, has basically agreed to the terms of the treaty letter which has been drafted and forwarded to New Zealand. The letter will be signed by the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy (Hon. John Kerin) and the New Zealand Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries (Mr Colin Moyle). However, it points out that, on 4 August, it was advised that New Zealand was reluctant for that letter of agreement to be given treaty status and it is important that it should be given treaty status because, if it is not and it simply remains as a letter, then future Australian or New Zealand Governments might change the terms of the agreement.

If it is a treaty, then it would be much longer standing and it would last for the duration of several Parliaments. So, the organisation cannot understand why New Zealand wants to water down the treaty letter as it does. The correspondence states that this is completely unacceptable to Australians, the UDV, the ADFP and the ADIC. It asks that all dairy farmers take urgent action to ensure that the Prime Minister intercedes and that the ground rules are fair and lasting.

The President of the United Dairyfarmers of Victoria (Jim Saunders) said that the farmers should urgently seek a commitment from the Prime Minister and the Federal Government to support Mr Kerin's treaty letter being accepted by New Zealand in accordance with the discussions that have already taken place between the Federal Minister and the New Zealand Minister. Why should the Australian dairy industry be so concerned? It feels that the New Zealand dairy industry has received massive assistance from the New Zealand Government for quite some considerable time and the letter that I have is quite specific on those counts. It points out that the New Zealand Dairy Board is a statutory monopoly exporter of all New Zealand dairy products. It states:

The export markets supplied by New Zealand vary in profitability and include significant access to the high priced European Community market from which the Australian dairy industry is excluded. The New Zealand Dairy Board has the ability to direct product from its lowest priced export market to Australia and significantly undercut the Australian domestic market. In other words, the New Zealand Dairy Board has the opportunity to utilise its market power over all New Zealand exports to unfairly expand market share in Australia.

Australian dairy farmers have very little chance of preventing that. The United Dairyfarmers of Victoria also points out that New Zealand dairy companies and the dairy board have received considerable financial assistance in the past, and that puts New Zealand's industry in a very strong financial position to compete in Australia, compared with the Australian industry.

Until 1986 the New Zealand Government provided the New Zealand Dairy Board with a subordinated loan of \$NZ750 million, repayable over 40 years with interest at the token rate of only 1 per cent. That was made available to the New Zealand Dairy Board on conditions which also provided flexibility to defer payments in the event of adverse marketing conditions. In 1986 the New Zealand Government, apparently motivated by the desire to remove any

suggestion of concession finance, replaced this subordinated loan with a commercial loan of only \$NZ150 million. So, in effect, this meant that the New Zealand Dairy Board has been granted a tax free capital injection of the balance of \$NZ600 million of the original loan (that would be \$A500 million). This money would be available to the New Zealand Dairy Board to invest as it saw fit for the benefit of the New Zealand dairy industry.

The Australian dairy industry has no objection to the New Zealand Dairy Board or any New Zealand company investing in Australia, but it does not believe that it is consistent with the ideals of the agreement if those investments are financed or facilitated by tax-free capital grants from the New Zealand Government. I believe we can all see the acute disadvantage in which the Australian dairy farmers would be placed.

It also points out that the New Zealand industry enjoys a number of taxation advantages over the Australian industry, as if the foregoing comments were not enough. Neither the New Zealand Dairy Board nor the New Zealand cooperative dairy companies are liable for company tax on retained earnings. As a result, the New Zealand dairy industry has been able to build up a very substantial capital base. By comparison with Australian dairy companies, the New Zealand dairy companies (so claim the United Dairy Farmers of Victoria) are relatively debt free.

Even if that situation is only half true, members would realise how much of a threat a letter of agreement between Australia and New Zealand would be to the Australian dairy industry if the thing is not sewn up very tightly and any unfair practice completely removed. To that extent I repeat my request to the South Australian Minister of Agriculture to collaborate with the Federal Minister, John Kerin, to ensure that Australia's dairy industry is not disadvantaged, that the treaty proposed between Australia and New Zealand is not watered down to a simple letter of agreement, and that the points requested of the Federal Government for inclusion in that treaty are included.

Without a completely fair and balanced agreement between Australia and NZ, the Australian dairy industry, which is acknowledged the world over as being the most cost efficient, would be placed at an even greater disadvantage. Members can rest assured that the European Common Market, which currently bars Australia from competition, subsidises its dairy farmers extremely heavily. The United States subsidises its dairy farmers and Australia is still managing to compete. New Zealand should not be allowed any unfair advantages—our closest and most competitive neighbour.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I have had the privilege in recent days of being able to present a petition to the House. In the absence of a device to move a motion to the effect that the petition be noted, I take the opportunity of this adjournment debate to bring the sentiments of that petition and some of its background to the attention of the House. The petitions, signed by the residents of Gilberton, Walkerville, Vale Park and Medindie, urged the Government in the forthcoming State Budget to appropriate moneys to satisfactorily redevelop the intersection of Robe, Northcote, Walkerville, Park and Mann Terraces by the extension of the metropolitan inner ring route so as to ensure the safety of pedestrians and road users.

At a meeting called last weekend by the Gilberton Residents' Society the issue of the redevelopment of that intersection and completion of the inner ring route was the major item of discussion. I had the privilege of being able to address that meeting, which was attended by about 60 residents, all of whom, including myself, had signed the peti-

tion which has now been presented to the House. The meeting was concerned about a number of issues, the principle issue being that the metropolitan ring route which services all of metropolitan Adelaide, in particular the 2½ to 3 kilometre section along Robe Terrace, to be completed. There has, over the last three or four years, been an enormous amount of activity undertaken both by the local Walkerville council and myself as the member for the area, to ensure that this very important project is placed on the public works program of the Highways Department.

At the meeting the council presented to the residents a list of the various events that have occurred over the past two to three years leading up to the public meeting. There have been no fewer than 24 events in that period including deputations to the Commissioner of Highways by the council, meetings between the Commissioner of Highways and myself, deputations comprising residents, the council and myself to the Minister of Transport on three occasions, and a number of exchanges of correspondence between the department, the Minister and myself addressing the various ways in which that part of the ring route can be completed. The ring route will provide a benefit not only to local residents of Medindie, Walkerville and Gilberton but in fact to the whole of metropolitan Adelaide because of the major impact that the completion of that ring route will have for a variety of motorists.

The wider dimensions of the completion of that ring route have been recognised by adjoining councils and by the central region of councils. They acknowledge that it is not a local issue but a regional and metropolitan issue. They have been prepared to endorse the action taken by the Walkerville council as the responsible body in the affected area and the actions taken by me in order to enhance our arguments to both the Commissioner of Highways and the Minister of Transport. There will undoubtedly be benefits to local residents but, more importantly, access to the north-western suburbs and the industrial land in Woodville and Port Adelaide is critical.

Use of Robe Terrace, which is effectively an arterial road for use by commuters, is being severely impaired by the increasing use made of it by prime movers and a variety of other very heavy transport vehicles. This is resulting in an extensive deterioration of the pavement surface and is presenting an increasing traffic hazard to the residents whose properties abut Robe Terrace as well to residents and school-children who wish to cross Robe Tce to get to a variety of recreational facilities in the parklands opposite.

The actions that have been taken by the residents over a number of years have contributed to an improvement in their urban environment. I believe that on this occasions they will also be extremely successful. They are not pursuing simply a parochial issue: despite the benefits that it will provide for some people, there will in fact be an improvement in traffic movement around the whole of the city, with a diversion of heavy transport away from roads which are primarily servicing residential property, onto major urban arterial roads, which will be able to take a greater volume and diversity of traffic. All of this has to take into account some of the recent events and activity in inner metropolitan Adelaide.

There has been a revitalisation of the housing stock in the inner city area. There has been a renewed interest in the integrity of the inner suburbs. There is a desire to ensure that the commercialism that has crept out along the other parts of the ring-route of the southern side of the city, on Greenhill Road, and on the eastern side of the city, on Fullarton Road, does not start to occur on both Park Terrace, Gilberton and further around into Robe Terrace, Med-

indie. The council has indeed taken some action to prevent this from occurring, although there are some commercial developments at the western end of Robe Terrace.

The increasing concern that residents in the inner city areas have about the volume of traffic that goes through the suburbs in which they live can be attested to by members representing a variety of inner metropolitan Adelaide seats. So, this discussion about the importance of having a major road separated from the local residential feeder roads is indeed very important. We have been presented with a variety of options to confront the increasing traffic volumes that have occurred over the past few years. Between 1976 and 1986 there was a 25 per cent increase in the traffic volume along Robe Terrace. A further 9 per cent to 10 per cent increase in traffic volumes is predicted in the 10 years to 1996, with a further 12½ per cent predicted by the turn of the century. The pavement surface is deteriorating, the nature of the traffic using the road is changing considerably, and the parking and access problems are producing more and more hazards.

The four options that are being considered are: a 'do nothing' option, which, basically, no-one accepts; a four-lane minor widening, which would cost in the order of \$1 million and which would not solve some of the major problems that I have attempted to outline; the remaining two other options are estimated to cost about the same, that is some \$2 million; the first is a wide verge option, and the second is a service road option. It is the service road option that I wish to see undertaken and that the residents and the council wish to see completed, because it would provide an integrity and a completion of that inner metropolitan ring-route in a way that we have already seen at Park Terrace, Gilberton and Fitzroy Terrace, Fitzroy. These are the considerations that have gone into the petition which has been presented to the House. I will continue to lend my efforts towards ensuring that this most important project gets on the forward public works program of the Highways Department.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Earlier this evening I referred to a letter forwarded to the Director of the State Supply Department by an independent researcher. I was not able to conclude my reading that correspondence, and I want to pick up where I left off. The letter is dated 2 August 1988. The second concern referred to in the letter is as follows:

That any manufacturing activities of the CFA outside of their own requirements may be contravening section IV of the Trade Practices Act dealing with restrictive trade practices. As a publicly funded body the CFA is in a position to purchase requirements under special Government discounts and to stockpile any contract requirements, using public funds, for contract price maintenance, in such a way that they are operating outside the normal commercial operating terms and conditions, with the result that normal commercial operators are disadvantaged when trying to compete. A judicial ruling may be necessary to determine the accuracy or otherwise of this situation, but certainly, a logical appreciation would indicate that the free enterprise operators cannot compete on a par with a government funded competitor.

The writer concludes as follows:

These are significant matters of concern and while not wishing to be seen as interfering and meddling in this matter, I would appreciate your point by point comment in order to clarify my own concerns regarding the unnecessary loss of employment in South Australia caused by any awarding of this tender out of the State. Perhaps it would be in order therefore, that any contract negotiations with the CFA be set aside until satisfactory investigations are resolved in relation to the foregoing matters.

I believe that this is a very serious matter and I ask that the Director of State Supply consider the points outlined in the letter. I would appreciate it if the Minister responsible

for this matter could provide to me, as member for the district, a copy of the reply to the writer.

Also, on the same subject I want to refer to a letter that was written by the same writer to the Premier on this same subject. I will not refer to the entire letter but I shall just quote a couple of paragraphs from it. The letter, dated 4 August, states:

Dear Mr Premier,

I am writing to acquaint you with a number of communications and approaches which I have instituted in an endeavour to obtain insight and resolution of a situation which seems most unusual, to say the least . . . I am at a loss to understand why the Victorian Government should be entitled to subsidise their CFA operations at the expense of jobs and work in the free enterprise manufacturing sector, and particularly as it affects our South Australian position with our national leaders in this field of fire-fighting equipment supply. The Police and Emergency Services Minister in Victoria recently claimed, in a premature announcement to the *Ballarat Courier* of the awarding of the current CFA tender, for 90 appliances to the Victorian CFA that, 'This additional production will have the effect of reducing the overall costs of the CFA's fire units.'

Along with some of the other irregularities which appear to have been experienced by manufacturers in the fire-fighting equipment supply industry in South Australia, perhaps now would be an appropriate time to have these matters investigated at an official level.

I know that the Minister of Emergency Services has been involved in this matter and that he has received a deputation. I have spoken to him about the matter, and I believe that other members on this side of the House have referred to the issues that have been raised in this letter to the Premier. However, again I urge the Government and the Premier to investigate the claims made in this letter. I believe that they are serious. I believe that the writer has enough information to make these claims stand up, and I believe that it is appropriate that the investigations called for in this correspondence be carried out as a matter of urgency.

In the few minutes that I have remaining in this debate I want to refer to a couple of issues that pertain to my electorate. I am pleased that the Minister of Water Resources is present in the Chamber, as I want to refer to a couple of matters that relate to the southern part of my electorate which are in urgent need of attention by the Minister.

I refer first to the lack of action in cleaning up the Onkaparinga estuary, and I suggest that it is totally irresponsible that the Government has failed to take any action in this regard. The lack of action by the Government to rectify some of the pollution problems in the Onkaparinga estuary is blatantly irresponsible. It is now more than two years since residents of Old Noarlunga organised a well attended public meeting which called on the State Government to take urgent action to clean up the Onkaparinga estuary in the vicinity of that town. At that meeting we were advised that a report was being prepared by Manning and Associates to examine the water quality of the estuary.

More than 12 months after that report was commissioned by the Department of Environment and Planning it was released in June 1987. Since then the Government has refused to take any action in regard to that report's recommendations. One of the objectives of the report was to determine the effects of the septic overflow from Old Noarlunga on the water quality of the River Onkaparinga. In regard to this objective, the report states:

The township of Old Noarlunga in the vicinity of the estuary has a population of some 1 200 persons. As indicated in the introduction, there is a real concern regarding septic tanks and their effect on the estuary. It is generally considered that the present situation is unsatisfactory. Being in such close proximity it is likely that much of the effluent could end up in the estuary apart from any direct pumping out or septic tank overflows that may occur.

The report goes on to state that there was sufficient data from the estuary to indicate that the township was making a significant contribution to the pollution. Since the release of the Manning report, repeated attempts to have the Government sewer Old Noarlunga have failed because, we are told by the Minister and by senior officers of the department, that it is not an economic proposition.

I can assure the Minister and the House that I will continue to make representation on behalf of those people in Old Noarlunga who are being totally disadvantaged. It is a very old area. It was settled very early in the history of South Australia, and over time it has grown. There has been considerable development in the area but no attempt has been made to improve services such as deep drainage. The matter is urgent, and I ask that the Minister consider it as such.

The report also recommends that the South Australian Health Commission should be contacted with regard to the possible health risk in the river to swimmers and the need to erect signs advising of this risk. I refer to a letter dated 12 May 1988 from the Deputy Premier to one of my constituents in Old Noarlunga, as follows:

As noted in your letter, the Manning report which was released in June 1987 suggested that the South Australian Health Commission should be consulted with regard to possible health risks in the river to swimmers and the need to erect signs advising of this risk. I understand that the Health Commission has considered the report and has requested further information from the consultant.

As you are no doubt aware, responsibility for various parts of the estuary rests with a number of agencies. I anticipate that a meeting of representatives of those agencies will be held when the South Australian Health Commission has evaluated that further information. Officers of that meeting will determine the need, placement and wording of warning signs.

Once again, no action has been taken to erect these signs since the release of the report which, I remind the House, was some 12 months ago. The fact that requests have for more than two years failed to bring a positive response from the Government seems indicative of the Government's lack of concern regarding significant environmental issues, particularly in the southern part of my electorate, and I ask the Minister to treat those matters with urgency.

Motion carried.

At 10.16 the House adjourned until Thursday 18 August at 11 a.m.