

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 September 1989

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

PUBLIC TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That the Government and in particular the Minister of Transport be censured for the discriminatory action taken on the recommendations of the Fielding study into public transport.

Some six to eight months ago the Government tabled in this House the Fielding Report, which was an extensive investigation into transport operations in South Australia and which considered in significant detail for the first time all of the functions of the State Transport Authority and new innovations that may be needed and made very significant recommendations to the Government about the future direction of our transport system.

The Government has looked at that report very selectively and taken out of it issues that will be of no consequence to the improvement of the performance of the STA. The recommendations in terms of the extension of the tramline down King William Street and the conversion of King William Street into a significant transport mall are issues which should be considered well into the future. These are not the sorts of things we should be looking at now in relation to the transport system and the operations of the STA.

More importantly, what the report looked at and what the Government has totally ignored was the major problem of restructuring the STA, and the very significant problems in the work practice area that were highlighted in the report. One of the important recommendations made by the Fielding committee was that the STA should be split into two distinct areas; that it should have a policy group or board structure and also an operational structure. That structure has been recommended not only by the Director-General in South Australia (back in 1985) but also by many world experts in restructuring transport authorities overseas.

In particular, some excellent work has been done by Dr Wendel Cox in America on the restructuring and redirection required in the STA, but this controversial suggestion is one that the Government has totally ignored. I believe that if we are to make the STA into a modern transit system, recommendations put forward by Fielding should not have been scrapped but should have been investigated to the full. It is a pity that the Government has seen fit to walk away from some important recommendations of Fielding, because his argument on the number of people working in the administrative system and about the restructuring of the whole area was an important part of his recommendations. As many people would be aware, this is a controversial matter that requires the Government to bite the bullet. If we look at STA reports over the past five or six years, we note that the administrative section has encountered one of the biggest increases in costs.

If we talk to the workers, the people who drive the buses, trains and trams, they say that, while they recognise that some changes have to take place in their areas, without doubt the most important change in the STA has to take place in the administrative area. For the Government to walk away from that recommendation, having paid \$100 000 for the Fielding report, seems to be quite scandalous. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I move:

That, recognising the potential profound social, cultural, industrial and economic impact of the multifunction polis proposed by the Japanese Government to be established in Australia, this House calls on the Premier to make available details and provide time for parliamentary scrutiny of the proposal, including:

- (a) full details of all matters so far agreed upon and commitments entered into by the Japanese, Australian and South Australian Governments;
- (b) costs, both incurred and proposed, which have been or will be the responsibility of the South Australian Government, and
- (c) plans, including timetables, for public consultation about the project, and that no further commitments be entered into until Parliament has undertaken such scrutiny.

The multifunction polis is a project of such massive proportions that I doubt whether many Australian politicians—let alone Australian citizens—have any understanding of its size, complexity and potential impact. The multifunction polis, which should be self-explanatory by its title but which is not, was first proposed by the former Japanese Minister for International Trade and Industry at the Australia-Japan Ministerial Committee hearing in January 1987. Senator Button at the time was our Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, and he expressed interest in advancing the proposal.

In a series of subsequent meetings officers of the Japanese Ministry for International Trade and Industry (MITI), and the Australian Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce (DITAC), developed a proposal which had been discussed with the States. The basis of the proposal, from the Japanese point of view, was that the Japanese perception that Australia and Japan as advanced industrialised nations, strategically located in the northern and southern extremities of the Asia Pacific rim, were well placed to work as partners in the development of the region and, of course, our region is universally accepted as having the greatest growth potential in the world economy.

Let us look at the words 'multifunction polis'. Multifunction is self-explanatory: it means many functions or uses. 'Polis' comes from the Greek word meaning not only city but system of government. One has to look at the word 'polis' in the true breadth of its original meaning to understand the concept of the multifunction polis. The editorial in the *Australian Planner*, which is the journal of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, of June 1989, states:

The multifunction polis is a proposal, but for what is hard to pin down . . . That paper [developed by MITI] envisaged a new city of perhaps 50 000 to 100 000 people in Australia which would transform previous forms of urban development. It would provide a high quality 'semi-residential' environment for international cooperation and exchange based on 'high-tech' and 'high-touch' industries; the latter being recreational resort, culture and convention-based activities.

We now come to the critical point around which the debate should revolve:

By the beginning of 1988 the Australian Commonwealth and State Governments had agreed to join with the Japanese in a joint feasibility study of the proposal and had laid down nine principles governing Australia's participation. These principles emphasised that the polis must be truly international in nature, fully integrated into the Australian society rather than a cultural enclave and of benefit to Australia's industrial restructuring.

The feasibility study is currently in train, and obviously the proposal is still in its formative stages, but already it is clear that the proposal is many things to many people who are engaged in some way or another in its consideration or in the feasibility study. However, it is a completely vague and unknown concept to the Australian people. In short, we are contemplating a multi-billion dollar—not multi-million dollar—proposal which would involve the establishment in

Australia of anywhere between 50 000 and 100 000 people as either a population centre or a series of population centres involved in a highly technical and complex series of international activities. In short, the proposal would have a profound political, social, cultural and industrial as well as economic effect on this country, yet the people themselves know little about it.

In fact, a few weeks ago at a seminar in Adelaide, organised by Flinders University, the Federal Minister for Science, Customs and Small Business (Mr Barry Jones), if I recall correctly, stated that not one question had been asked in the Federal Parliament about this proposal since its original announcement. In the State Parliament I have placed questions on notice and, as I recall, there have been one or two brief ministerial statements and a bit of publicity, but there has been no parliamentary debate about a project which, in whole or in part, the State Government is seeking to have located in South Australia. There should be no escaping from the fact that this is a huge project which, if it goes ahead, is destined to dwarf the aggregation of any current Japanese investment in this country.

It would be totally different from the existing Japanese presence in Australia, whether or not the city as a physical entity is built. It is receiving enormous official promotion in Japan and, virtually by default of public debate, a tacit acceptance by Australian State and Federal Governments. It is quite clear that any project on this huge scale should be the subject of intense public scrutiny and it should be the subject of detailed parliamentary debate. However, no such debate has been initiated by this Government.

Mr Gunn: It needs a select committee.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: At this stage, perhaps one should talk about a select committee as a preliminary form of investigation. Over a period of two years a high degree of secrecy has been maintained. That veil of secrecy is now being lifted and documents are being made available. However, at the seminar which was held a few weeks ago, Professor Gavan McCormack, who is the Foundation Professor in East Asian Studies at the University of Adelaide, stated:

The high degree of secrecy that has been maintained for over two years now is worrying . . . The way in which the subject has been discussed, however, is less than reassuring.

Professor McCormack is an independent academic who was not representing the University of Adelaide or anything else. He has a background of 27 years personal and professional involvement in and with Japan, which he regards as his second home. We are not looking at his criticism of the way the project has been conducted so far; we are not looking at someone who is not well informed and who is not objective; and we are certainly not looking at anyone who is in any way hostile to the notion of Japanese involvement with Australia.

One of the statements made by Professor McCormack that sounded very strong warning bells with me related to a quotation from the minutes of the Joint Steering Committee for the Multifunction Polis which was held in Sydney in late March 1989. Presumably this was minuted in a joint meeting of Australian Government officials and Japanese Government officials. I want to read it onto the record, because I think it should alert every honourable member of this House to the nature and attitudes which have prevailed at least up until this point in relation to the multi-function polis. The minute of the joint steering committee states:

The control of public consciousness in relation to the MFP project is a matter on which the Australian side is concerned. This is thought to be a basic stage in realising the possibility of the MFP.

To put it simply, even though the project has firm commercial or technical principles, before this potential is clarified there will

have to be in Australia a sense on the part of the Australian state, individuals and regions which will be affected by it that it will be very beneficial to them. For this reason, it is necessary to control the consciousness of public and related organisations very carefully.

Since when has it been necessary to control public consciousness in Australia? Since when has it been necessary for officials to state that public consciousness has to be controlled? When we talk about the need to control public consciousness in relation to a project that will have a profound influence on this country, it sounds suspiciously like Nazi Germany—a fascist State. The only public consciousness that should relate to this project is the consciousness that is developed by open and public debate, by independent analysis and scrutiny, and by the involvement of people who will be affected. The notion of this control of public consciousness is something that should be absolutely condemned out of hand.

Mr Gunn: It should not be tolerated.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It should not be tolerated, as the member for Eyre says. This notion of lack of understanding is one of my five principal concerns about not only the concept but the way in which the concept is being implemented by Australian State and Federal Governments, by the Bannon Government in particular, and that is obviously the concern of this House.

I am concerned that Federal and State Governments are moving in the direction of positive commitment towards a project that is not properly defined. Even the Minister for Science, Customs and Small Business acknowledges that the concept is diffuse. *Business Review Weekly* describes it as tantalisingly vague. If two well respected authorities, one a Minister of the Crown and one a national publication, can not understand the concept, how easy might it be—in the words of the official of the joint steering committee—to control public consciousness?

My second principal concern is that there is little public understanding of the concept and, therefore, there is little public interest. As I said, there could be profound effects—beneficial, adverse, or both—on the social, cultural, political and economic life of this country and this State. My third concern is that in these circumstances extreme caution should be exercised. The public interest demands that substantial information should be freely and publicly available before a commitment of any kind is made by the State Government to support any aspect of the multifunction polis. Yet we know that commitments have been given.

My fourth concern is that the Japanese have apparently, and admittedly, selected Australia because of its climate, its resources and its strategic location to pursue their own economic and other interests, which may not coincide with ours. My fifth concern is that the stated goals of the multifunction polis could well be achieved through other existing means. Those goals, of course, are value added exports, cross-cultural education programs, development of biotechnology and high technology, and development of leisure industries and tourism. Not one of those goals could not be pursued within the existing structure by Australians, for Australians, in cooperation with whoever they choose. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Country Fires Act 1989. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This very small Bill sets out to remove an anomaly in the new Country Fires Act. This Bill seeks to amend section 75 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (g) of subsection (2). This has caused a great deal of anguish among rural communities, because people are concerned that that provision may be interpreted in such a manner as to increase the land-holder's liability to a degree which would be not only unreasonable but beyond the reasonable expectations of anyone in society. The offending paragraph provides:

(g) provide for the clearing of firebreaks and the clearing or burning-off of land and provide that failure to clear a firebreak or to clear or burn-off land in accordance with the regulations constitutes evidence of negligence in any action for recovery of damages, or compensation, in respect of destruction of, or damage to, property by fire.

Paragraph (g) is very broad, all encompassing and goes beyond what any reasonable person would expect of a responsible land holder. It would be appropriate therefore to delete this paragraph from the Act. I understand that the Minister has agreed not to proclaim section 75 (2) (g). However, if the law as it stands is inappropriate or wrong, it should be amended to a reasonable form which can be fairly and reasonably enforced. Therefore, in accordance with the undertakings I have given to a number of organisations, which have rightly expressed concern about the operation of this section, I have introduced this Bill to delete the section, so that there can be no problems in the future.

Even though the Minister has given an undertaking, another Minister on another occasion might feel inclined to have that section of the Act proclaimed, and the consequences could be horrendous for unwitting people who are trying to do the right thing and who, under normal circumstances, would not have contravened the Act. Therefore, in view of these grave concerns and the likely damage this section could do to law abiding citizens who apply commonsense, I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I move:

That this House condemns the Liberal and National Parties for their lack of compassion over their stated policy of reducing family allowances, pensions and other welfare payments to a level akin to the 1960s.

Welfare means many things to different people. It can involve a person receiving an aged pension, families receiving family allowances or a person on an invalid pension. There is a wide variety of welfare payments in this country, which have been established over many years and for very good reasons, that is, to assist people who are less fortunate or who need specific assistance from our country. That is what being part of a nation is all about—working as a community to help people in need. I am proud that I am a member of a Party that believes in the principle of supporting families and our seniors by giving them a bit of a buffer against some of the pressures that we all face from time to time. People who go through periods of sickness may receive sickness benefits, and people who are unfortunately unemployed may receive various assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

However, in recent times we have seen an assault on our welfare payments, which has been going on for a number of years. We know that the Liberal Party has made many attempts to undermine this system and pit Australian against Australian. If people are unemployed and are receiving a

benefit from the Commonwealth, they are labelled 'dole bludgers'. I reject that; I believe that there are very few dole bludgers around. Most of the people I know who are unemployed are really keen to find work. It is not their fault, and for members of the Liberal Party to pit Australians against one another is quite unfair.

We have seen this in recent months after the coup that occurred in the Federal Opposition, when Mr Peacock took over from Mr Howard. We know that a *quid pro quo* is involved in all this, because Mr Peacock could only have taken over if he had the support of the dries—the right wing within the national Liberal Party. Obviously some deals had been made behind closed doors, and one of these has been exposed recently. In this respect, I refer to an assault on the welfare sector in this country.

This has been exposed well by the preselection of Mr Ian McLachlan for Barker. While accepting the nomination for the Liberal Party, he made perfectly clear that he proposed to ride as a campaign a significant reduction in welfare. He identified it on television and radio, and to anyone who cared to talk to him. That is the target he would pursue. This man was born into privilege, and has been privileged all his life. He cannot expect, for example, people in my electorate, who work at Mitsubishi and who support three kids and a mortgage, to feel compassionate towards a man like Mr McLachlan who advocates openly a reduction in welfare payments. He is talking about family assistance.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TYLER: He is talking about family assistance and pensioners receiving assistance; that is exactly what he is talking about. We have also seen another person who is very privileged and who has always been a bit of a silver-tail, that is, the Federal President of the Liberal Party, Mr John Elliott. In a number of speeches he has made around the country, he has made quite clear that he is advocating slashes in welfare payments.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The member for Morphett interjects. I draw his attention to an article in the *Advertiser* of 27 July 1989. Mr Elliott delivered a speech at the Joe and Dame Enid Lyons Memorial Lecture at the Australian National University in Canberra. He confirmed the themes he espoused in a speech to the South Australian Police Force Club the previous Monday. The article stated:

'Australian welfare payments should be reduced and the cuts would be part of the tough decisions a coalition Government would have to take, the Federal President of the Liberal Party', Mr Elliott, said yesterday.

There will be pain for some of us as one takes away some of the welfare shackles', Mr Elliott said.

He said, 'There would be pain for some of us.' I can tell members that there would be no pain for Mr Elliott—absolutely none at all. He is a privileged person who earns a considerable amount of money and believes in the privileged obviously getting—

Mr Robertson: He gets a considerable amount of money, but he may not earn it.

Mr TYLER: That is a judgment that the member for Bright has made. I am sure that Mr Elliott does work extremely hard and is a successful businessman in this country. However, he is, nonetheless, part of the privileged in Australia. He would have no idea what it is like to live at Happy Valley, to work shift work and to struggle to meet many of the demands that are placed on families. He would not have the slightest idea. The article continues:

Yesterday, he said the Liberal Party's position was that there were probably too many people dependent on the welfare system, and 'that'll have to be changed'.

That is what he said. It continues:

About 30 per cent of Australians—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr TYLER: That interjection is interesting. It continues:

About 30 per cent of Australians received some form of Government handout and people had the mentality that 'basically we deserve a piece of the welfare cake'. 'All these things seem to have been enshrined in the past 90 years in our philosophy and way of life,' Mr Elliott said. 'In my view, we've got to reset the values system in this country.'

Mr Elliott said he believed the Liberal leader, Mr Peacock, 'understands what needs to be done'.

That is what Mr Elliott says of Mr Peacock. Obviously, if Mr Peacock is to remain Leader he will have to succumb to some of the extreme right wing elements in his Party. We know that the right wing has the numbers in the Federal Liberal Party. Mr Peacock defeated Mr Howard only because the Liberals believed they needed a fresh face and a person who could put up a 'caring' image. Well, beneath the 'caring' image one has only to scratch to find the McLachlans and the Elliotts in the Liberal Party. They will be pulling the strings. If Mr Peacock wants to remain as Leader he will have to dance to the tune of the Elliotts and McLachlans.

Within the coalition there is a Party that is quite unashamedly anti-welfare—that is, the National Party. Senator Stone of the National Party is a senior shadow Minister in the Federal coalition who is allowed to shoot his mouth off and say whatever he likes. He does not care whether he upsets people who are receiving welfare benefits and makes their lives uncomfortable in his quite proud way of targeting the welfare system. Senator Stone actually said that on Channel 10's *Face to Face* program. I draw members' attention to the *Financial Review* of 17 July 1989, which states:

The Opposition spokesman for finance, Senator Stone, yesterday gave the first public indication of the Opposition's targeting of the welfare system as part of a new philosophical direction. . . . Speaking on Channel Ten's *Face to Face* program, Senator Stone said the welfare state had destroyed the incentive for Australians to save for times of need, because they knew they could rely on being looked after by the State.

The Opposition has been examining a range of tough measures against particular welfare recipients such as long-term unemployed people and sole parents, a general tightening of eligibility for a wide range of welfare payments . . .

Senator Stone makes no secret of the fact that he will target some of those areas. I read recently a country newspaper which stated that the National Party Leader had said that one of the areas to be targeted was country pensioners' telephone rebates. He made quite clear what he was on about. The coalition has actually declared war on those who receive welfare payments. That has not gone unnoticed by some of the lobby groups in the community. The *Adelaide News* of 17 July 1989 contained an article asking the coalition to clarify the Liberal policy on welfare. The article, entitled 'Aged call to clarify Liberal policy on welfare', stated:

A national pensioner group today called on Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Peacock, to immediately clarify Opposition policies for the aged. Comments yesterday by the finance spokesman, Senator Stone, have indicated the Opposition would target pensioners in welfare cuts, the Australian Retired Persons Association (ARPA) said. The group said the comments contradicted statements by the social security spokesman, Mr Connolly. Senator Stone said on Channel 10's *Face to Face* program he was trying to promote debate on whether welfare measures should be wound back. He also said Australians were not saving because of the welfare state.

I believe that the Federal Minister for Social Security, Mr Brian Howe, summed up the matter when he said, as reported in this article in the *News*, that it was time Senator Stone detailed how a future coalition government would cut welfare spending. The article further stated:

Mr Howe said Senator Stone had a record of not caring for people, and was associated with a party that talked about compassion through its hat.

We see that time and time again. The Minister for Social Security was spot on. He was further reported as saying:

Of course you can take money off the poor, of course you can take it off the old, of course you can take it off the disabled. It's about time Senator Stone told us from whom he is going to take it, how much, and how he is going to do it.

The article then states:

Senator Stone's record showed he had been responsible 'for throwing more people, more aged people, onto the scrap heap than any previous head of Treasury'.

That is one of the reasons why Senator Stone is no longer in the Treasury. He scurried off to join the National Party and to support the discredited 'Joh for Canberra' campaign. The National Party, keen to have someone who would stand up and articulate its extreme right wing policy, was eager to pick up Senator Stone. Well, he has completely exposed what a Peacock coalition Government would do to welfare payments: it would completely destroy our system, and make life an absolute misery for many thousands of Australians. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADOPTION ACT

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House requests the Government to repeal section 27 (7) (a) and (b) of the Adoption Act 1988.

This motion seeks to rectify an anomaly that has occurred with the introduction of the Adoption Act 1988. It is now necessary for persons who have been adopted to sign a veto to give notice to the Government that they do not wish to be contacted by the relinquishing mother. Similarly, the relinquishing mother can also sign a veto to say that she does not want to be contacted. The ridiculous situation that has occurred is that, from now on, every five years adoptees, in particular, must sign this form. If they do not sign the form, they can be contacted by the relinquishing parent.

In the past three months, through receiving over 50 telephone calls and speaking to a large number of adoptive parents and adoptees, I have discovered that this provision is having a tremendous impact on family relationships, in which a very tight and very neat bond has been developed between adoptive parents and an adoptee. A lot of unnecessary anguish and anxiety has been created.

Whilst the legislation might need to be reviewed from time to time—and this relates to all legislation—in this case one wonders why it was necessary to cater for a certain group of people, who lobbied the Government so hard and for so long to bring about their own personal aims, rather than consider the whole of the issue and everybody involved.

Two public meetings have been held in Adelaide in the past few months, the first attended by 170 people. People were asked to attend and discuss this issue and the legislation. I thought it was an excellent result for 170 people to come out on a bitterly cold winter's night. Further, many people were not prepared to come forward publicly to let it be known that they were either an adoptee, an adoptive parent or a relinquishing parent. It took a fair bit of courage for these people to come along and have their circumstances made public, even though their names were not sought at that meeting. About 110 people attended another meeting last evening for a further opportunity to discuss what they had already experienced through the impact of this legislation.

Since the inception of formal adoption in South Australia, from the period 1926 to 1988, there have been about 25 000 adoptees, and this would involve about 55 000 biological parents; 100 000 grandparents; 25 000 brothers and sisters;

and about 50 000 uncles and aunts if we extend that family. That totals about 250 000 persons. When we consider the adoptive persons, totalling about 50 000 parents, there are 100 000 grandparents; 25 000 brothers and sisters; and 50 000 aunts and uncles, totalling another 225 000. So, if we assume that that is the percentage of people involved from 1926 to 1988, this legislation reaches about 475 000 people from South Australia who are knowingly or unknowingly involved. We also say 'unknowingly', because this legislation unfortunately has highlighted some cases where adoptees have not been advised that they were adopted. I have had two tragic instances referred to me of people in their sixties who were not aware that they had been adopted.

Certainly the adopting parents do not want their family life disrupted by a stranger knocking on the door and saying to the children, 'You have been adopted and I am your relinquishing parent.' The Parliament has looked at this legislation and the Government has been tinkering with it for several years. It went to a Parliamentary Select Committee of the Legislative Council, and the whole of this legislation has been controlled by another place. It is very frustrating to sit in the House of Assembly, the people's House, the Chamber where we represent the people, to have the legislation agreed to by consensus—to use a common phrase—by people who are not answerable to the people. They are answerable to the whole of the State but really those in the other place are answerable to the delegates of the respective political Parties. Unlike those of us in this Chamber, they are not answerable to the voters in their electorates.

The Legislative Council erred in reaching this consensus. The legislation should have been thrown out if there could not be any reasonable amendments to what was proposed. It was certainly not necessary to bring in a veto clause in a reverse situation in which if a party does not want to be contacted a veto must be signed. Why did the other place not consider if a party wanted to be contacted, that the Department of Community Welfare was advised of the agreement to be contacted?

However, we have the reverse situation: those who do not want to be contacted must advise the department, and must do so every five years. As one person put to me at the meeting last evening, what happens if they sign ten forms each covering a period of five years? The department would then have forms covering the next 50 years. There is nothing in the legislation to stop anyone from doing that. I do not see how it could be illegal, because the person only has to advise the department that he or she proposes to travel around Australia or overseas, and do not know where they will be in the next five years, so they provide the department with forms for the next 50 years.

On the other hand, there are anomalies in the legislation, because this is a vast country and people are quite mobile and can travel all over the country without anyone being able to contact them. Services in the outback of the country, including mail and the delivery of newspapers, are quite infrequent, so it would be very hard to contact people to let them know that this legislation is in place.

In addition, a lot of Australians are serving their country overseas, or through employment, travelling overseas as well. Leave this legislation alone. Of course, the tragedy of this legislation is that it is retrospective. It wiped out all the agreements and arrangements that have been made since 1926. The answer is to throw out this veto and that the veto remain in force—as a permanent veto and if one wants contact one could authorise the department of that desire. However, to do it around the other way—as it is at the

moment—is wrong. Of the many letters I have received, I believe that a letter to the Family Information Service dated 15 March 1989 from a 29 year old currently living interstate sums up the situation quite well. I read this letter to the meeting last night and I will now read it to the House. The letter states:

I am an adopted person of 29 years currently living [interstate], I have recently been informed of the government's alterations to the adoption law. I do not entirely agree with the current stand on adoption laws and wonder what consensus of opinion was taken before these major changes to my life were undertaken. Certainly, neither myself nor my adoptive parents were consulted regarding our feelings on this very personal matter.

I understand that in some cases there is unhappiness and a certain sense of 'displacement' but, this is not the general circumstance of all adopted children and relinquishing parents. In these cases, when both parties were searching, there were organisations set up to assist them. I am one of the majority who has had a wonderful home and parents who gave their all to make life a pleasant adventure for me. Maybe they gave more than the 'average normal parents' because they really wanted me. I believe the environment, not the genetics, moulds ones character and the people involved in that environment play the major role.

There seems to be a lot of discussion about the 'rights' of the children and the relinquishing mothers. What about the rights of the adoptive parents who have, after all, played the major role? I think more consideration should be given to their feelings. They have all done their best to give their children a good life when, for whatever reasons, the child was 'given up' for adoption. 'Given up' being the operative wording. Legal documents were signed and now the Government makes them invalid. The reasoning behind this has not been made clear to me. I request that you send me a copy of this new law, some explanation as to how the people concerned arrived at their decision and the necessary papers to 'veto' my information from inquiries.

I have not been coerced in any way to think along these lines. I have known since the day my parents received me that I was adopted—a 'special' child and very much wanted. My parents always talked openly with me about the circumstances and all my relatives were equally supportive. Perhaps, this is the type of situation that should be used as the criteria for new adoption laws and subsequent interviews with prospective adopting parents. Moulding a child's life is an enormous task and I would hope that the current criteria for couples wishing to adopt is based on this. Perhaps we will have less need for new laws to accommodate the minority and more children leading well balanced, happy lives like mine. I look forward to your reply.

The reply from the Department for Community Welfare Adoption Services, dated 11 April, is signed by Margaret Porter. The letter states:

Thank you for your letter dated 15 March 1989. I have considered the issues you raise and will respond to each of them in turn. I have also enclosed the information and documents requested.

As you suggest, a large number of people whose lives have been affected by adoption have no wish to seek information. In countries such as Finland, Israel and Scotland where information has always been freely available, less than 10 per cent of people express interest in information and a much smaller proportion make contact with birth relations. Following the legislative changes in England in 1976 only 2 per cent had applied for information by 1980. However, following the changes to the Victorian 'Adoption of Children Act' in 1984, 7 000 applications were received in the first two years of the service, 65 per cent of those being from adopted persons.

South Australia appears to be similar to Victoria in that we currently have 4 500 people waiting for information, and once the service officially commences on 1 July this year, there are indications that there will be a huge increase in this demand.

That did not happen. The legislation has only recently been proclaimed and the regulations brought in. The letter continues:

Where legislation has changed the outcome has been positive and has not resulted in mass reunions of adopted people with birth parents, unhappy adoptive families or distressing situations with natural parents. However, this State's legislation recognises that, whilst welcomed by many individuals and organisations, there are people, like yourself, who do not wish to seek or receive information or contact with birth relatives and has therefore included the option of placing a veto on information.

The introduction of this legislation was preceded by lobbying and action by groups and individuals, including adopted persons, birth parents and adoptive parents. In 1987, a select committee was appointed and subsequently advertised in the media to advise of the committee's appointment and to seek public comment. Twenty-eight people appeared as witnesses before the committee representing such groups as 'Parents of Adoptees Support Group', 'Australian Relinquishing Mothers Society', Festival of Light as well as individuals. Also 56 written submissions were received as well as a number of petitions. The outcome of this was a report including a number of recommendations and I have enclosed a copy of the relevant section.

Your question about the rights of adoptive parents is most relevant. It would appear that the legislation focuses on the adopted person and their birth parents; however, some adoptive parents do share a desire for information with their adopted children and this interest appears to be quite unrelated to the happiness and satisfaction with their family life. I hope that this letter, together with the information enclosed goes some way to answering your questions and concerns. If not, please do not hesitate to write again.

To complete the correspondence, I should read out a further letter this person wrote back to Margaret Porter of the Adoption Services because, as I said, from all the discussions I have had with a number of adoptees and their parents, this sums up the whole feeling. The letter is dated 30 May 1989 and reads as follows:

Dear Ms. Porter,

Thank you for taking the time and trouble to reply to my previous queries regarding the current changes in the adoption laws in South Australia. I am, though, disappointed that I have not seen any articles regarding these changes in our local newspaper. Darwin is almost a 'sister' city to Adelaide and I am sure there would be many South Australian adoptees here. I have duly completed my 'veto' form and one thing bothered me. In completing all the details required to prove I am who I say I am I have given the Community Services more details on myself than they ever had. In fact, I have made it easier to find me. I wish to stress that I am placing my trust in the 'system' and I sincerely hope it doesn't fail me.

I actually thought seriously about completing no forms and leaving my file questionable. But, that would leave my adoptive parents in the direct line and I don't feel that is entirely fair. I have no wish for my family to be disrupted after all these years of love and sharing. I have enclosed a brief letter, the contents of which I am happy for any inquiring people to be aware of. I hope this can be achieved without disclosure of anything else in my file. As I said before, I am still not entirely convinced this disruption of our lives was completely unavoidable and I sincerely hope my 'veto' stands for five years and no-one outside Community Services is given access to my file.

I have been forced to place my 'adoption privacy' for the future in the department's hands, providing all my current details in the process. Instead of thinking of my adoption as a 'natural' process I will now be thinking of this as a major 'emotive' issue. Again, thank you for your past help. I feel I may not resolve these changes in my own mind but I do hope they are for the best and will help those who, for one reason or another, feel the 'need to know'.

I have not mentioned the name of that person because of the confidentiality of this issue. However, it is important that we get on record the feelings of these people and details of how the legislation has affected them. The person who wrote that letter enclosed the following correspondence, which simply states:

To whom it may concern:

I have vetoed my information for many reasons, mainly because I don't think it really matters any more. My adoption has never been a big issue in my family and I don't want it to become one. I have had a wonderful childhood—warm, secure and happy. I am now married and my life is full and enriching. I feel no bitterness, anger or any 'negative' attitudes. I just feel it was a natural part of my life. I hope this in some way 'helps' anyone inquiring about me to understand that I am happy as I am, part of a wonderful family.

I hope for the sake of this person that that information will always remain strictly confidential. I believe that the department has a system to cover that, but errors can occur. One hopes that the department can remove any possibility of error, but there have been allegations of mistakes occurring.

Comments have also been made on the attitude of departmental officers when approached by people requesting forms. I understand that all these matters have now been taken care of by Ms Vardon and the adoption services staff. They appreciate receiving complaints so that any misunderstandings can be rectified. However, this is an important and emotive issue, important to many people.

Parliament is playing with people's lives. We are dealing with people's futures and when we do that we must be careful indeed. I believe that in its efforts to try to resolve the situation the Legislative Council has erred. In some respects it has totally missed the point in respect of people's feelings. If there were 25 000 adoptions between 1926 and 1988 in South Australia, and if half of those were within the family circles, it still leaves about 12 500 individuals. A large number of those people would be affected in their lives, if not in all their lives, which will never again be the same since the passing of this legislation. I have in my possession, for the perusal of members if they wish, a graph showing the total number of adoption orders in South Australia from 1927 to 1988. Last night the parents of adoptees, and adoptees themselves, met and prepared a petition because of their concern, but there was insufficient time to have the petition presented to Parliament. That petition states:

To the honourable the members of the House of Assembly:

The humble petition of the undersigned residents of South Australia sheweth: that on 17 September 1989 a law is effective that all adopted people and their birth parents must fill in forms every five years to either give or restrict information about their personal life and their upbringing. We believe the Government has not thought through this decision thoroughly, as many adopted people have not been told by the parent that brought them up. Obviously this could cause problems in many families. Also, from the birth parents' point of view, they may have made new lives and new families for themselves without the thought of the child they put up for adoption. All adopted people will have this veto over them for the rest of their life; if they do not renew it every five years, they are left wide open to be found and there is nothing they can do about it.

We wish to see the establishment of a register for those wanting contact, with both parties being registered before any information is given and the publication of the existence of such a register. Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will reconsider the veto requirement to ensure the right of veto is reversed and to ensure the privacy of adopted persons and relinquishing parents is protected.

That petition is signed by several hundred people, and there are more petitions coming in. On that note, I recommend the motion to the House.

Mr ROBERTSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

WASTE RECYCLING

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I move:

That this House urge the Government to devise a metropolitan Adelaide waste recycling plan to—

- (a) set targets for waste minimisation of both household and industrial wastes;
- (b) facilitate industry innovation to achieve efficient recycling and reuse of paper and plastics;
- (c) ensure safe collection and disposal of toxic wastes; and
- (d) encourage metropolitan councils and industry to set up kerbside or conveniently located collection systems so that householders and businesses can readily participate in resource recycling.

Adelaide is likely this financial year to reach the dubious landmark of producing 1 million tonnes of solid waste. While this volume may be dwarfed by that in places like New York, Australians are still the second most prolific per head of population in terms of producers of waste among industrialised nations—a very dubious distinction indeed.

Community concern and genuine preparedness for reducing and recycling waste has been stimulated to the point where a flood of inquiries is being received by members of Parliament and bodies such as the Conservation Council, the Australian Conservation Foundation, Greenpeace and other environmental groups, and particularly by local councils.

In my view, we need a four-pronged plan for metropolitan Adelaide which will reduce the waste that we generate, recycle that which cannot be reduced, arrange for the safe disposal of dangerous and toxic waste and enable ordinary householders to recycle in the most effective and efficient way possible. The first element of such a plan would be advice to householders and industries about the means of reducing the total volume of waste that we produce. This can include advice on environmentally sound products—products that do not damage the environment; products that do not involve hazardous chemicals; and consumer necessities that do not involve unnecessary packaging of waste paper and plastic that are not really essential to the product.

It is important that manufacturing and packaging industries work deliberately and enthusiastically to reduce the excess packaging in our everyday products. To this end, the State Government should work with those industries to devise a code of ethics aimed at reducing the amount of excess packaging. Those two measures, which would ensure that people can choose environmentally sound products and reduce excess packaging, would go some way towards reducing the volume of waste produced by our society. They would also have the effect of saving scarce resources and energy. The production of all these waste materials involves the use of energy, trees, oil and other petroleum products, all of which are scarce and valuable resources. We throw away huge amounts of valuable renewable and non-renewable resources. We are a consumer society and we must turn that around so that we become a conserving society.

Some argue that, because Adelaide does not have a severe shortage of landfill sites for garbage disposal, we do not really have a problem. I believe that that is a very short-sighted approach. We do have landfill sites. Initiatives like the one taken at Wingfield to produce methane and natural gas from the waste at Wingfield have the potential to lengthen the life of landfill sites like that at Wingfield.

Mr Robertson: And provide 10 per cent of Adelaide's gas.

Ms GAYLER: And provide 10 per cent of Adelaide's gas needs. I congratulate Falzon Brick Company Pty Ltd, which is situated in my own electorate, for its initiative at Wingfield. However, it is not sufficient to rest on our laurels and say that as consumers, because we have adequate landfill sites, we should continue wasting resources and leave our waste disposal systems alone.

Every year we throw out about 470 000 tonnes of glass—enough sand to cover the length and breadth of Bondi Beach to a depth of three metres. Each year three trees are cut down to meet each person's timber and paper needs. With the possible exception of milk cartons and composites of plastic and paper, all paper is recyclable. Of course, we could return to buying our milk in bottles. In relation to cans, every year Australians throw out enough metal to make 400 000 new cars. We place our food scraps and other organic matter in the garbage bin instead of recycling it as compost for our gardens.

I realise that we have short-term problems relating to the glut of paper and plastics as a result of the enthusiasm about this topic in recent months, but nevertheless we must tap the enthusiasm of the community and plan appropriate recycling mechanisms for the whole metropolitan area. I have been absolutely astounded at the negative reaction to

community concern for recycling by some local councils. In my own area of Tea Tree Gully the interested community has been outraged at reported comments of city council staff claiming:

Recycling was a phase and amounted to a lot of yuppies jumping up and down.

The suggestion by some members of local authorities that this is just a passing fad rather than a genuine concern for the conservation of resources, for the reduction of the amount of pollution that our society creates, is an insult to thinking people in the community who genuinely want to see their State and local council authorities devise means to make recycling practical, easy, efficient and available to ordinary families.

The sort of reaction I refer to is exemplified by a letter I received from one of my local kindergartens, the Kathleen Miller Kindergarten. The Director of the kindergarten, her staff and the parents on behalf of the children wrote to me expressing their concern that Government agencies and industry ought to be helping people to reduce waste and to recycle waste materials. I quote from one section of this letter:

Could the Government look at this issue because if all the little people like us are doing the right thing it seems to be up to the bigger people who need to act as well.

That goes for local councils and for the Waste Management Commission and our other State Government authorities who should be doing everything they can to help minimise the waste that is produced and to facilitate recycling. A lot of schools in my electorate and others in metropolitan Adelaide are getting involved, and I would like to pay tribute to KESAB for its efforts in encouraging schools and community groups to participate in ways of recycling both paper and plastics. KESAB has been organising a newspaper recycling program with local schools but, unfortunately, a new contract has been negotiated because the market has been flooded with newsprint as a result of the participation of schools and other community groups. Until improved methods can be arranged for the collection and more particularly the reuse of newspaper, it will be a difficult problem.

However, I understand that clean, white office paper is still in demand and I am very heartened that organisations like Rewrite are producing 100 per cent recycled paper and that this is gaining community acceptance. I am also very pleased that the Federal Government has now taken off the sales tax which applied to that recycled paper because, as that product gains wider use, no doubt the price differential between recycled paper and virgin paper will reduce.

In the other area of plastic recycling, KESAB has also taken a new initiative which is supported by SAFM. Under this scheme, KESAB and SAFM aim to save raw materials, at the same time reducing pollution. Participation in this important environmentally helpful scheme is a terrific way for schools to raise extra funds for their local use, and I congratulate KESAB on the scheme 'Rescue the Future', which has a triple function and will be a boost to the environmental participation of schools in this important initiative.

It is not sufficient for us to rest on our laurels because we now have adequate landfill sites. Waste reduction and waste recycling can be done. As I outlined in my news release of 1 June 1989, it has been done on a comprehensive basis in other cities in the world and, with massive public interest, we can do our bit for conserving natural resources and protecting the environment. The model that Adelaide should follow is that which has been in practice now in the city of Seattle in Washington State on the West Coast of the United States. In 12 months Seattle has developed what

is regarded as the most successful urban recycling program in the United States. It has put into action that State's two priorities for solid waste: waste reduction and waste recycling.

The city of Seattle did an economic analysis which showed that recycling was cheaper than costly landfill at the local rubbish dumps and very much less expensive than the incineration option that some cities in the United States have considered and adopted. The key to the Seattle project is kerbside recycling. The city has set a target of 60 per cent recycling by 1994, the highest target set by any city in the world. Seattle has adopted the kerbside recycling model in the belief that separation of waste materials at source, that is, at the point of the household, is the most effective method, producing the best product for subsequent recycling. It does not rely on sorting later on at waste transfer points, at the council depot or at the rubbish dump. For this reason, it is the most economical way of effectively recycling and getting a good product at the end. The way Seattle operates this scheme is to have kerbside crates in local streets on collection days.

Mr Duigan: Like Prospect City Council.

Ms GAYLER: Like Prospect City Council, which I congratulate on its recent initiative. It uses different coloured crates for different products: for cans, glass, paper and, separately, for newsprint. In a separate program in the city of Seattle, large green-wheeled containers are being used in another experiment for collection of a variety of wastes for later sorting. The city intends to compare the results of those two schemes.

Within four months of the city of Seattle's plans commencing in 1988, 55 per cent of eligible households were taking part in the recycling program. Money saved from landfill costs is passed on to those participating households in the form of reduced garbage rates. The sorting of wastes at the source involving trucks picking up separate material from households for recycling is slightly more expensive, but it produces a higher quality recycled product. The city proposes further programs involving the collection and composting of backyard wastes and the recycling of plastics.

In many ways, Seattle and Adelaide share a long history of progressive government and enlightened environmental and social policies. I believe that it is important that we consider such models and adopt them for our own purposes. Metropolitan Adelaide has 30 councils, and I believe one of the difficulties we will have to face is the coordination between those councils. I believe also the recycling will be more difficult here than it would be in the city of Seattle, but it can be done. It is vital that the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Minister of Local Government, the Local Government Association and environmental conservation bodies pool their energy and enthusiasm to devise a workable practical plan for metropolitan Adelaide.

The Australian Conservation Foundation is undertaking a survey of metropolitan councils to determine what measures those councils are taking now and what they would like to see in terms of waste minimisation and recycling. I am sure that, if the communities of South Australia were surveyed, they would find strong support for a coordinated and practical waste reduction and recycling plan. I urge the Conservation Foundation, the Conservation Council and the Local Government Association to keep the pressure on councils individually and collectively to play their part. I am pleased that the Minister for Environment and Planning has set up a recycling advisory committee, and I look forward to early news of its deliberation. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BOTANIC PARK

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I move:

That this House acknowledges that the commitment of the Government to returning the temporary car park in [Botanic Park] to full and open parkland use has been honoured and notes with approval the continuing and progressive return of alienated parkland to full public use.

The cynics were wrong: the land that was used by the Botanic Gardens and STA for temporary purposes for employee car parking while the conservatory was being built has been returned. It was for temporary purposes, and a commitment was given at the time that it would be returned to open parkland use, and that is exactly what has happened. No-one believed the Government, but the assurances it gave on that occasion, and on many other occasions, was to ensure that the parklands of Adelaide existed for the enjoyment and the recreational use of the community. The land is not there for the parking of vehicles.

It is not our objective to use them for parking; it is our objective—which has been demonstrated by a commitment since 1982—to return as much of the alienated parklands to open community use as possible. At the time the Adelaide City Council stated that it had been deceived over the car park, and the residents association of Hackney and nearby areas stated that the parklands were being used as a pawn, but neither of those statements is correct.

A number of people were able to gain a significant amount of prominence at the time by jumping on the band wagon and claiming that the Government was alienating public land and that temporary purposes would, over a period of time, become permanent purposes. But, they are wrong—very wrong indeed. No-one would be able to identify any part of Botanic Park as being the former car park. The cyclone wire fencing has gone; the directional signs have gone; the bitumen has gone; the earth has been ploughed, flattened, and resown.

No-one who goes to Botanic Park to view the beautiful Tropical Conservatory or to attend the opening later this year will find evidence of the former car park that was necessary while the conservatory was being built. I remind members why the car park was necessary. The Government has already made a commitment to return the STA bus depot at Hackney to open parkland use and to provide that land to the Botanic Gardens for inclusion in Botanic Park. That commitment will be met. There is no question about that whatsoever.

Subsequent to that commitment it became possible for the State Government to utilise a grant from the Bicentennial Authority to build what is, I believe, one of the most beautiful tropical conservatories in this country, if not in the world. It is an extraordinarily beautiful structure, as anyone who has the opportunity—as I had with the Director of the Botanic Gardens—to view it from both inside and out would agree. But, I remind members that it was built on STA bus depot land that was used by the employees to park their vehicles while on duty as bus drivers. Many of the buildings at that depot had been demolished and car park space was reduced so that construction work on the conservatory could begin.

Therefore, it was necessary to provide, in the interim, alternative car parking spaces for the employees of the STA bus depot. No deceit was involved in that exercise. An agreement was reached between the STA, the Botanic Gardens Board and the Government about the uses to which that land would be put. There was no deceit whatsoever; there was an agreement that the car park would be provided so that people who were temporarily inconvenienced by the erection of the conservatory would have an alternative place

to park their vehicles. And that is exactly what happened. So, those people who said that subterfuge was involved are wrong.

Guarantees were given, and those guarantees have been met. I hope that the member for Light will second this motion, as he is in the House at present. I had much pleasure in seconding a motion that he moved in relation to the parklands on 19 March 1987. I congratulated the member for Light on putting this motion before the House; I was happy to second his motion—and I hope that he will be able to second mine. I remind the House of the terms of the member for Light's motion, which was passed by this House and subsequently by the Upper House. It stated, in part:

That, in the opinion of the Parliament, in the management and development of parklands in council areas of South Australia:

... (b) the public should have free and unrestrictive access;

(c) the parklands should be reserved as a place for public recreation, leisure and enjoyment;

(d) every effort should be given to the restoration to the public use of areas which have previously been removed from general use;

(e) the character of the parklands as a green belt dividing the City of Adelaide from the suburbs should be preserved...

(g) the Crown should be subject to the same development constraints and comply with the same obligations as councils...

They are fine sentiments, and they were endorsed by the members who spoke in the debate, from both sides of the House, both in this Chamber and in the other place. Indeed, every single one of those elements has been picked up in the decision to return land in Botanic Park to open parkland use. This is in accordance not just with the commitment that has been given by the Government in this regard but indeed with all the items contained in the member for Light's motion of 19 March 1987. In relation to Botanic Park a significant commitment has been honoured on this occasion. But it is not the only one. A number of other pieces of land have been returned to open parkland use as well.

In response to a question on notice from the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier provided details of various areas that had been identified in this regard or already returned to open parkland use. This has occurred in relation to the whole of the Hackney bus depot (about which we have been talking), involving some 5.24 hectares, and the Postal Institute on West Terrace, involving .83 hectares. The Adelaide Gaol site and environs has been returned to open parkland use. The gaol is no longer in use and this has occurred while a study is being undertaken as to the best use to which the old Adelaide Gaol itself could be put. Some 3.212 hectares of land is involved there.

Probably one of the most significant areas for members of this House is the more than four hectares of land on the western side of the Morphett Street bridge, which area one sees as one leaves the Parliament House car park and drives out onto Morphett Street. The area was previously used for car parking but that use has now been prohibited. This 4.2 hectare area will progressively be returned to open grassed parkland use. Members would have noticed the work being undertaken over the past few months. The traffic direction barriers have been removed and the shelters, and so on, that were on that land have been demolished. The concrete structures that were there have been removed and the bitumen is being pulled up. The area is progressively being cleared of building materials so that it can be returned to open parkland use.

In the *News* of July 1989, when the announcement was made about the return of this Botanic parkland to open parkland use, the Premier indicated that, taking in total those four packages of land that I have already identified

as well as smaller parcels of land nearby, a total of 12 hectares has been returned to parkland use in Adelaide since the Premier gave that commitment during the 1982 election, to ensure that the parklands were returned to open parkland use for people's passive and active recreation. That is 264 acres, a significant contribution by this Government. So, most of the land that was alienated by previous Governments has been returned during the period of the Bannon Government. That is indeed a significant contribution.

The terms of the motion refer to both elements, a car park in Botanic Park as well as the continuing and progressive return of alienated land to open parkland use. No Government in South Australia's history has been so committed to ensuring that those parklands, a key and very distinctive feature of Adelaide's design and lifestyle, are able to be used by as many people as possible as is the present case. I hope that members take soon the opportunity to visit Botanic Park and look at the way that the Conservatory has been integrated into both the park and the Botanic Gardens. When it is opened in November, I hope they will take the opportunity to enjoy what is, as I have already said, one of the most distinctive and attractive conservatories in the world.

I note in the Program Estimates that we have just been handed that a significant contribution has been made in this year's budget to both the Conservatory and the planning for the eventual change of use for the current STA site. An extra 2.5 full-time equivalent staff are being allocated to the redevelopment of the STA Hackney depot. In addition, there will be extra staffing for the Tropical Conservatory as well as extra resources to complete the surrounds of the Conservatory. That will include the complete landscaping of the area surrounding the Conservatory, making it one of the most important and attractive areas for South Australians and for visitors to South Australia. It will become a landmark institution, as have so many other institutions in Adelaide, for visitors to this city. With those comments, I urge the House to endorse the motion, acknowledging the contribution that has been made to the parklands as a result of this decision, and I seek the full and enthusiastic support of all members of this House.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES BOUNDARIES

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

That this House deplores the fact that recently gazetted State and Federal amendments to the South Australian-Victorian State fisheries boundaries may have jeopardised the success of the South-East rock lobster industry buy-back scheme.

This problem arises from a combination of two factors, at least. First, the buy-back scheme removed 695 lobster pots from the Port MacDonnell fishery. Of the 3 766 pots initially held by the Port MacDonnell fishermen, 695, or the equivalent of 18.45 per cent, have been withdrawn. The South Australian Minister (Hon. M.K. Mayes) and the Commonwealth Minister (Mr Kerin) concluded an arrangement (*Commonwealth Gazette* No. S.406 of Wednesday 21 December 1988) whereby the surveyed State boundary, that is, the surveyed land boundary of South Australia and Victoria, was extended south to latitude 40 intersection, to form the eastern boundary of the South Australian rock lobster fishery. Thus, for at least the third time in recorded history, South Australia has ceded land, or submerged lands, to Victorian control, an area which was originally vested by English Acts of Parliament (Acts IV and V, William IV, clause 95, 15 August 1834, and Acts I and II of Victoria,

clause 60, of 1838), both of which affirmed the latitude 141°E as the eastern boundary of South Australia.

The first concession was made by ratifying the incorrect surveys of 1847 to 1850—the Wade and White surveys—which placed the boundary between South Australian and Victorian physically on the land surface at 140°58'07.3"; that therefore gave to Victoria, according to the Privy Counsellors of the day in London, a strip of land about 2.25 miles wide and extending to the New South Wales-South Australian border. The second concession was in the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1967. In schedule 2 (dealing with the area that includes the adjacent area in respect of South Australia), this Act, and schedules, actually varied the seaward boundary from the South Australian-Victorian surveyed border by gradually ceding to Victoria submerged land from 140°58'07.3" East to 136°29' East in a series of steps.

The third occasion was an agreement to amend the South Australian-Victorian rock lobster fishery boundary to conform to that 1847-1850 survey error (South Australian Commonwealth *Government Gazette*). There may well be other cases that I have not researched. Incidentally, the land border dispute raged for many years between South Australia and Victoria until, in 1914, the matter of the Australian High Court decision (*South Australia versus Victoria*, No.12 CLP 667) was taken to appeal in the Privy Council in London. Their Lordships affirmed that the Wade and White line, as physically surveyed, that is, as laid down on the surface of the land, should remain in place as the true land boundary. Their decision is to be found in the *Commonwealth Law Reports*, volume 18, 1914 at pp.115 to 142.

However, there are still anomalies in this matter, despite that Privy Council ruling. Since the earliest days of settlement the South Australian-Victorian fisheries boundary has been understood to lie along the line 141°E of longitude. In 1976, the Australian *Government Gazette* (No.S. 191, Canberra, Wednesday 27 October 1976) proclaimed the South Australian-Victorian Rock Lobster Boundary to lie of meridian 141° east to its intersection with parallel 45°6'15" south, and thence to vary southwards (Fisheries Notice 69).

Again, the journal of the South Australian Fisheries Industries Council, 1975, number 3, carried the gazettal of Fisheries Notice 54, 20 December 1974, giving the same boundary for southern zone S. Even more interesting is the fact that, despite the Commonwealth and South Australian gazettal on 21 December 1988 of the amended boundary for the rock lobster fisheries, the Victorian Marine Fisheries News of November 1988, volume 3, number 3, carried a map at page 4 defining the boundary of the South Australian-Victorian western crayfish zone as 141°E to 40°S.

A map correction appeared in the Victorian Marine Fisheries News, volume 4, number 1. The boundary at June 1989 was still set at 141°E. The title only was amended to read 'Abalone and rock lobster zones'. So, as far as Victoria is concerned, twice in the past eight or 10 months 141°E has been gazetted as the official boundary for South Australian-Victorian rock lobster fishermen. There are discrepancies between the South Australian and Victorian fisheries gazettal notices; there are discrepancies between the fisheries and the petroleum (submerged lands) boundaries and, possibly, South Australian and Victorian boundaries agreed to by other Federal and State Acts of Parliament.

In the case of the rock lobster boundary, the Port Macdonnell fishermen by an action of State and Commonwealth Ministers have now been deprived of an area of fishing ground which was traditionally and statutorily theirs for decades. This area is over two miles wide at the coast and

extends at least 20 to 40 miles out to sea, depending upon the precise location of good quality lobster fishing grounds. The Port Macdonnell fishermen range over some 30 miles of coastline east to west, covering some 300 square miles of fishable lobster grounds. They have been deprived at a stroke of the ministerial pen of between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of their fishing grounds, yet, as I said at the outset, at the same time they have ceded to the Government 18.45 per cent of their pots in accordance with the lobster buy-back scheme. In other words, much of their buy-back effort has been negated, and that means possible financial loss, because they are still paying annual contributions to a scheme from which they gain only reduced benefits.

I ask the Minister, in particular, and members of the House: is this fair? It certainly discriminates against the Port Macdonnell, Blackfellows Caves and Carpenter Rocks fishermen. It deprives them of a traditional fishing ground which the Victorian Government still believes to be theirs according to its gazettal notices. Was it necessary for this gazettal to take place? Will they be compensated in any way for their loss of earnings? What are the implications when these facts are related to other Federal and State administrative Acts and to subsequent court decisions?

I might refer briefly to section 51 (3) of the Australian Constitution which refers specifically to compensation, and also to decisions made ministerially in South Australia favouring the Spencer Gulf prawn fishermen when, recently, there has been a waiver or deferral, at least, of buy-back payments. Those decisions have already taken place. Will the same favours be granted to south-eastern fishermen if they strike financial difficulties?

There are also other court cases to be considered, including *McGovern v Pennington*, 1986; the *Kelly v Kelly*, the 1987 appeal; and the Crockett decision ordering the restoration by the Minister of Forests and Lands in Victoria of abalone fishing rights off Wilson's Promontory. I suggest that these decisions may also have some relevance in this matter. The issue is far too complex for me to canvass at length during the short time allowed, but the Minister and his Director of Fisheries have matters to which they should give serious attention.

I would request at the very least that they listen to the Port Macdonnell and lower South-East fishermen and give them a reasonable hearing in a far more amenable climate than has been the case in the past few years. Probably some mutual concessions might be appropriate in this case. I simply ask the Minister to listen to the complaints of the fishermen and recognise that by ministerial fiat—his own at State level and the Minister's at Federal level—South-East fishermen have been deprived of long-term traditional fishing grounds.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING TRUST HEATING POLICY

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

That this House call upon the South Australian Housing Trust to honour the commitment made by the General Manager of the trust in Mount Gambier on 22 March 1989 to repair defective home heating appliances for all existing trust tenants in the South-East and asks that adequate funds be provided for this purpose.

Last winter and again in 1989 the member for Victoria and I received an increasing number of complaints about faults in or lack of home heating in South-East Housing Trust houses. Several factors may be responsible. For example, the ALP is experiencing a far tighter economy—the result

of its own making—so that there are literally fewer funds available for trust purposes.

There is emphasis on new homes, rather than on repair. There is lack of adequate repair and maintenance funding generally. The Commonwealth-State housing funds have been seriously cut during the past 18 months, and the accelerated depreciation of chimneys and heaters with ageing of trust homes, particularly those constructed between 1948 and 1960 in the South-East, would necessitate a large repair and maintenance program. Again, the trust's failure to provide depreciation funding as required by the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is another important factor.

I have no quarrel with the local representatives of the trust who are loyal to their Minister and devoted in their duties. They try to look after tenants but, in times of financial restraint, they find that crisis management presents increasing problems to them. Certainly, the lack of funds has exacerbated their problem and that of tenants so that in 1987 a new policy was announced by the General Manager of the trust and the Minister, as follows:

1. Where a Housing Trust home is vacated and the room heater has reached the end of its economical life and is beyond reasonable repair, those heaters will be removed.

2. Any vacant homes where an open fire-place exists but is unsafe the Housing Trust seals off the fire-place and generally renders the chimney unusable because of its potential danger.

3. For existing tenants . . . heaters will be repaired if it is economical to do so. If however repair costs exceed 50 per cent of replacement costs, the tenants are advised that the trust will no longer maintain the heater, which is generally removed as a matter of urgency.

That was the 1987 policy. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted. debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: HARTLEY LANDFILL

A petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop the proposed landfill at Hartley was presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to the question on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard No. 8*.

PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

8. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Premier: How much financial assistance has the Government made available to the Pitjantjatjara Council for road construction and health facilities respectively.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In 1988-89, \$462 000 was allocated to Anangu Pitjantjatjara for the operation of the AP road project. In the same period funds amounting to \$543 300 were provided by the South Australian Health Commission to the Nganampa Health Council, which provides health services to the Pitjantjatjara lands. A further \$67 000 is provided by the Department for Community Welfare for petrol sniffing rehabilitation.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report on the operations of the Auditor-General's Department for 1988-89.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Lyell McEwin Health Service—Fees.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1989-89.

QUESTION TIME

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Deputy Premier accept strong criticism by the State Government Insurance Commission about our public hospitals and, if not, does the Government intend to take action against SGIC for misleading advertising? I have in my possession a brochure now being distributed by the SGIC to metropolitan households that promotes the commission's health insurance scheme and urges people to join it. In justification the SGIC states:

The public health system is under pressure. Long waiting lists, ward closures, staff resignations, anxiety over whether your medical problem will be classified elective or essential surgery . . . it all adds up to uncertainty and insecurity. There really is only one answer if you don't want to risk having to wait for a public hospital bed for treatment deemed to be non-essential—take out private hospital insurance.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would do nothing to dissuade anyone who wants to take out private health insurance from taking it out, and if they want to take it out with the SCIG, good luck to them. All I can say is that I believe that this Government has acted quite responsibly in the way in which it has treated the public health system in the budget. If an individual wants a guarantee that he or she can get treatment for any ailment on a particular day in a facility of their choice, they are not going to get it. They will not get it in the private sector any more than they will get it in the public sector.

Mr S.G. Evans: Are you saying it is false advertising?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If in fact that is what it is saying (and I believe it is) then it is false advertising. Short of possibly a same day request from a GP, no-one can be guaranteed that they will not be put on some sort of a list. If the Leader of the Opposition wanted to go into a private hospital in order to have some sort of non-urgent surgical procedure, he could not be guaranteed that that surgery, whatever it might be, would occur on a particular day or on a day of his choice. The honourable member knows what happens when people want a consultation with a specialist: one rings up the specialist's secretary who says, 'Yes, well, would perhaps 3 November be appropriate?'

What I can guarantee is that, first, where a person who is uninsured seeks urgent and necessary medical treatment, they will get it in a public hospital immediately. Secondly, anyone who requires non-urgent surgery will also get it. The position in relation to the list is as I have reported to this

House several times: the average waiting time is about four weeks for non-urgent surgery in our hospitals.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That happens to be the case, and the figures are there to demonstrate it—and that waiting time is shortening, as the figures for July will bear out. That was a month when there was a great deal of pressure on the hospitals, particularly in relation to ear, nose and throat ailments—and we all know what winter does to us. It was a time when there was a great deal of hoo-hah from the Opposition about what was happening. However, the waiting times came down in the public hospital system in that period.

HOMESTART LOAN PROGRAM

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether HomeStart loans represent a trap for borrowers, as claimed by the Opposition? Yesterday in this place—and as reported in today's *Advertiser*—the Opposition claimed that a new HomeStart loans scheme would trap borrowers into taking out a loan for which the total repayments would greatly exceed those in relation to conventional bank or building society loans. Using the example in HomeStart's own brochure, the Opposition has claimed that on a loan of \$61 600 a HomeStart borrower would repay a total of \$443 154, compared with \$285 714 under a conventional loan.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I appreciate, Mr Speaker, the problems that you might have had in your former job as a teacher, when you had dull students in front of you: the example that was used by members of the Opposition was taken from HomeStart's own brochure, but there was one vital figure missing. I could be generous and say that, when they supplied those comparisons to the *Advertiser*, they correctly included the purchase price of the property, which was \$70 000; they correctly included the deposit, which was \$8 400; and they correctly included the loan figure, which was \$61 600. However, what was missing was the income of the borrower.

The example in the brochure was a random example of an applicant having an income of \$22 000 per year. Taking this income figure, if we compare a HomeStart loan with a building society loan of the same amount—that is, a loan of \$61 600—we see that the applicant would need an income of \$39 000 per year, not \$22 000, as we state quite correctly in the HomeStart brochure. In other words, the would-be home buyer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —would not get a loan under a conventional loan: he or she would have to apply under HomeStart, and that is the whole point. HomeStart enables ordinary South Australians to get started in buying a home; it does not apply to the two-income families to whom the member for Bragg refers. The Government has clearly explained the unique nature of this type of low start loan and no-one would dispute that. HomeStart loans allow applicants to borrow 2.8 times their income compared with 1.8 times under a conventional loan. They also peg payments at about 25 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I know that the Minister is not being disrupted by the barrage of discourteous interjections; nevertheless, the Chair believes they are most inappropriate and, furthermore, the Chair is unable to hear what the Minister is saying. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The truth always does hurt members of the Opposition. As I was saying, under HomeStart, payments are pegged at about 25 per cent of income, ensuring affordability for the whole life of the loan. Incomes and house values also increase over the life of the loan. Payments might rise to \$2 250 in year 23 of a HomeStart loan but, in 23 years, the borrower's income will also have increased from \$1 800 a month to \$9 000 a month. Furthermore, the value of the property will have increased from about \$76 000 to about \$457 000.

HomeStart loans are all about providing home purchasing opportunities when there are currently none: that is the whole point. The Liberal Party does not care a damn for those people who are currently trapped in the private rental market. It makes that fairly obvious. In fact, in the member for Bragg's example yesterday and again today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Bragg, in his example yesterday and again in his example today in the *Advertiser*, in effect advocated that the public of South Australia should have conventional building society loans, resulting in payments of about \$10 580 a month, yet we are talking about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —Mr and Mrs South Australia who are currently earning only \$22 000 a year. They are the people we are trying to get into home ownership. Let us consider a person who is paying rent for a three bedroom house, and the Real Estate Institute figure is currently \$130 a week. Over 23 years, that person would pay in excess of \$500 000 in rent. There would be no equity remaining—none whatsoever. The money would go into the pockets of landlords and, as I said yesterday, they are the true constituents of the member for Bragg—his friends, the landlords.

We found from this exercise that the Liberal Party does not care a damn about struggling South Australians in the private rental market. The Liberal Party has not proposed any alternative to this exciting and innovative HomeStart Loan Program. The people of South Australia currently are endorsing this program. The hotline is jammed; at 11 o'clock this morning we had had 1 254 inquiries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are probably fortunate that more members of the public did not get the opportunity to witness a spectacle such as that. The member for Coles.

PILOTS STRIKE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In view of the disaster which has struck the tourism industry in South Australia as the result of the pilots strike, will the Premier immediately allocate additional funds for tourism marketing in order to provide what the industry regards as essential strengthening and reinforcement of the State's tourism marketing effort by way of compensation and recovery programs for the effects of the strike? The pilots strike in South Australia has resulted in a substantial drop in retail sales—reported as being as high as 22 per cent for one Adelaide department store; a decrease in hotel occupancy from anticipated September levels of 70 per cent to around 40 per cent; a significant decrease in the demand for goods and services from suppliers to the hospitality industry; a drop in the demand for duty-free goods which may send some

outlets to the wall; and virtual devastation of the convention industry.

I understand that even this morning's ram sales at the Adelaide show were adversely affected because of the strike. Opposition discussions with senior members of the tourism industry reveal that the industry firmly believes that only an immediate substantial increase in marketing funds, in addition to funds allocated before the disaster struck—that is, under the tourism budget—together with a closely coordinated, well directed and sustained marketing strategy designed for damage control, can save the industry in this State from irreparable damage. One industry leader has said that any inaction would be intolerable.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think the best answer that I can give is to direct the honourable member's attention to the comprehensive statement issued by the Minister of Tourism yesterday which has been developed in conjunction with the industry and, which, as part of a strategy—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is not enough.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Oh, it is not enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am afraid, Mr Speaker, that the question and the way in which the explanation was couched indicated that the honourable member was completely ignorant of what the Minister had said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The explanation made absolutely no reference to the comprehensive action taken. Therefore, I assume that there was no knowledge as far as the honourable member was concerned. I will be happy to send her the details and ask her and other members of the Opposition whether they would like to cooperate in the action that the Government is taking in conjunction with the industry to ensure that we can minimise the effects of this dispute.

In relation to the question of marketing, we are well aware of marketing needs; that is why there was a further substantial increase in this year's budget. It has been increased by over 50 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat for a moment. If the member for Coles wants to debate the matter that she has indirectly canvassed by way of her question, she can do that through other forums of the House. However, the Chair cannot tolerate the continuous interjections that she is directing to the Premier while he is replying, or endeavouring to reply, to her original question.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House of the latest unemployment figures for South Australia as released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and I am delighted to inform this House of the latest unemployment figures for South Australia and to give some detail of the excellent performance of this State's economy. At the present time, seasonally adjusted figures for unemployment are at 6.6 per cent, which is the lowest since November 1979—and this is very pertinent.

An honourable member: Well done!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The former Labor Government left the economy of this State in an excellent condition. The Liberal Tonkin Government managed to increase unem-

ployment quickly and lower the participation rate in the work force to an enormous extent. The Bureau of Statistics statement released today shows a record number of South Australians in the work force.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Deputy Leader can carp, but he knows that this Government is putting our foundation in proper order. Members opposite spent three years ripping the base out of this economy. They joined with the Fraser Government and went about undermining secondary industry, so they can just sit and listen for a change like good little people and they may learn something about what we have achieved. The foundation of this economy, based on the Bannon Government's policies of establishing firm industrial, technical and service-based industries, is coming to fruition. This is the second month in a row in which the figures have dropped very dramatically.

Our participation rate is now the highest we have had since the figures started to be compiled in 1978—63.2 per cent participation in the work force. We showed a growth rate in our employment figures of 1.2 per cent in August compared with a national growth rate of .7 per cent, so the State economy is totally out-performing the national economy. It is very significant that industries in this State are performing. I am sure that the member for Price is delighted about that, as his district will be one of the recipients of this good news. In the areas of industry and secondary industry development—manufacturing—the member for Price's area will enjoy increased growth and employment, as will that of the member for Albert Park.

Most members, in fact, will see that occur. We have seen a growth of 1 per cent in participation in the work force, and that demonstrates significant confidence on the part of the labour market in this State's economy, with a drop of 1 per cent seasonally adjusted in the unemployment figure from July. That is a very impressive track record for this Government and shows that we are delivering the goods. The good thing about it is the fact not only that it represents August but that it shows a trend indicating a long-term growth in our positioning for those industries we want to see in this State.

If one looks at participation in the work force as a whole, we see that South Australia is at the top. We keep being singled out by various media writers but, in terms of our comparison with other States, on seasonally adjusted figures, we are well ahead of Tasmania and Queensland, the Queensland seasonally adjusted figures representing 7 per cent compared with our 6.6 per cent. We are not far behind New South Wales in terms of performance and, when we think of the immediate local market New South Wales has of 4.5 to 5 million people, that is a significant indicator of how South Australia is performing.

I am delighted to inform the House and the community that South Australia's economy is doing very well and, as a base for the employment of our young people and for the training packages we are introducing, it will continue to perform well within the national economy.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Health confirm that the Government is yet again fiddling figures on hospital waiting lists? In answer to the Leader's question the Minister mentioned waiting list figures for July. The figures he is using show a total of 6 910 on the waiting lists of the major metropolitan hospitals for July, a drop of 136 on the pre-

vious month, although the figure remains significantly above the monthly figure for earlier this year. As well, I have evidence that the figures the Minister is using are not the true figures. For example, the figure he uses for the Flinders Medical Centre shows a total number on the waiting list for July of 1 547. However, I have a copy of the hospital's own inpatients booking list, dated July, which shows that there are in fact 1 672 on the waiting list, which is well above the figure the Minister has given.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My information is taken from information given to me by the hospitals—and nowhere else. Let me repeat: it is what I have been given by the hospital administrator—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have no idea where the honourable member got that from. Let me make it clear that the information I have is that in March 1988 booking lists for the metropolitan hospitals peaked at 7 307. In June this year they were 7 046 and in July this year they dropped, as the honourable member said, by 136 to 6 910. I will back my figures against the honourable member's figures at any time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is aware that displaying documents is out of order. I also remind him that the Chair was extremely tolerant of his question in view of the reminder I gave the House the day before yesterday that questions are out of order if they seek an expression of opinion or contain arguments, expressions of opinion, inferences or imputations, or contain epithets or rhetorical, controversial, ironical or offensive expressions.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, if, in fact, the question is out of order, you should have ruled it out of order and not read a lecture when it is all over.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the Deputy Leader saying that he does not wish to have toleration extended to him from the Chair?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Mr Speaker, but we get thoroughly fed up with the sermons that you regularly deliver to us denigrating members of this House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair could quite easily proceed along disciplinary lines in respect of the Deputy Leader. However, for the sake of the workings of the House I will choose to ignore that. The honourable member for Newland.

HUMBUG SCRUB

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland has the floor.

Ms GAYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister of Lands appeal to the Geographic Names Board to retain the name Humbug Scrub for the area designated as such by Colonel William Light in the late 1870s? Tea Tree Gully residents who are members of the Friends of Humbug Scrub Wildlife Sanctuary have advised me that the Geographic Names Board proposes to change the name of Humbug Scrub to Para Wirra. The area was originally inhabited by the Peramangk Aboriginal people. Colonel Light explored the region in the late 1830s and in the late 1870s, as Surveyor-General, he named the area Humbug Scrub. Thomas Paine Bellchambers then established a wildlife sanctuary in

1905 which he named Humbug Scrub. The Friends of Humbug Scrub advise me that it is important that the sanctuary lands—both leased and freehold—should remain within the designated area of Humbug Scrub.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her question. I agree that she has raised an important matter, which is that we retain historical names for South Australia's heritage. I am aware that there has been a proposal to alter boundaries in the Humbug Scrub area and that this has been under discussion for some time with the City of Munno Para, Australia Post and the South Australian Police Force, and also, as the honourable member says, the Friends of Humbug Scrub Association. The request to establish a name and boundaries for an area between One Tree Hill and Kersbrook resulted from confusion in addresses by people living in this area and also to enable effective emergency servicing to take place. Consultation with all interested parties will continue, and it will be some time yet before a decision is made by the board.

Following that decision, a notice of intent is published to allow for any formal objections, and a recommendation is then made to me as the responsible Minister. I understand, however, that the area of scrubland known as Humbug Scrub will retain its identity but there will be apparently some new suburbs created in the area. In view of the honourable member's eloquently expressed concerns on this most important issue I will ask the Geographical Names Board to take her views into consideration. I will keep her informed of progress in this matter.

ISLAND SEAWAY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Marine investigate union interference in further work to be undertaken on the *Island Seaway*? I have been informed that the vessel is to be put on a slipway tomorrow for further modification work. The company which is to do the metalwork has also offered to do painting work required at a cost of \$7 000 and to give a three year guarantee on the work. However, I have been told that union officials have intervened to direct that the painting work must be given to another company which will charge \$47 000 for the work.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am not sure which work the honourable member is talking about, if it is the work that occurred some months ago. What he said was incorrect.

JAPANESE LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Albert Park.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Was the member for Coles completely unaware that the Chair was calling the House to order? The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made with regard to the joint submission from five schools in the western suburbs for the introduction of the Japanese language on their curriculum? The Minister will recall that I wrote to him supporting this submission from four primary schools and one high school. Can the Minister outline the department's response to the request?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in the study of languages in our schools. I recall his having raised this issue in the Parliament some time last year. The submission to which the honourable member refers was an excellent submission prepared by the

Seaton High School in conjunction with several of the surrounding primary schools—Grange, Hendon, Seaton North and West Lakes Shore. The submission represented a great deal of work by those school communities, with careful thought and detailed planning. It is an excellent example of cooperation to provide an extended and more effective curriculum that can be offered to young people as they move through primary and secondary years.

This submission, and other applications, was considered by the Adelaide Area Languages Other Than English Committee—and each area has a similar committee. As a result, the Adelaide area committee recommended that Seaton High School offer Japanese within its language program. This will be staffed from within the school's general staffing provision as the LOTE program does not include provision of salaries for secondary schools. I understand that the school has been advised that it may proceed with its planning to introduce Japanese into its curriculum. It has also been recommended that an extra 1.5 salaries be provided to three feeder primary schools under the LOTE program to introduce Japanese into these schools in the 1990 school year. This was intended to provide continuity for children to follow through with their study of the Japanese language from year 4 to year 12.

During the recent negotiations with the South Australian Institute of Teachers regarding the curriculum guarantee package, it was agreed that schools in future would incorporate the teaching of second languages within their staffing allocations. I remind members that part of the agreed package will enable primary schools to use specialist teachers in two subject areas, one of which will be a language other than English. Staffing allocations will be according to the agreed formula.

Schools already targeted for Japanese under the Languages Other Than English Mapping and Planning Project will now need to plan together within this policy framework. It may be that some schools will decide that under the current circumstances 1990 will not be their preferred year to start the program. If the schools wish to proceed the Adelaide area committee will await advice on staff required and make every effort to find suitable teachers.

However, I point out that the supply of teachers of Japanese is very limited. The shortage of suitable teachers could affect the timing of the implementation of the program in the schools involved. The staffing officers will work on this matter with the schools. Within the identified priorities of the South Australian languages policy, the LOTEMAPP will determine a timeline for 1990 to 1995 for primary and secondary schools, indicating the timing of the introduction of second languages.

It will identify the schools targeted for the teaching of particular languages and other aspects, such as mode of delivery. I am very proud of the development that has taken place in recent years in our schools in relation to teaching second languages. We have led Australia in this area and, clearly, we can now face the future challenges very confidently with the already well established language program in our schools.

BOOL LAGOON CHARGES

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Did the Minister for Environment and Planning receive Crown Law advice before personally intervening to stop prosecutions against 15 people in the Mount Gambier Magistrates Court last week? If so, what was that advice? If not, why not, and will other people charged for offences under the National Parks and

Wildlife Act now receive similar treatment? These charges related to incidents at Bool Lagoon on 27 May this year whereby people entered the lagoon area to protest against duck shooting, which was being conducted entirely legally and with permits from the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

A spokesman for the Minister has said that charges were dropped following the personal intervention of the Minister. I am advised that the Minister's action is widely considered to have put in serious jeopardy the credibility of laws designed to deal fairly with illegal hunting. For example, I have a copy of a letter written to the Minister on Monday of this week by a member of the Murray Lands Consultative Committee of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (Mr Peter Schramm). In tendering his resignation, Mr Schramm said this about the Minister's actions in having these charges dropped:

Your action was a serious blow to the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Now there is no point in laying charges against anyone who commits an offence against the National Parks and Wildlife Act. I feel you have made a mockery of the justice system of South Australia. There are many of us who now feel the work we have done in the curtailment of illegal hunting has been destroyed.

The Minister's actions in this matter contrast with other cases in which there appears to have been a very heavy-handed attitude taken to trivial offences. For example, the Government took to the Mount Gambier Magistrates Court earlier this year a man accused—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member still quoting from the letter, because if he is not he is beginning to draw comparisons that amount to comment and debate?

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, this is still facts.

The SPEAKER: This is still part of the same quotation?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Mr Speaker. For example, the Government took to the Mount Gambier Magistrates Court earlier this year a man accused of driving just 45 metres along a track off Coorong Beach. The man did this while looking for a place to camp. The magistrate found that there had been no reason to take this man to court on summons. The National Parks and Wildlife Service received many complaints over the attitude of rangers to campers in the Coorong National Park during this year's Lions' fishing competition. After this latest case the view is now widely held in the South-East that the consistent administration of laws for our national parks has been undermined by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the entire latter section was a direct quote from the letter from the same Mr Schramm. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would be amazed if it was—but never mind. I did not seek Crown Law opinion on whether charges should be proceeded with, and I did so for a very good reason. First, I want to say it is certainly not a serious blow to justice in this State and it is not in any way undermining the laws that are administered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

As members opposite would know, probably the reason for this question is that this whole issue is a very emotive one in the community, and it seemed to me that turning people into martyrs and heroes would not in any way allow for some reasoned and sensible discussion about these issues. As members would know, and as I have made very clear in the past, I have called for reports from two of my committees, one being the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, the other from the Department of Environment and Planning, to provide me with information about duck shooting within conservation parks. It seemed to me that it would

have made a lot of common sense for the whole issue to be dealt with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Members opposite do not like my answer, Mr Speaker, because it is actually one based on commonsense and reasonableness. Because I am not prepared to rush out into the community and up the ante on these issues, obviously the Opposition is very disappointed about that. I believe that the decision which was to allow proper, sensible, and rational discussion to take place so that all groups could put forward their point of view without the emotion of having people made into martyrs was probably a very sensible one.

It certainly has been applauded by wide sections of the community. For the Opposition to try to make some kind of inference and the wild assertions that we have come to expect from the honourable member—and he says it with a bit of a smile on his face—is just a sheer nonsense, and I believe that the decision that has been taken is the correct one.

COBBLERS CREEK DAM

Mr RANN (Briggs): Is the Minister of Transport aware of claims by the Salisbury council that a flood disaster may hit Salisbury homes unless the State Government urgently builds a dam at Cobblers Creek? In a front page story in yesterday's *News Review* headed 'Flood disaster fear', the Salisbury council said it feared stormwater from up to 10 000 homes to be built in Golden Grove will meet the Little Para River and flood out houses in Salisbury Plain, Salisbury Park and Brahma Lodge. The council said that unless a dam is built, it will take legal action against the developers—the South Australian Urban Land Trust and Delfin. The Mayor of Salisbury said that a dam was the only safe and adequate flood prevention strategy for the residents of Salisbury.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Briggs for his question.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Beg your pardon?

Mr Lewis: You should see the erosion in Dry Creek.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I particularly ask the honourable Minister not to encourage the honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did not think I was encouraging him at all, Sir. I thank the member for Briggs for his question, because it is a very important issue. A couple of weeks ago I had a meeting with representatives from the Tea Tree Gully council and also the Salisbury council at which it was agreed that a certain amount of work needed to be done just to assess how much of a problem was to be caused by the additional building at Golden Grove. Everyone at that meeting agreed that at that stage it had not been computed with a degree of accuracy.

It is very important to establish whether the State Government does have additional obligations here due to the whole development at Golden Grove. There are other problems in that area that could contribute to flooding on the Salisbury Plain, quite unconnected with any additional building at Golden Grove. As the member for Briggs would be aware, councils have an obligation to do as much of this work as they possibly can with the assistance of State Government within the limit of the State's budget and how much we can afford from time to time.

They set priorities. One thing that has concerned me since I have had some ministerial responsibility in this area is the way priorities are set for the funds available. I would like a lot more work done on how we establish priorities. At the moment, it is pretty much on a 'first come first served' basis as to where funds are spent each year. That is not satisfactory. I believe there must be a set of priorities and a greater degree of assessment of the urgency of the various programs for local government.

In summary, the Government is well aware of the problems that could be faced by people on the Salisbury Plain and it will do everything it can to see that funds are made available, particularly in relation to problems created by the Golden Grove development. In the first place, we must compute the degree of that problem and that is being done in cooperation with councils. I will let the member for Briggs know as soon as that investigation has been completed and inform him of the action the Government intends to take as a result of that investigation.

WITHDRAWAL OF CHARGES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Does the Premier condone any Minister seeking to have charges withdrawn after they have been laid according to the due processes of the law?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The House has heard what the Minister for Environment and Planning had to say.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am satisfied that, in those particular circumstances, that was appropriate. Any one of these cases would have to be looked at in terms of the circumstances involved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Premier advise the House whether the figures for the level of private investment in South Australia are rising or falling? On the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* an article indicated that of 20 investors and developers surveyed 13 had never invested in South Australia and said they never would, and seven had invested in South Australia and said they were quite happy to continue the present situation. The article concluded that South Australia was considered unfavourable for investment opportunities. That sits oddly with the statement in the June quarter report of the State Bank that new capital expenditure in South Australia for 1989-90 is expected to increase by a strong 15 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will extend the same tolerance as I extended to an earlier question, but I point out that drawing comparisons of that nature is clearly comment. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. I must say that I felt the report in this morning's paper, and the release which subsequently came from BOMA, was unduly negative in its approach. I say that particularly about BOMA, because I had the opportunity yesterday to speak to the President of that organisation, who assured me that BOMA was, in fact, very positive about investment prospects in South Australia and was also very concerned to maintain a positive posture. That is rather

at odds with the article headed 'SA perceived as least attractive property investment State'.

Having said that, I point out that the Government has been well aware that perceptions of South Australia can be very negative, in the eastern States in particular. Indeed, both my colleague the Minister of State Development and Technology and I, in this House and elsewhere, have constantly referred to the need to ensure that positive promotion of South Australia takes place. It is for that reason that we have undertaken investment seminars in other States and overseas, and those seminars have yielded extremely positive results. It simply proves that, if we get out into the marketplace and are prepared to explain and market our products, we will get results. If that is not happening in the property area, that is a pity. I am not quarrelling with the perceptions revealed by this survey, merely suggesting that they are not universal perceptions. I am also saying that those perceptions have changed rapidly over time.

I also make the point that it is a little hard to draw too many conclusions from a survey of this limited nature, anyway. After all, only 20 people were consulted. In fact the list showed only 19 names and, of those, two were separate companies, being linked to the same group and presumably having the same attitude. So, it was a limited sample; it was confined to a particular area of property development and, as such, overlooked what was happening here in South Australia. Let us put that on the record.

The honourable member refers to the State Bank quarterly report, and there are all sorts of other investment statistics and measures. The State development registry of investment shows something like \$2.5 billion since June 1988. That is a superb and massive upsurge in development. The evidence of one's eyes as one walks around the city will establish what has been happening in CBD development. The value of building approvals in the city has jumped by 105 per cent—\$1.12 billion for the June 1989 quarter alone. So there is an enormous amount happening.

The vacancy level is not unduly high. Indeed, market predictions are that those vacancy levels will increase and then decrease over time. If that were not the case, people would not be investing and building here. We cannot have it both ways. It seems to me that there is undue pessimism about development in this State. Certainly, there is not sufficient detailed knowledge of just what is going on or a recognition of the enormous development, particularly in our industrial manufacturing area, with long-term prospects and exciting projects.

The frigates project is one of the most recent examples, which will take us into the next century. Some great things are happening, and it is important that we as a community get up, say that and project it to other States and overseas. The Government has certainly been doing that. We have an ongoing and developing program, and I would be delighted if an organisation such as BOMA would join with us in doing that. I suggest that, for a start, it should help tell the story more comprehensively. If it wants to take surveys, by all means let it do that, but let us make them much more comprehensive and realistic. We are very happy to work with BOMA in promoting opportunities in South Australia.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology now confirm that an agreement dated 22 March this year signed by him and parties to the aborted Marineland redevelopment included a confidentiality clause, will he explain why that clause was inserted

and will he now table the agreement in full in the interests of giving taxpayers more information about the Government decision which will cost them at least \$6 million?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will confirm that that agreement contains a confidentiality clause such as appears in the standard wording of such commercial agreements. There is nothing different from other standard agreements in this matter. The point I made previously was that, if there is to be a release of any information, we would need to seek the approval of the other signatories to the agreement. We have done that and have received a letter from the other party, which has indicated the terms and conditions under which information could be made available. The honourable member is now asking for the entire agreement to be made available.

This is something that I would need to have my officers discuss with the Abel family, because Mr Abel's letter states:

Our clients do not object to all of the relevant facts pertaining to this matter and the surrounding circumstances being disclosed by the Minister. However, such consent is subject to and conditional upon our clients being at liberty to make such responses to the media as they may consider necessary and appropriate.

It is entirely reasonable for them to request this. We now have to go to them and say that we have a request to release the entire agreement. The confidentiality clause provides:

[The parties] acknowledge and agree that all information contained in or in relation or connection to this heads of agreement . . . shall be kept as confidential—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, I ask you to ascertain whether the Minister is reading from a departmental docket and, if he is, whether he will table it.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am not reading from a departmental docket, Mr Speaker. It is a manila folder which contains papers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Not only do I have the Minister's assurance that he is not reading from a ministerial docket but, even from this distance, there appears to be visible evidence that he is not. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can assure the House that there is no stamp on these photocopies which indicates that they are an attachment to a docket. Members can take my assurance on that. The confidentiality provision continues:

. . . and shall not be disclosed by them to any person, firm, corporation or other body whatsoever (save and except as required by legislation or regulation) and shall use their best endeavours to ensure that the confidential information is not disclosed or distributed by their or any of their employees or agents in violation of the provisions hereof.

The advice that I have is that it is a standard clause appearing in commercial agreements.

BRIGHTON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House what action has been taken to rectify problems concerning the pedestrian crossing on Brighton Road adjacent to Brighton Primary School? The issue of road safety at that crossing outside the school has been of concern for a number of years now. On 7 March this year a year 7 student monitor named Cathy Koenig was doing monitor duty. As she finished her duty and pushed the button to return across the road, crossing on the 'Walk' sign, a fully laden semitrailer came through the crossing and went so close to her that it brushed her clothes. As a result of that incident a number of parents came to see me and, following our deliberations, we agreed to take a number of steps: one was to request the council to extend the 'no

standing' zone surrounding the crossing; another was to ask the school to appoint lollipop persons to police the crossing; and the third was to approach the Minister to see whether the duration of the 'Walk' phase could be altered and whether the number of lanterns at Jetty Road could be increased.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Bright for his question and acknowledge at the outset his interest in the issue. I congratulate him on his persistence, which has finally paid off. An examination of the traffic lights at the intersection took place and, after that examination, it was considered appropriate to install an additional lantern. This occurred on 18 April 1989. However, the angle of the lantern on the western side of Brighton Road was examined and no alteration was required. It has therefore been decided to increase the 'Walk' phase at that set of lights to ensure that children are able to cross Brighton Road more easily in an effort to minimise the temptation for children to step from the kerb during the flashing 'Don't walk' phase. I am certain that when the member for Bright informs his constituents of that alteration they will be pleased. I have been happy to cooperate with the honourable member in this exercise, and it demonstrates again that persistence pays in this game.

PORT LINCOLN SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Is the Minister of Water Resources in a position to report to the House on the proposed sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln? Members would be aware of my and my constituents' concern about this proposal. In response to a question I asked some weeks ago, the Minister indicated that she was requesting her department to prepare a further report and that she would be making an announcement soon.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member did ask me a question, I think on about 15 August, about plans the Government might have to construct a sewage treatment plant for Port Lincoln; and I did tell the House that I would be making an announcement in the near future. I am delighted to now make that announcement: the State Government will spend \$300 000 to design a sewage treatment works for Port Lincoln. The investigation and design work for this sewage treatment works will be complete in about 12 months. This is probably the first time since I have been in this Parliament that the Opposition has actually welcomed and supported an initiative that has been taken by this Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No, the Government is not taking the Liberal's policy. Let me assure the House and the member for Flinders that the announcement has absolutely nothing to do with the Opposition. It is in response—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Leader please restrain himself. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very sad when a member of this House who tries to put himself up as an alternative Premier is so petty as to not concede that he has been beaten to the punch on an issue. While the Leader of the Opposition might make a number of pronouncements, I remind the member for Flinders that it is the Government, and I as Minister, who will authorise the money for this project to proceed. I think that that is a fairly salient point.

Mr Olsen: We'll be there to write the cheques.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I assure the Leader that we are writing the cheque right now. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is a little slow on the uptake. I repeat my

statement for the member for Flinders. The Government in this year's budget will spend \$300 000 to design a sewage treatment works for Port Lincoln. The investigations and design work for this treatment plant will be completed in about 12 months from now. The design will be of the highest calibre. It will provide for the secondary treatment of sewage with an allowance for tertiary treatment, if that proves necessary in the future.

The funding package will include examining the feasibility of disposing of effluent on land for the irrigation of crops and wood lotting. The sludge produced as a by-product of the sewage treatment process will be dried and spread on the land. This sewage treatment plant is estimated to cost between \$3 million and \$4 million. Although the project results not only from the representations of the member for Flinders, I think every member would concede that he has consistently raised this issue during the time he has been in this place. Indeed, I well remember that when I first visited Port Lincoln he raised this issue with me.

The Government recognises the importance of ensuring that we move fairly quickly to prevent the disposal of untreated effluent into the marine environment. I remind members that later this month the Finger Point sewage treatment plant will be opened in the South-East. This will be the last plant servicing a major city or town in South Australia to discharge into the marine environment. I shall seek funding for the construction of the Port Lincoln sewage treatment works, and I can tell the honourable member that we are moving very quickly on the investigation and design work for this project.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 26 September at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 783.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): What a lot of diatribe we have heard today. The Minister of Housing and Construction has tried to explain his HomeStart scheme. All one needs to do is look at page 12 of today's *News* to see the facts. It states:

The State Government's \$1 000 million homes boost is nothing more than a clever facade in an election year. Stripping this program of all its window dressing we find the State Government is doing little more than promoting a clever poverty trap.

The Government that is supposedly looking after people on low incomes comes up with this clever poverty trap. The article continues:

It is enticing people who can least afford to overcommit themselves to significantly boost the amount of money they borrow. There is no denying HomeStart is an innovative product and, with self interested groups only too willing to applaud the move, it is sure to trap many people. And why not? At first glance it appears more attractive for the home buyer than traditional means. Today the Minister of Housing and Construction did not attempt in any way to refute the fact that a \$61 000 HomeStart loan will cost \$443 000 at the end of 27 years—

nearly \$200 000 more than a fixed interest bank loan at 15 per cent and \$160 000 more than a building society loan. That is absolutely scandalous. When one looks at the HomeStart loan scheme one sees what a sham it is. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the following tables detailing HomeStart loan repayments and certain comparisons.

Leave granted.

HOUSING LOANS COMPARISONS

Purchase price of property: \$70 000
Deposit: \$8 400
Loan: \$61 600

Year:	Yr 1	Yr 5	Yr 10	Yr 18	Yr 23	Yr 28
Monthly Payments:	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
HomeStart	458	612	879	1 567	2 250	3 002
Fixed Interest Loan 15 p.c.	784	784	784	784	784	784
Building Society 17 p.c.	882	882	882	882	882	882
Outstanding Balance of Loan:						
HomeStart	65 472	82 602	106 416	132 821	108 326	Nil
Fixed Interest Loan 15 p.c.	61 419	60 359	57 744	46 320	28 162	Nil
Building Society 17 p.c.	61 480	60 734	58 273	48 631	30 574	Nil
Actual amount paid by home buyer over length of loan (27 years)						
HomeStart	5 496	31 922	77 752	196 083	313 426	443 154
Fixed Interest Loan 15 p.c.	9 408	47 040	94 080	169 344	216 384	254 016
Building Society 17 p.c.	10 582	52 910	105 820	190 476	243 386	285 714

HOMESTART LOAN FROM BROCHURE—AUGUST 1989

Years	Monthly Payments \$	Yearly Payments \$	Total Amt Paid \$
1st	458	5 496	5 496
2nd	492	5 908	11 404
3rd	529	6 351	17 755
4th	568	6 827	24 583
5th	611	7 330	31 922
6th	657	7 890	39 812
7th	706	8 481	48 204
8th	759	9 118	57 412
9th	816	9 801	67 214
10th	876	10 537	77 752
11th	943	11 327	89 079
12th	1 014	12 177	101 256
13th	1 090	13 090	114 347
14th	1 172	14 072	128 419
15th	1 260	15 127	143 546
16th	1 355	16 262	159 808
17th	1 456	17 481	177 290
18th	1 566	18 792	196 083
19th	1 683	20 202	216 285
20th	1 809	21 717	238 003
21st	1 945	23 346	261 349
22nd	2 091	25 097	286 446
23rd	2 248	26 979	313 426
24th	2 416	29 003	342 429
25th	2 598	31 178	373 607
26th	2 793	33 516	407 124
27th	3 002	36 030	443 134

A table entitled 'Example of the Outstanding Balance Over the Term of the Loan', is produced by the Government for its HomeStart package. It is an interesting document because it shows an inflation rate of 7.5 per cent over 27 years. That is a rather interesting prediction for this Government to make, because it talks about reducing inflation, yet it here predicts an inflation rate of 7.5 per cent. It then shows a property value increase of 8.5 per cent over 27 years. Today, the Minister talked about property value increases, which this document shows are inflated by 8.5 per cent.

I know that the Minister of Housing and Construction resides in the Elizabeth area. If he looked at his local paper in the past few days he would have discovered that property values are not rising by 8.5 per cent but, rather, are decreasing

rapidly. There are more 'fire' sales in Salisbury and Elizabeth due to falling property values than anywhere else. The whole scheme is predicated on an increase of 8.5 per cent. It is a joke and a fraud. The HomeStart scheme is a con. This scheme that the Government documented for the people of South Australia is a fraud.

The other day I read an interesting article in which Mr Luckens, one of the designers of the scheme who worked for Sacon, said that if anyone defaulted on the scheme the Government had a novel way of getting out of it—the State Government would pick up the cost. It is absolutely scandalous for a Government to say that, if at the end of a certain period a couple defaults in relation to their responsibilities, the Government will pick up the tab. Further, one must consider the level of property values in the southern and northern suburbs, where the majority of new housing will take place. This is an absolute fraud, and the Government should be condemned for it.

The initiative is innovative, and it should be in the marketplace, but it should not be promoted as being a major Government proposal, with the Government going to an election. Some products of a similar nature are already available in building societies and banks as part of their packages, and the people in those organisations will tell you quite openly that, when people are actually told what will happen, they run away from it at a hundred miles an hour. There are things that the public want to know about and that is why I have tabled that document.

In looking at the first example in relation to the outstanding balance one can see that after 10 years one owes \$160 000 on the \$61 000 loan originally taken out. So, in 10 years the amount owed on the loan increases by \$46 000. With prices indicating a reduction in property values in the northern and southern suburbs, it would be interesting to see how people would cope if, for any reason—whether divorce or deciding to walk away from their commitment—they were required to meet that extra \$46 000. One must bear in mind that people in this position could not meet the payments in the first place and that that would be the reason for walking away.

Also in this document the Minister has blatantly said that property values will increase. Consequently, that would have a very significant effect on monthly payments. Has any

member of this Parliament tried to pay the bills with the inflationary increases of a property? It is impossible. One does not pay the bills with cash that comes from the increased value of one's house. The thing is an absolute fraud. The Government has not been game to give the real reason and substance behind this exercise. The public of South Australia should be made aware of what an absolute con it is. One starts off with a \$60 000 loan and in 27 years one pays \$443 000—nearly \$200 000 more than for a fixed interest loan and \$160 000 more than a standard building society loan.

It is interesting that we hear all this talk at the Federal level about getting people ready for retirement. Under this scheme, as people are retiring, more and more money is being paid out. Under HomeStart, in the eighteenth year one would be paying \$1 566 a month, while under a fixed interest loan one would be paying \$784. The scheme is supposed to be for low income earners but it is an absolute con.

The public of South Australia must be glad that the Opposition has got up and shown early what a big con and a big fraud this is. Members representing people in the southern and northern areas must be wondering how they will sell this absolute con to the people who are trying to buy new homes. If the Government was announcing in this place that it intended to put \$1 000 million into developing housing through the Housing Trust, that would make some sense. However, to put this absolute sham to the people of South Australia is an absolute disgrace.

During the election campaign of 1982, a proposal called the Ramsay Trust was introduced. Where is that now? Further, in 1985 a home loan low interest scheme was introduced, almost identical to this scheme. What happened to that? Six months after it was started it was scrapped. Now, in 1989, during a run up to an election an almost identical thing is being proposed again. It is an election stunt. All I can say is that if South Australians condone these sorts of things they deserve the Government that they get.

As I said earlier, the people going to building societies and banks are walking away from this type of loan. People in the banks and building societies will tell you that straight away. Further, what is SAFA's commitment to this? We know that SAFA is going to put up the money. How much will it cost SAFA? If the loans are going out at 15 per cent and it is borrowing at 17 per cent, what is the cost? What is the administration cost to the building societies and to the banks? Also, what will happen to all the housing concessional loans that we got years ago?

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): During debate on the budget previously I raised the issue of future directions for this State. One matter that the Government has to come to grips with concerns the issue of industrial relations in South Australia. Occurrences like the pilots' dispute and other industrial disruptions cut across the ability of the State and the nation to perform according to the standards that we believe are appropriate.

I again refer to the matter of corruption. Again today we have seen another example of corruption by this Government, when a Minister stood in this place and said that she would make up her mind about whether a person is guilty or innocent. That is disgraceful. At least Don Dunstan had the guts to say, 'If you don't like it oppose it but be prepared to take the consequences.' It is a corruption of the system for a Minister of the Crown to make the decision as to

whether people are guilty or innocent, to say that because it is considered that they are innocent they will be taken out of the court system. If a court in dealing with a case decides that a matter is not worth pursuing, then that course can be taken, but this must be left up to the courts.

On the question of corruption, the Government seems unable to come to grips with its responsibilities on the matter of corruption in the building industry. We have heard the results of a survey about what interstate investors think of South Australia. I am sure that more details of this will be put before the public of South Australia. Although we do not have intimate details available, quite clearly, interstate investors do not think kindly of South Australia.

There are two elements in relation to this matter. One concerns corruption in the decision making processes in Government. Time and time again we have seen this Government woo investors to this State, asking them to spend money, but then because of vested interests projects have been refused. The marina projects were classic examples, and the latest one was the cable car proposal.

Mr Tyler :

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Fisher is now apparently saying that the Opposition is running the Government—which is quite extraordinary. It is corrupt for Governments to ask investors to come to South Australia and to build and prosper here but to then tell them that a project cannot proceed, perhaps due to some antagonism or some opposition from community groups. The other reason for our not being thought of highly interstate is due to the parlous state of our building industry. So, the two principal reasons for this are that the Premier cannot make a decision and that the building industry is in a poor state.

Over a period I have related to the House a number of incidents associated with the building industry. In fact there has been a long history of happenings in the building industry which I am sure no-one on this side of the House condones, although these practices have certainly been condoned by members opposite.

If people are involved in industrial relations, they become somewhat saturated with the stories of the mischief, thuggery and intimidation that goes on at building sites in Adelaide. I do not know how a Government or any member on the other side of the House can sit idly by when they see little people being subjected to threats and intimidation that emanate from the building unions of this State. It is not only the right of people to be able to live and work in this State, but nobody should be subject to—

Mr Tyler: Have you got evidence?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have presented evidence to this Parliament over a period.

Mr Tyler: Have you been to the police?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I certainly have been to the police—yes, indeed.

Mr Tyler: What happened?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister knows that we had some follow up on certain matters that were raised earlier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I'm not quite sure who has the floor.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That prompts me: towards the end of last session I raised a question associated with the asbestos regulations. At that stage I related a case involving a person who had had great difficulties with the unions and the Department of Labour in relation to clearing some old buildings from the Emu Winery site. I never finished that contribution, and the member for Fisher reminds me of

that fact, so I will complete it now. The facts of the case were that a person had contracted to clear materials. There was no restriction at that stage on what he could remove in terms of normal fibro asbestos. There were certainly regulations governing the removal of blue asbestos, and those regulations had bipartisan support in this Parliament.

Quite an extensive campaign was waged against that person, and the Department of Labour was called in on a number of occasions to stop the work. The work was stopped quite illegally on at least two occasions, and the Minister had to call off the dogs. This person got himself into such a financial situation that he had to complete that contract. The key to completing that contract was the removal of blue asbestos from some piping at the winery. The Minister well knows that, and he well knows that we presume the person in question blew himself up. He certainly died as a result of injuries sustained from explosives.

I will relate a telephone conversation that he had with me about a week before he blew himself up. He said, 'Mr Baker, what can I do? I contracted for this contract at a reasonable price. I believed I could fulfil it. The unions, the Department of Labour and the Minister have frustrated every attempt I have made. At least now I can go on with the contract but I cannot get the blue asbestos removed.' I said, 'All you have to do is get a recognised contractor to remove that blue asbestos.' He said, 'I cannot get anyone to remove that blue asbestos because the union says I have to pay \$1 000 before I can get it removed. They said they would not let any of the recognised contractors remove it. What can I do? I am going broke. I have nowhere to turn.' About a week before he blew himself up, I informed him of some legal ways to get that blue asbestos removed.

I do not know the circumstances behind the explosives; I do not know why it happened, but it is a great shame that it did happen. All I can say is that, if he finished up taking some short cuts at the end because of the financial situation he was placed in by the unions and the Government of this State, and if those short cuts meant that he took some risks at the end of the day that he should not have taken, there are certainly some questions to be answered.

When people talk to me and say, 'We have to put up with it,' I do not have to put up with it and nobody in this Parliament should put up with the disgraceful actions of building unions in this State. People have been injured; families have been terrorised; in this case, an unfortunate accident occurred. Also relating to the investments field is the fact that ASER ran overtime by a year-and-a-half at double the original cost. We also had delays in the Telecom building and in every building in this State.

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

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I want to take up a number of claims made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech on the budget. In relation to the education budget, he makes great play in claiming that recurrent spending in the budget of 1985-86 was 22.2 per cent of the total budget and that this year that figure is 18.6 per cent of the budget. This is presented as a fundamental explanation of a reduction in education spending and in the standard of education. In fact, it is an irrelevancy. From 1987-88 we have seen significant changes in the structure of the budget and in the accounting processes, whereby a greater level of funds are now passed through the Consolidated Account. This includes all Commonwealth funding which was previously outside the Consolidated Account.

There is now a much bigger cake, not a smaller slice for education expenditure. In fact, we have reached a record

\$873 million this year to be spent on education. There is also a record average recurrent expenditure amounting to \$4 391 per student, a 15 per cent increase in real terms since the last days of the Liberal Government in 1982. That is an increase of \$294 per student. So, the Leader of the Opposition's argument is based on fallacy and irrelevance.

Let us deal with some of his other claims. It is claimed that 850 teachers have been lost to the system since 1982. In fact, since 1983, the Government has retained 860 teachers whose positions have been freed up because of a decline in enrolments, due to the demographic make up of the South Australian population. It is estimated that by June 1990, the total number of teachers who have been freed up by reducing numbers of pupils but who have been retained within the education system will be 980. These teaching positions have been allocated in important areas such as improving the quality of education in the language teaching area and special education, and in science, technology, literacy and school counsellors at the primary school level. These facts contradict the claims of the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me turn to the important statistic of student/teacher ratios which is the real measure of the resources going to the education system. In 1982, after three years of Liberal Government, the ratio of students to teacher was 14.3 to one. In 1988, this ratio has been reduced to 13.2 students for every teacher. This is a reduction in this vital measure of 7 per cent over the six year period.

It means that more teachers are available for the education of our children in State schools. This Bannon budget also marks the first contribution to the landmark curriculum guarantee package, which now has agreement following a vote of teachers in our State schools. In the 1989-90 budget, \$6.6 million is provided for the first half of the 1990 school year. This amount is estimated to build up to about \$29 million per annum at the conclusion of the fourth year of the agreement. A total of \$54 million in extra funds will be provided for our State education system over the coming four years. This will take South Australia to the forefront in both educational excellence for our school students and in terms of teaching conditions.

Let us compare this with the situation under the New South Wales Liberal Government. Since the Liberal Party came to power in New South Wales, it has abolished 2 000 teaching positions, class sizes have increased and non-contact time has decreased. Before the recent election in Victoria, the Liberal Party stated very publicly that massive cuts would be made to education if it was elected. That statement made front page news in the *Melbourne Age*. More recently, just before the recent Victorian State budget, the Liberal Party stated that if elected, it would reduce teacher numbers in that State in proportion to the reduction in school enrolments. In short, these are the policies of the Liberal Party in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. That is why the Liberal Party in South Australia has opposed the curriculum guarantee and it is why the Legislative Council member, Mr Rob Lucas, who is the South Australian Liberal Party education spokesperson, implored teachers to reject the Government's proposed \$54 million curriculum guarantee package. The Liberal Party has other plans for education.

Teachers are advised to read between the lines when it comes to the Liberal Party's education agenda. The Leader of the Opposition has stated already that savings are to be made in education under his Government's agenda. The Liberal Party can mean only that education salary expenditure will be cut, because 84 per cent of the education budget in this State is spent on salaries. The community needs to

know where these cuts will be made. Will the Liberal Party cut the number of guidance officers, special education programs, school counsellors, advisers—where will those cuts be made? How will they be made and how would they affect teaching and conditions in South Australian schools for our children?

If one compares the situation with New South Wales, where it was teachers who went, the Liberal Party's priorities are clear: it has no fundamental commitment to a comprehensive public education system. The Bannon Government does have such a firm commitment to the continuation and development of quality public education, which guarantees to ordinary families that their children will receive quality teaching, relevant to the needs of the 1990s, equipping them with all the essential skills for the challenges ahead.

The curriculum guarantee is the most recent hard evidence of this Party's commitment. It tackles some of the long-standing difficulties in the education system, including compulsory country service. It also reflects our priorities for improving resources in primary schools, providing primary schools with specialist teachers or language teaching and one other specialist teacher of the school's choosing. It addresses the real concern of parents when children have more than one teacher during the school year; it reduces substantially the number of contract teachers in the system; and it increases the number of promotional positions in our schools.

The education budget, which will be debated in more detail in next week's Estimates Committee, is a budget of which we can be proud. It directs more spending per student into the State education system in line with this Government's priorities and in line with the priorities of the parents of students in our schools. I can say with confidence that this policy is in line with the views of parents of students in my electorate. I am proud of the work that the Minister and the department have done in relation to education.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): If one was a parent one would be asking whether it would be wise to trust one's daughter with this Government following the speech of the honourable member for Newland. Look at the promises made with regard to education; prior to the 1985 election, when Premier Bannon promised no cuts in teacher numbers, he said:

I can announce today that a State Labor Government will continue to retain teacher numbers in spite of decreasing student enrolments.

Members who have examined the budget papers for the past three years would have noticed that the budget papers clearly show that the Bannon Government has cut teacher numbers in our schools by 700.

Last year's four page summary of the education budget, released by the Liberal Party, showed that despite the fact that the Bannon Government promised to retain every one of the 180 freed-up teachers resulting from the enrolment decline, nevertheless, the number of teachers in South Australian schools in fact was cut by 180. Therefore, what the member for Newland is admitting here this afternoon is that, after the largest strike in South Australian education history, the Government has been shaken into making yet another series of promises which could prove to be just as specious as saying that it will retain the number of teachers in schools.

The Bannon Government has also claimed that it kept its promise of providing 400 extra ancillary staff in schools. Once again, I refer members to the budget papers, which show an increase of only 65 ancillary staff, not 400, in the

past three years up to 1988-89. Of course, the Government is appointing only part-time ancillary staff while it is cutting full-time ancillary staff from other areas. Despite the promises made a few moments ago by the member for Newland—reiterating promises made elsewhere—I still point out to her that groups of educationalists, such as teacher librarians and student counsellors, are still very uncertain as to their future under the new curriculum guarantees because there is no firm commitment that their positions will be retained within the primary and secondary spheres of the Education Department. So much for promises.

Meanwhile, the member for Newland almost seems to have a fixation with life in New South Wales and Victoria—where she would probably much prefer to live as would a lot of people who are now living under the present Labor Government in South Australia. The truth is that her concentration on life in New South Wales and Victoria has absolutely no relevance to South Australia. Of course, they tell us that the ALP in South Australia has no relevance to Federal Government policies. The Labor Party cannot have it both ways. Either it believes that South Australia is influenced by interstate Liberal Party policies and then, if so, the South Australian Labor Party is definitely strongly influenced by Federal Labor policies.

Of course, the truth is that the Liberal Leader—whose commitment the member for Newland chose to ignore a few minutes ago—only a couple of weeks ago, promised that in our first budget, that a Liberal Government will increase the number of teachers by 200 with a goal of increasing that number to 500 in our first term in office. With that increase in education resources, we would definitely be able to provide the curriculum guarantees which are still questionable under the present package offered to the teachers in South Australia by the Minister of Education and his new Director. So much for the arguments of the member for Newland, who seems to believe that life in other States is more relevant to South Australia than what is happening here.

I turn to the topic of HomeStart. The Minister again today tried to give everyone the impression that HomeStart was the best thing since sliced bread. As I said yesterday, we only have to look at the \$109 200 loan which is available to people on a \$39 000 income. If they repay the required amount of \$9 756 a year (\$813 a month), after four years they would not be close to meeting the interest which is accruing on that \$109 200 loan. So, after only four years, instead of \$109 200 they would owe an extra \$33 061. In other words, the capitalised original principal plus interest would be \$142 261. So, if in the fourth year the Government asked people to increase monthly or annual payments, they would have to find not \$813 but more than double that amount—\$1 778 a month—simply to meet the interest repayments, and they would still owe \$142 000 plus as the value of the home.

In four years that would mean that the value of houses in South Australia would have to have risen by 30.27 per cent for the mortgagee simply to maintain equity. That, of course, is an inflation rate of almost 8 per cent per annum for four years. As the member for Bragg said, what is really happening is that last year and this year home values in South Australia have actually declined and if high interest rates prevail they will decline again next year, so the equity promised by the Minister to these poor innocent mortgagees, accepting the bait of HomeStart, would have declined instead of appreciating—and there is the flaw.

It does not require excessively complicated mathematics to follow that argument. Anyone can do it in a matter of three or four minutes. There is absolutely no deception to

the mathematics and, as I said yesterday, they err on the conservative side, because I have simply taken an annual increment, whereas the banks increase the debt on a monthly basis. So, my figures are on the low rather than the high side. So much for the HomeStart commitment which the Minister says is wonderful for people on low incomes. In fact, after just a few years they would be faced with a far greater amount of principal to repay.

Of course, the Premier himself has admitted this. Mr Bannon, in the *News* of Tuesday 5 September in an article on page 2, states:

Borrowers should understand that, because of the outstanding loan balance being indexed to inflation, the amount owing would increase for a number of years before reducing.

The Premier's mathematics were very much at fault, because people would have to start repaying a massive sum—more than double the initial repayment—after four years simply to meet the interest. So, the whole story is definitely not being told to those borrowers who enter the HomeStart scheme. I suggest that the truth should be told before people are encouraged to enter that system. In fact, the poor people whom the Premier said were on only \$20 000 a year would be better off keeping their names on the Housing Trust list and paying the \$106 a week Housing Trust top rental rather than going into HomeStart and placing a huge millstone around their necks and those of their families, because they will never reduce the principal. Instead, it will keep running away and increasing. They will never begin to repay the principal of their debt.

The member for Light referred to police resources, saying that in South Australia police resources are inadequate. One question I would ask the Minister responsible for police services is whether he is being absolutely honest with regard to police numbers in South Australia. My information is that, instead of increasing, police numbers have in fact reduced, as the member for Light suspected, because police around the State are finding it harder and harder to allocate their resources to petty crimes that are committed and are having to concentrate on major crime. In other words, much crime goes unheeded, as the police just do not have time to begin to put detectives to work.

One possible answer is that the cadets in training in South Australia used to be regarded as a completely separate entity. The police numbers signified the fully trained officers. Now I understand from a reliable source that cadets are included in the gross number of police in the South Australian Police Force. They are not being gainfully employed under training, yet they are included in the number of police officers. That is a positive deception, yet nowhere have we heard the Minister acknowledge that. I would like some response during the budget Estimates Committees.

One only has to read the newspapers of the past few months to realise that in the Burnside area there were 28 break-ins within three or four weeks and, in Parkside, about 40 during that period. A close relative of mine had her home broken into twice within two weeks. The police have very little time to do much more than make a note of the offence. Ultimately, it was left to my relative and a neighbour to give a description of the offenders. They were apprehended at Holden Hill some several weeks later with no chance of recovery of the funds because, as the police said, most of the time these people who offend are drug addicts and are simply stealing to sell whatever they steal very cheaply in order to feed their habit. There is rarely recovery of the material stolen.

I would say, therefore, that the police are justified in complaining about resources. They simply do not have the staff to hand to resolve the major crimes, let alone start to look at minor crimes, which are increasingly prevalent in

South Australia. One does not have to do any more than read the local newspapers to discover that. Almost everyone in this House would have a close friend or acquaintance whose property has been burgled, with little or no recovery.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to refer to two matters in this grievance debate this afternoon: the first relates to the success of a sporting team in one of the high schools in my electorate, Mount Barker High School; and the second relates to my concern regarding matters pertaining to the St John Ambulance Service, particularly in relation to my electorate.

The Mount Barker High School senior girls basketball team has for the second year in succession become South Australian high school champion. It has again been invited to compete in the Australasian championships which will be held in Brisbane in December of this year. The Australian championships are considered by the Australian Basketball Federation to be a blue ribbon tournament on the junior basketball calendar. Mount Barker High School competed admirably at last year's championships in Wollongong, New South Wales. Regrettably, it narrowly missed a place in the grand final, but it is anticipated that this team, with the experience gained and the strengthening of the squad this year, will improve on last year's placing and, indeed, there is a positive attitude that this team could take out the honours this year.

To attend the championships in December involves considerable expense, and the cost is estimated to be about \$9 000. As a result of winning the State championships, the school was given \$200 toward expenses but, as far as raising the remainder of that sum, clearly, the students, the school and the parents of the students face quite a problem, because a considerable amount was required to attend the competition last year.

I bring this matter before the House this afternoon because of my concern about the need for funding and support for such activities. On behalf of Mount Barker High School and the parents of these schoolgirls, I made contact with Foundation South Australia to ascertain whether some assistance could be provided for the team, as I believe assistance should be provided. I have been told—and I am not in any way critical of the foundation or the people who are responsible for it, because they have set criteria to follow—that the foundation cannot assist because it is not able to provide financial assistance to individual schools. I accept that, but in this case it goes past the situation of an individual school—these girls have become South Australian champions and they are now representing South Australia in the Australasian championships.

As a result, I believe that it is only right that these young people should be given some form of assistance. The gentleman from the foundation with whom I spoke indicated that it would be appropriate for the school and parents to seek patronage from the people who live in the district and from business people. However, when one considers the high proportion of people in the work force who commute from Mount Barker to Adelaide, one realises that there is not a lot of scope for assistance from larger businesses.

I seek some form of assistance for those girls. I have contacted the Department of Recreation and Sport which, whilst it is very supportive, indicated that it is unable to support this team in a practical fashion. I do not believe it is appropriate that the parents should have to continue to fork out money in this way; some assistance should be

provided when one considers that these young people are representing this State in an Australasian championship.

In this House a week or so ago in response to a question by the Leader of the Opposition, who asked the Minister of Health to give a guarantee that he would use the considerable powers that he has under the Ambulances Services Act to ensure the continued participation of St John volunteers in the State's ambulance services and that these volunteers remain free of ambulance union control, the Minister stated:

If anyone was in any doubt as to this Government's commitment to the voluntary principle in the ambulance service, that would have been put completely to rest by the statements made by my predecessor as Minister of Health (the present Minister of Transport) during the dispute that occurred in the ambulance services some months ago.

He went on to indicate the support of the Government for volunteers in this most important service. That is all very admirable. In the Stirling district there is to be a substantial decrease in the available service. Presently, two professional crews provide coverage, 13 hours a day, five days a week, and it is proposed that one crew be rostered to Unley, leaving Stirling with only one eight hour shift. That shift will, presumably, be required to assist with the metropolitan work load. World-wide medical authorities suggest that ambulance response time should be six minutes or less and the metropolitan average response time is about that level.

It is impossible for Hills residents to receive this service, however, if the ambulance is despatched from the city or Mount Barker, if and when the Mount Barker service has a car available. Regrettably, statistics show that because Stirling is lumped in with the metropolitan division, it has the lowest work load of any metropolitan centre. That may be the case, but it does not remove the need for an ambulance service, particularly given the conditions in the Hills, that is, dangerous driving conditions and adverse weather, and the calls on St John as a result of accidents on the notorious Mount Barker Road between Crafers and Cross Roads.

My concern is that, not only is the service to be reduced but the paid staff and volunteers wrangle continues. It is well known that, because of the treatment handed out in some cases by paid staff, it is now extremely difficult to maintain volunteers within that service. I use this opportunity to bring my concern to the notice of the House, and I call upon the Minister of Health again to use his powers under the Ambulance Services Act to ensure the continued participation of St John volunteers in the State's ambulance service, and to ensure that both the volunteers and the paid staff can continue to work in harmony in this essential service for all South Australians.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): This afternoon I will briefly canvass the need for the substantial redevelopment of the Elizabeth Police Station and court complex. The Elizabeth Police Station and the associated Para Districts Court were constructed in the very late 1950s and early 1960s, and these buildings are now some 30 years old. While they were very advanced at the time they were built and provided adequate accommodation in those days, the reality is that they are now hopelessly inadequate for the task they have to perform. They are inadequate with respect to the facilities made available for employees and police officers, some of whose colleagues are required to work out of the station, separated from the main building and located in an adjacent Government office block over the road. That separation is

not conducive to good communication between officers and does nothing to enhance police work in the area.

The court complex is divided with one set of courts adjacent to the police station and cells and another set of courts on another site across a car park adjacent to the existing buildings. Of course, they are only temporary buildings that will not be adequate in the future. A substantial amount of money is to be spent on temporary renovations to the courtrooms. The existing arrangements mean that many young people who appear before the Juvenile Court are required to wait outside under the verandah in full view of the public. This is completely inappropriate and, in my view, is something that cannot be tolerated any longer.

The Government has responded to that by providing funds that will allow adequate extensions to be made so that the waiting room will be moved inside and additional facilities will be provided for the courtroom office staff. While these temporary improvements are welcome, they do not address the long-term redevelopment issues of this site. I believe that particular attention will need to be paid to the report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. While there has been no incident in that respect, we need to address the problems that could arise in the future if improvements are not made to the cell block.

I was very concerned to note that Legal Aid solicitors are required to consult with their clients while they remain in the exercise yard. This very much hampers the communication between lawyer and client. As staff cannot be made available to guard prisoners in any separate facility that could suffice as an interview room, solicitors are required to stand outside, often in the rain, in order to converse with their clients.

Mr Duigan: Like members of Parliament often have to do.

Mr M. J. EVANS: That could be the case. But in this instance I think we owe those people a little more duty of care to ensure that the facilities are brought up to standard before any tragic event occurs. What concerns me most is that the temporary improvements to the court facility give every appearance of being an isolated decision without adequate reflection on the improvements that will be needed in the adjacent police complex.

I believe that it is vital that the Courts Department and the police work together to redevelop this site rather than work in isolation. There can be no doubt that if the two departments proceed in isolation the end result will be far from satisfactory. I realise that the police and the Courts Department like to maintain a significant degree of separation for ethical and judicial reasons, and that is perfectly appropriate. However, in the case of regional police/court complexes I do not believe that it is either economic or safe to have that kind of separation in a physical sense. We cannot afford to have prisoners escorted by police officers across significant distances merely to maintain a physical separation between two sites. There is no reason why these sites cannot be developed as an integrated complex but in a way that emphasises the separation between the two arms of government—the Judiciary and Executive.

The Minister of Emergency Services, who is responsible for the police, and the Attorney-General, who is responsible for the courts, will, I hope, consult with each other and with their architectural and departmental advisers to ensure a future plan for this complex so that the police officers, court staff and redeveloped cells can operate on the one site. Further, I hope that the future development of that site is set down in the budget process for future years. The temporary improvements will assist us for the next 12 months to two years, but I believe the people of the northern

region—and I include in that not only the electorate I happen to represent but also the adjoining areas—will need to pay some attention to the Government's plans for this complex in the next 12 or so months.

This situation cannot be allowed to go on forever. I notice that the Port Adelaide Police Station is about to be redeveloped with an associated court complex. The Holden Hill redevelopment has already occurred. However, funds allocated in the budget do no more than provide temporary relief for the Para Districts Court and the Elizabeth Police Station. This needs to be remedied—not immediately because obviously funds are not available for it—and a joint plan needs to be set down so that the public and the employees—the police officers and court staff—can have adequate confidence in the future.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I should like to take this opportunity to raise two matters which are of particular concern to me. The first is the unfortunate habit of certain members opposite of getting up in this place and making accusations in relation to the so-called policies of the Federal Liberal/National Parties. What the member for Fisher said about it was nothing more than a diatribe of nonsense. He made allegations and assumptions about policy which did not have a figment of truth in them. It is obvious that he is devoid of anything constructive to raise in his electorate. If he is concerned about the welfare of his constituents and the rest of the citizens of this State and nation, he should know that the greatest attack which has ever been made on the underprivileged and on people trying to bring up families is the current economic policies of the Hawke Government.

The member for Fisher was obviously trying to drag a smokescreen across its bows, because 17 per cent interest for the average citizen for a house and up to 20 per cent on an overdraft is an outrage. That is causing the despair, the concern, the general dissatisfaction with the Government and the lack of confidence in members of Parliament.

As I have said before, the community's expectations have been unduly raised by people, such as the member for Fisher and others, who have raced around their electorates and the State making all sorts of promises and supporting causes which cannot be justified. Therefore, people have become very disillusioned with members of Parliament and have expressed their anger. The only response by the member for Fisher, for example, is to get up in the House and talk a lot of inaccurate, malicious nonsense.

The member for Fisher does not understand that this country requires successful people to get into Parliament to bring sound business practices into the administration of Parliament and the Government to ensure that there is sufficient money to meet the needs of the underprivileged and to provide the facilities and create the conditions in which people can obtain employment. During the greatest economic progress that this country has seen during the 1950s and 1960s—the Menzies/Playford era—people were encouraged. During those times people had adequate social security payments because they could be afforded by the community, inflation was kept in line, interest rates were kept down and people could afford to buy homes and raise families at a reasonable cost.

The second matter concerns my electorate. I again refer to the outrageous situation facing my constituents and others living at Mintabie. For too long these people have been the victims of Government inaction and bureaucracy and the manipulation of people in positions of power within the Aboriginal administration of those areas. It is a disgrace to all concerned that approximately 1 200 people currently

operate and live at Mintabie. Their future is threatened because of this inaction. The Government has built an excellent school at Mintabie, but if something is not done there will not be many people to use it. It is urgent that the fields be extended, that electricity be established and that commonsense should prevail.

There is grave dissatisfaction with the person chairing the Mintabie review. I do not like naming people, but he was named before a parliamentary committee. Whether this person is acting under direct ministerial instructions, I do not know but, if he is, I must make the strongest possible criticism of the Minister. At this stage the information that has been given to me and to my constituents indicates that, to date, the way that Mr Kaufmann has undertaken his responsibilities has been less than satisfactory. The people there are appalled at the treatment that they have been given. They are getting no responses. No propositions to solve their problems have been forthcoming. Surely, as members of Parliament and as South Australians we want to see the people there continue to mine, to spend money in South Australia, and to employ people, with a resultant increase in wealth for the benefit of all South Australians. To this date, nothing has happened.

I call on the Premier to act immediately to resolve this matter. We want action and we want the review completed in one month, with solutions put in place to rectify the matter. Most of us are reasonable people. I believe that I have been reasonable and that my constituents and the people in the Mintabie Progress Association have been more than reasonable. However, they are now absolutely sick and tired of what has transpired. They have been treated in a cavalier fashion and their wishes have been ignored. I want to know who has the ear of the Minister. I want to know whose views have given preference over those of the local residents.

It is to the benefit of all the local Aboriginal communities to have these problems rectified and the suggestion I have put forward implemented forthwith. An incoming Liberal Government will tackle and solve these problems. We have discussed them at length, and commonsense must prevail. It is a disgrace that all the decisions affecting the lands are being made in Alice Springs. As I have said before, there is this woman lawyer up there who has caused havoc. The thing that concerns me is that the Aboriginal communities are missing out. I believe that the power should be put back in the hands of the local Aboriginal communities. They are the ones in trouble.

What has happened in relation to this matter is disgraceful. What I have had to say so far is nothing to what I will say in the next few weeks if something is not done in this regard. I am sick and tired of this nonsense going on. I call on the Minister and on all those responsible for the administration of the Mintabie review and the other agencies involved to get off their backsides and fix the problems, and to do it quickly. The people up there have had it right up to the neck. They have been ignored and treated with contempt. It is time that this nonsense stopped. These are fairly harsh criticisms, but this is nothing to what I could say in relation to these matters.

The final matter to which I want to refer relates to my concern about the difficulties being perceived by many people involved in education in country areas at the moment. In my recent travels around my electorate I have been concerned about the number of people who have expressed concern to me—and particularly the principals—about the effects of the new education arrangements in South Australia. They are concerned about having less time to supervise and to attend to the administration and general running

of the schools. The time currently available for administration will be drastically cut back. We all realise that there has been a reduction in the number of people attending schools and that a static number of teachers has been maintained. However, it is essential that teachers be maintained in the small country schools such as those at Yunta and Cockburn.

It is absolutely essential that those schools have a minimum of two teachers. The suggestion put forward that Yunta should have 1.4 teachers is a nonsense of the highest order: from where would one get .4 of a teacher for Yunta, anyway? This really is a reflection on the communities concerned. These communities are entitled not only to adequate education but to equal access to education facilities. Some 30 per cent of the State budget resources goes on education, and these communities are entitled to a reasonable amount of those funds to ensure that children are provided with the best possible education opportunities.

The itinerant teachers who operate at Tarcoola are doing an excellent job. They are well supported by the excellent correspondence school that we have in South Australia; it is probably second to none in the world. It provides excellent facilities. Those little schools which give those outlying students the opportunity to have some classroom experience play a very important role in providing education and a vital role in those local communities. Once you lose a school, you lose a great deal of character and a focal point in those local communities.

Far too many people have left country areas. It is the role of Government to redress that particular matter and to see that country people get equal access to Government facilities, and a fair go. They are not asking for anything special; they just want a fair go. That is all they want. I hope the Minister of Education and his officers will give careful consideration to my comments and make sure these people are not disadvantaged. In the time I have been in Parliament I have been concerned to see that everyone gets an equal go for education.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I take umbrage at the remarks made by the Minister of State Development and Technology in answering questions we have been putting to him in relation to the Marineland redevelopment and in particular the amount of money that has been allocated for it in the budget. The Minister said yesterday that I was destabilising any attempt at redevelopment on the Marineland site and accused me of being hellbent for the past nine months on ensuring that everything possible is done to make this project not succeed. He said:

Finally, he has to bear the blame for any decisions made that do not give success to this project.

That is the first admission by the Government and the Minister that perhaps there is something questionable about this project and this particular development when the Minister is making a statement that someone is going to have to take the blame for any decisions that do not give success to the project.

The Minister has been very clumsy in handling this project and this particular development—he and his department. The head of that department, Mr Hartley, has now left, and there is probably a damn good reason why he left and did not seek renewal of his contract. Eccles and other persons employed in that department have a lot to answer for, and I believe only a parliamentary Public Accounts Committee inquiry or a royal commission of some kind, certainly some investigation into this whole issue, will bring out what really transpired. I am firmly of the belief that there was a conspiracy to get rid of Tribond Developments,

the company that was enticed to come from Victoria to develop this project.

I also believe that the Premier is up to his ears in it, that he knew when the West Beach Trust sought the Government's approval for Tribond or any developer of the new Marineland complex to take dolphins from the sea that within weeks of making that decision a resolution would be put to the ALP conference and passed. The Government very cleverly hid from the developers who were coming from Victoria the real facts of what had happened—and from then on the issues became very murky—as one senior Government person said to me, 'very smoky indeed'.

There is a lot to be answered for at all levels of government. One comment the Minister made in his answer yesterday when he was quoting a minute from his department in reply to a request from the Auditor-General was as follows:

The comment in your covering minute is perhaps a reasonable case—this is with respect to the engineering assessment—with the benefit of hindsight. However, at the time the existing facilities were only required for a relatively short time prior to demolition to make way for the new development.

That is wrong because the proposal all along was to partially develop the Marineland complex and operate the remaining portion to ensure that there would be a continuous cash flow. Never at any stage was the whole complex to be closed. Never at any stage was it proposed by Tribond that there would be total closure and redevelopment. That was not possible, because the dolphins and sea lions had to be kept in some facility whilst building was going on. The minute continues:

Marineland had been operating for some time and with the temporary improvements proposed it was considered Tribond had a reasonable prospect of trading to break even during the redevelopment stage. You should also note that Tribond itself made the decision to close the facility to the public essentially on commercial grounds.

Tribond closed because it could not get public liability insurance. West Beach Trust must surely have known that there would have been difficulty in obtaining that insurance because of the disgraceful condition of those premises.

I believe there were reports from Sacon over the years condemning the structure that housed the main Marineland building, and certainly the level of asbestos that was in there. The decision to close was forced upon Tribond. It was not a decision it wanted to take: it simply could not get insurance. The Department of State Development and Technology did not want to help Tribond nor did it take the opportunity to make representations to the State Government Insurance Commission because, after all, surely that organisation could have carried the risk in the interests of the State.

Then we come to the stupid comments made by the department and those falsely made by the Auditor-General. Many people, including the Auditor-General, have been misled on this issue, where the attendance figures that were provided could not have been possible. Perhaps 250 000 people could have visited that place. The Tourism Department was called upon to give advice. However, that department had not recommended people to visit Marineland in the last few years of its operation, so how could it be in a position to advise anyone just how many people would visit that complex? Nobody was going down to visit the old Marineland, not even school groups.

The figures were based on the Atlantis Marine Park in Western Australia, and it was conservatively estimated that because 350 000 people visited the Adelaide Zoo each year (and that has been the case for a number of years), it was considered that that number would visit the new Marineland complex. It would be a totally different operation,

bearing in mind that the present complex seats only 750, whereas the proposed complex would seat 3 500 and have an entirely different format which would be much more entertaining, including high divers, etc. Therefore, there would be a greater attraction to the people of South Australia and to tourists.

That is why the West Beach Trust wanted Marineland initially, to bring tourists to the area, to back up the caravan park, the villas and the on-site vans. The Department of State Development and Technology got it wrong. The Auditor-General was obviously misinformed, and if a little more work had been done on those figures, they would have found that the new proposal was viable. Further, six or seven plans were submitted on behalf of Zhen Yun to the Department of State Development and Technology which anticipated expenditure of between \$15 million and \$20 million on the new complex.

Again, the Minister has failed to advise the department or the people of South Australia of what was really going on. I do not think that anyone in the department knew of what was going on either. It is time the Minister got his act together, and I am glad to see him in the Chamber, because he has some people on his staff who ought to be booted out. There is one person there by the name of Kevin Foley who does not hesitate in putting a bit of pressure on a few people around the place. He insults them and abuses them.

The Friends of the Dolphins have been subjected to abuse from this character, and certain sections of the media have been abused because they attempt to write stories and ask questions about this Marineland redevelopment. It is the sort of behaviour I would not tolerate from any public servant, let alone a ministerial assistant. I believe that he is the ALP candidate for Semaphore, and I hope that people will wake up to the fact that he is not worthy of any support whatsoever, so good luck to Norm Peterson. We do not want people like this Foley character in Parliament who want to stand over and mislead people.

This whole issue is a sad and sorry mess. We have the Minister claiming credit for bringing in the Zhen Yun organisation. He never got them at all. They were introduced to Tribond by Mr Peter Allen from Hong Kong. The stories we read in the media that the Minister brought them in are not correct.

Many questions still have to be answered. We all want to know how the West Beach Trust obtained \$550 000 and the composition of that amount. Has it been paid for something it sold and has it been paid for selling part of that facility? When it sold Marineland for \$66 000, the developers were then told, 'Don't forget that there is another \$240 000 for the water filtration plant and tanks', so that was well handled by Virgo and Haslam. It is no wonder that Haslam got the big flick. A financial arrangement was made whereby Tribond was to pay for this filtration plant, and we believe that some moneys were paid and that the West Beach Trust was then compensated for the full amount, so many questions still have to be answered.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): One of the inter-church councils of the Anglican Church invited me to bring to the attention of the House a matter of concern to it relating to the provision of paediatric cardiac surgery at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. It also raised travel expense assistance to parents of country children who have to come to Adelaide, or for families who have to accompany their children interstate.

Apparently, the State does not provide paediatric cardiac surgery of a complex nature here in South Australia, and this means that it is necessary for children to go interstate.

The problem is that children of that age have to be accompanied by a parent or parents. The inter-church council received a letter from the Adelaide Children's Hospital. The first part of the letter thanks the inter-church council for the money it has raised and the second part sets out the problems. The letter, which was addressed to the Glenelg and District Inter-church Council, refers to a sum of money that was collected and then states:

... this amount was forwarded to a mother who was on her own in Melbourne with her 12 month old son for major heart surgery. The family are from Port Augusta and incurred high expenses travelling to and from the ACH for regular monitoring before the decision was taken to refer to Melbourne.

There is then further thanks for another sum of money, and the letter continues:

... earlier this year the ACH had to send a child to Melbourne where no option was offered this baby except transplant.

Of course, that was not available in South Australia. I must explain that this letter was written by the Cardiology Social Worker at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. It continues:

There have been some developments and changes in the travel scheme administered by the South Australian Health Commission. Whereas previously, the SAHC reimbursed the cost of father's travel and covered the cost of accommodation, now, since 1 July, only one parent's accommodation fee is met, and if both parents choose to go, the father (or one parent) must pay his own way.

If a child requires a medical escort, then both parents must pay their own way.

Further, accommodation for one parent is met only for \$30 per night, incurring a shortfall of \$26 per night—costs that the parent must pay.

If a parent looks for cheaper accommodation, the distance from the Royal Children's Hospital [which is in Melbourne] increases.

Naturally a parent will be spending until late at night at the hospital with a child and to contemplate a journey 'home' at midnight, of a great distance, with no transport, is highly undesirable not to mention dangerous.

This will of course disadvantage our parents of children with heart conditions since no paediatric cardiac surgery of a complex nature is undertaken in South Australia. It also places quality medical care into the realm of only those persons to whom money is no object.

The ACH have written to the Health Commission making a strong case of support for both parents to be sent with a child, but as yet we have had no answer.

It has also happened that parents in a time of crisis at diagnosis make wild financial commitments to pay, that they have in reality, no means of meeting.

This is a terrible state of affairs and should be a community/Government responsibility, not rest on the shoulders of grief-stricken parents whose first priority is the well being of a sick child.

The letter is signed by the cardiology social worker. This letter raises two questions; first, the need for child cardiac surgery of a complex nature to be established in Adelaide. To be quite frank, I have not been briefed on the level to which cardiac surgery is performed on children. However, a member of the Inter-Church Council has told me that it does not happen in this State and that the Adelaide Children's Hospital feels that there should be more encouragement to get a cardiac unit operational. I know that that would be extremely expensive, but I am sure that if the Health Commission and the Government can see their way clear to encouraging that department and providing funding, it would be a great asset to medicine in South Australia.

Secondly, the letter addresses the question of assistance to parents who must travel interstate. It is a very traumatic time for parents from both Adelaide and the country who must take their children to Melbourne for surgery. We are talking about a life and death situation, where young children are having major heart surgery. I do not see any problems with requesting the Government at least to assist and make sure that parents can accompany those children when necessary. Quite clearly, means testing is available,

but it looks very much as though the Government and the Health Commission are relying on organisations, such as the Inter-Church Council of the Anglican Church, to provide funding to enable parents to accompany their children.

I applaud the work of the Inter-Church Council. It has raised thousands of dollars collectively for good causes and in the course of this particular exercise \$200 or \$300 dollars has been raised by a small committee to enable parents to travel to Melbourne to be present when the operations take place. It is a very traumatic time in the life of their family. It is a very worthy cause, one in which the Government of this State should be involved. I ask the Health Commission and the Government to review the previous decision and make every effort to see that parents travelling interstate can receive some financial support and, in addition, to do whatever is necessary to establish a paediatric cardiac surgery unit in metropolitan Adelaide so that one day we will have a situation in which parents do not have to take their children interstate for such operations.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): First, to raise a matter that came to light this afternoon in this Chamber when the Minister for Environment and Planning—who is also the Minister for Water Resources—admitted to the Parliament that she had asked her officers to instruct prosecuting counsel to withdraw charges against 15 people, when those charges were already before the court. It is one of the most serious offences that a Minister could have committed against our system. It is the type of thing for which people who live in Queensland have been condemned. Anyone who takes such action should be condemned. The only way that our system can work is for the Parliament to make the laws, the police or inspectors—where they are authorised—to attempt to enforce the law; and the courts interpret it.

In this case the National Parks and Wildlife Service did what it believed was correct under the law and laid charges against 15 people over an incident at Bool Lagoon. The matters came before the court and a Minister of the Crown, on her own admission, without legal advice—and it is apparent without going to Cabinet (and if the matter had gone before Cabinet it would be even more serious)—instructed the prosecutor to withdraw those charges.

Such action places the whole concept of our law in doubt. Is it correct that a friend of a Minister or the Government can have charges withdrawn even when the matter is before a court? Is that the stage we have reached as a State? Who would have even dreamt that a Minister would carry out such a wicked action against the system, without any legal advice at all? She decided that, if these charges went ahead against the 15 people, they might achieve some stature in society as being a stirring mob. I do not know all the names of those people. I do not wish to, really, but in all probability some of them would already be recognised as the regular stirrers on such issues.

So it appears that if people break the law and they want to gain a little bit of prominence in society, and if they make that obvious, either before or after breaking the law, this Government will have the charges withdrawn. Those people would not have to live with the fear of the law of paying a penalty or of answering the charge. I am not sure whether or not they were guilty. That is not my job; it is the court's job. It is not the job of the Minister for Environment and Planning. Her job is to make sure that the law is enforced, and to back the prosecuting counsel in ensuring that people face the charges; and the court decides whether or not they are guilty. It may be that none of those people were guilty, but it may also be that they were all guilty—or at least some of them were guilty.

Is this part of the reason why our police force, for example, has lost confidence in the system? Are there other occasions on which this has occurred before matters have got to court; have people been apprehended and then rigged the system by having the matter pulled out by someone they know? That has been highlighted in other States. Are there other areas that have been covered up?

Many members of this House over the years would have been booked at times for speeding or for some other traffic offence. I know that I have and I have paid the price, as has any other citizen. I would not even make the approach to have the charge withdrawn, except if it occurred in front of this place and an inspector mistakenly placed a parking ticket on my car when I had the right to park there. But what do the National Parks and Wildlife inspectors think? Do they ask, 'Is this person likely to be looking for a bit of notoriety?' and therefore not go ahead with the charge?

What about the poor citizen in Hawthorndene who was dive-bombed by a National Parks and Wildlife Service aeroplane, the pilot of which was acting like a kamikaze pilot? In a remote area of the national park in the middle of winter, the plane swooped on that person at a very low level, dropping off a message to say, 'You have gone past the sign that says "national park" and you haven't got a \$40 permit.' There is nothing on the sign to advise that people must have a \$40 permit to go into the area. The plane came back in a second swoop and dropped off a map and a message saying, 'You can't go through this way—go back and round the other way. If you don't front up and pay the \$40 fee within a certain time, you will face a \$1 000 fine, because we have a photograph of your registration number.'

This person has to pay the penalty, but 15 others who broke the law at Bool Lagoon did not. Either they are Left Wing friends of the Minister or for some political purpose the Minister pulled the charges while they were before the court. Who can trust the system? It is one of the most disgraceful things—

Mr Tyler: Get out!

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Fisher says 'Get out!' A man is supposed to believe that he faces the law if charged, but a Minister of the Crown can just pull the charge. There was no legal advice or consultation with Crown Law or with the person who was before the court. The prosecutor was just told to pull it. If the member for Fisher believes in that, all I can say is that I would like to see what he or his colleagues would do if I or anyone from this side were the Minister and took that action; I would like to hear how he or his mates on that side of politics would squeal.

I would like to see them tramping up and down the corridors of this place to get to the media to say, 'This is one of the most wicked things that has ever happened.' And that is what it is. I repeat: this Parliament makes the laws; inspectors and the police attempt to enforce the law on the basis that the court will interpret the law and apply the penalty. Once Ministers start to interpret the law and apply the penalties, the whole system is put at risk. I hope that the Minister will make a public apology on this issue.

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report, by Tuesday 26 September, in accordance with the timetable as follows:

Estimates Committee A

Tuesday 12 September, at 11 a.m.

Premier, Treasurer, Legislature

Legislative Council
House of Assembly
Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works
Joint Parliamentary Service
State Governor's Establishment
Premier and Cabinet
Office of the Government Management Board
Premier, Miscellaneous
Treasury
Treasurer, Miscellaneous
*Treasury Department

Wednesday 13 September, at 11 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Minister of Health, Minister of Community Welfare, Minister for the Aged

South Australian Health Commission
*South Australian Health Commission
Community Welfare

Thursday 14 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Education, Minister of Children's Services

Education
*Education Department
Minister of Education, Miscellaneous
Children's Services Office
*Children's Services Office

Friday 15 September, at 9.30 a.m.

Attorney-General, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Corporate Affairs

Attorney-General's
*Attorney-General's Department
Court Services
*Court Services Department
Electoral
Attorney-General, Miscellaneous
Corporate Affairs Commission
*Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission
Public and Consumer Affairs

Tuesday 19 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs

Housing and Construction
*Department of Housing and Construction
Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of Public Works and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous

Wednesday 20 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of State Development and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Ethnic Affairs

State Development and Technology
Minister of State Development and Technology, Miscellaneous
*Department of State Development and Technology
*Technology Development Corporation

Agriculture
Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous
*Department of Agriculture
Fisheries
*Department of Fisheries
Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Thursday 21 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Emergency Services, Minister of Mines and Energy, Minister of Forests

Police
*Police Department
Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous
*Country Fire Services Board
Mines and Energy
*Department of Mines and Energy
*Office of Energy Planning
Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous

*Works and Services (Payments of a capital nature)

Estimates Committee B

Tuesday 12 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Recreation and Sport

Employment and Technical and Further Education
*Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education
Office of Tertiary Education
*Office of Tertiary Education
Recreation and Sport
*Department of Recreation and Sport

Wednesday 13 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Labour, Minister of Marine, Chief Secretary

Labour
Personnel and Industrial Relations
*Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations
Minister of Labour, Miscellaneous
Marine and Harbors
Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous
*Department of Marine and Harbors
Auditor-General's

Thursday 14 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Tourism, Minister of State Services

Tourism South Australia
Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous
*Adelaide Convention Centre
State Services
Minister of State Services, Miscellaneous
*State Services Department

Tuesday 19 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Transport, Minister of Correctional Services, Minister Assisting the Treasurer

Transport
*Department of Transport
Highways
*Highways Department
State Transport Authority
Correctional Services

Wednesday 20 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation

Environment and Planning

Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous

*Department of Environment and Planning

Engineering and Water Supply

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous

*Engineering and Water Supply Department

*South-Eastern Drainage Board

Lands

Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous

*Department of Lands

Thursday 21 September, at 11 a.m.

Minister of Local Government, Minister for the Arts

Local Government

*Department of Local Government

Arts

*Department for the Arts

*Works and Services (Payments of a capital nature)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am quite prepared to second the motion, but I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the present Ministry to a problem. If during the Estimates Committees undertakings are given by the Ministry to provide answers to questions that cannot be answered on the day and if that information by arrangement is provided to *Hansard* no later than two weeks after the end of the Estimates Committees (and according to an arrangement which existed last year information was circulated to members so they were aware of the answers as soon as they were available) all will be well.

I refer to the circumstance which arose last year where in many cases Ministers did not answer, or did not provide answers to *Hansard*. The *Hansard* volume in which those answers were recorded appeared some five months after the Estimates Committees sat. It was only after a number of Ministers were personally questioned about the answers relating to the promises given on the floor of the Estimates Committees that members were accorded an answer. For many years now Parliament has accepted the fact that Estimates Committees are an integral and vital part of the consideration of the budget. Many of the Ministers and Ministers' staff have complied with the requests that have been made and the fulfilment to members of the Estimates Committees have been forthcoming.

However, last year was a debacle in a number of vital areas and I suggest it is not good enough. It is a reflection on some departments' attitudes to the Parliament—and I go as strongly as that. In giving support to the creation of the Estimates Committees, I trust that somebody in Government will take on the responsibility of making sure that feedback, which is essential, is forthcoming, and without undue delay.

I would accept, and I am sure other members would accept, an answer from a department on the understanding that the Minister had, in error, indicated that information could be made available in a short time. A department could indicate that information was being sought or research had been undertaken and, at a later stage, an answer would be provided. That, at least, is an answer. However, a white-wash of the promises made by Ministers or their officers is a slight, not only against the member who asked the question, but also against the whole parliamentary system. I

point no bones at individuals. When it was drawn to their attention last year that information had not been forthcoming, several Ministers wrote letters to members, providing the facts and apologising profusely and saying that it had been a misunderstanding in their departments. So be it, but at least let us say here and now that we have highlighted a problem in advance of the Estimates Committees and that we trust that, in the best interests of the parliamentary system, information will be distributed as promised.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): As one of the Ministers on the front bench at the moment I take note of the comments of the member for Light and I assure him that, for my part and that of my colleagues, every endeavour will be made to expedite the replies getting into *Hansard*. I know how important it is. I recall that, in 1980 when I was in Opposition on one of the Estimates Committees which met in September, I did not get answers back until June 1981. I know how considerably inconvenient it was to me at the time, so I understand the point that is being made. Certainly, we will all endeavour to do our best to provide early replies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: When an undertaking was not complied with, I, as Chairman of Committee A, wrote to the Ministers who did not provide answers. All the answers were eventually provided but I agree with the member for Light: some of them were very late.

Motion carried.

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Mr S.J. Baker, the Hon. J. Cashmore, Ms Gayler, Messrs Hamilton, Kenelley, Olsen and Rann.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs De Laine, Duigan, S.G. Evans, Ingerson, McRae, Meier and Tyler.

Motion carried.

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS ACT

A message was received from the Legislative Council intimating that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARINELAND

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In Parliament yesterday the member for Hanson asked a question which suggested that the operators of Tribond were misled into becoming involved in Marineland, suggesting the company was not aware of the deterioration of the buildings. This is not the case. In fact, a letter from Mr Rod Abel to the current West Beach Trust Chairman, Mr Geoff Virgo, dated 6 January 1986, makes it clear that they were interested in developing a multi-million dollar facility, following an inspection of the site by Mr Rodney Abel.

In other words, they understood major expenditure was required to develop an international standard facility. This letter was written after Mr Abel had not only made a personal inspection of the Marineland facility but also had been given complete and free access to all the financial records including costs, revenue and attendance. The Chair-

man of the trust had personally shown Mr Abel the site and today he confirmed that he had pointed out the facility's disrepair during their inspection. Despite the obvious problems, Mr Abel's letter says, in part:

I have studied much of the recent information and various reports, and am pleased to advise that my first impressions regarding the potential of redeveloping the Marineland facility to international standard, remain undiminished.

Clearly Mr Abel thought there were problems but he felt they could be overcome.

The member also claimed a contradiction between evidence given to the Industries Development Committee and an answer I gave in a statement responding to a series of questions on the issue. Before dealing with this matter, I note that the member for Hanson's quoting of submissions to the IDC is yet again evidence of the Opposition's cavalier and would-be destructive attitude to evidence given to the committee; I know this is causing great concern to many in the business community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I suggest that you talk to the people in the business community. The point is that this relates to a matter which is of historical importance only—and that is whether it was Mr Abel who approached the trust or the trust who approached Mr Abel about the possible redevelopment of Marineland. Any investor considering a project of the size that was proposed for this one would be nonetheless thorough in assessing the state of assets, the potential of the project and other conditions applying in either circumstance of initiating the approach or having been approached.

In evidence to the IDC a report from the Department of State Development and Technology says:

Following an evaluation of the options Mr Porter made approaches to Mr Abel, a developer of oceanaria facilities, with a view to becoming involved in a major redevelopment of Marineland. During the course of discussions Mr Porter died which caused some considerable delay. Discussions were recommenced in 1986 by Mr Joe Haslam the newly appointed General Manager of the West Beach Trust.

It is difficult to check the veracity of this statement because of the unfortunate passing of Mr Porter but, on the basis of information before me now, the words 'made approaches' appears to have overstated the level of discussions involving the two men. In any event, the statement indicates that any approaches were by Mr Porter and not the West Beach Trust in a formal sense.

It has also not been possible to verify the contact between Mr Haslam and Mr Abel as the former has left the West Beach Trust. In any event, Mr Abel's letter is dated 6 January 1986, the third working day of that year, and refers to his 'recent visit', clearly before Mr Haslam might have become involved in discussions.

Mr Porter and Mr Abel were both sitting on the national committee examining marine parks. It is possible that Mr Porter raised the matter of Marineland. This does not constitute a formal approach. He most likely was sounding out Mr Abel about his interest. We will never know for certain. I am assured by the current Chairman, who was appointed in early 1984, well before these events took place, that since his appointment there had never been a formal approach to or from either party until after Mr Abel made contact with Mr Virgo after Mr Porter's death in December 1985.

In an answer to a question on this matter and which was supplied to the media it was stated that:

We are advised that it was Mr Rod Abel who first approached the current Chairman of the trust.

That statement made by me, I am advised by the Chairman, is correct. Mr Rod Abel contacted the Chairman soon after Mr Porter's death to express his condolences and to inquire

about the future of Marineland. Mr Abel asked whether the trust would consider leasing the facility to developers and was told that that would be considered. Subsequently, Mr Abel travelled from Melbourne to look at the site and initiated formal discussions on the matter after writing the letter which I mentioned earlier. I repeat that I am advised that, as stated in the written answer supplied on 3 August, the first contact made with the current Chairman was when Mr Abel called him. There had never been a formal approach to the trust before that. It is again unfortunate that the House's time need be taken up by the need to clarify such an issue which has no relevance to the current debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): In private members time this morning, I commenced to lodge a complaint on behalf of the Housing Trust tenants in the South-East of South Australia. In view of the fact that it may be several weeks before this matter can be resumed, I believe it is appropriate that I continue some of my remarks by way of grievance this evening. This morning, I mentioned that in 1987 the General Manager of the Housing Trust and the Minister had enacted a policy regarding home heating. The three salient points were: first, where a trust home is vacated and the room heater has reached the end of its economical life, and is beyond repair, it would be removed; secondly, if a vacant home has an unsafe open fireplace as opposed to a heater, the Housing Trust would seal off the fireplace and render the chimney unusable because of the potential danger; thirdly, for existing tenants of trust homes heaters would be repaired, but only if it was economical to do so. If the cost of the repair was more than 50 per cent of the value of the replacement, tenants were advised that the trust would no longer maintain the heater and it would be removed as a matter of urgency.

In March of this year—winter being imminent—the member for Victoria and I received repeated complaints about the quality, inadequacy or lack of home heating in trust homes. As a result, we complained to the Minister who in turn, rather than taking immediate action to remedy the situation, appointed a committee of inquiry—yet another Government committee of inquiry. By means of appointing the committee, any action to repair and maintain defective trust home heaters and fireplaces has been stalled right through winter. The first day of spring has already passed, so the crisis in the past six months has not been averted but at least avoided as far as the Minister is concerned. The committee still has to report.

In March of this year I decided that I would publicly release in the South-East of South Australia the Minister's 1987 policy. I paid the Housing Trust the courtesy of first saying that I would make that press release. I advised the trust of the conditions which I have just put before the House. Almost immediately, the General Manager of the Housing Trust visited Mount Gambier and made a press release, which I assume may in part have been an attempt to pre-empt anything that I would say but, at the same time, reassuring Housing Trust tenants in the South-East. Among other things this is what the General Manager stated:

No Housing Trust tenant in the South-East need be concerned about the possibility of heating in their homes being removed. Mr Edwards added. The only properties without heating would

be new dwellings and properties which were vacated and subsequently found to have defective heaters.

That is all well and good: I accepted that because it was an assurance that my tenants in the South-East would be looked after during winter. As I said previously, I have absolute faith in the Housing Trust representatives in the South-East who have performed remarkably well in the face of financial constraint. However, on 1 August 1989 another press release in the South-East stated:

The present trust policy provides that, where heating is available, the trust will repair existing heaters unless repair costs exceed 50 per cent of replacement.

In other words, we are back to the 1987 policy and we are contradicting the 22 March statement that was made by the General Manager of the trust. So, tenants in the South-East were confused.

Personally, I can understand why they would have preferred to retain their wood burning fire appliances because pine off-cuts have been available, at least to mill employees in the South-East. Anyone who drives around the South-East will realise that right throughout the district there is an almost endless supply of free dead hardwood—no one has to pull down growing trees—for those with the permission of property owners to scavenge that retrievable timber. In other words, there is a plentiful and cheap supply of firewood in the South-East particularly for those on low incomes, who choose to go around with a trailer and a chainsaw or handsaw and bring the timber home. Those other parts of South Australia may need other power resources in order to adequately heat their homes. The Katnook gas discovery in the South-East may result in gas becoming plentiful, and that may be a reasonably priced source of fuel. But, until that resource is proved up and made available to those living in the South-East, it cannot be supplied to Housing Trust homes.

People living in the South-East endure bitterly cold winters—almost as cold as the winters in Stirling and other such places in the high parts of the Adelaide Hills, although the South-East is not as wet as Stirling. The South-East is cold and damp and for that reason the Minister should give special attention to providing heating to trust homes. My electorate is right in the track of the prevailing winter westerlies.

Referring this matter to a committee means that the problem will not be resolved for a whole year; and this committee is inquiring into trust home problems for the whole State when only those in the lower South-East were complaining. I protested about the matter going to a committee and said that the Minister should have taken immediate action to ensure that South-East tenants were properly looked after. After all, the top rent is well over \$100 a week, and rents will increase. The poorest tenants are the worst affected: they have no spare funds, and their homes are wet and cold. If anyone doubts that I point out that since 1948, when the first trust homes were built in the South-East, a number proved to be 'lemons' (and I take that term from the automotive industry). Those trust homes may have been built on excessively wet ground and been poorly ventilated, but the truth is that a number of them have had a high incidence of tenancy turnover because people refuse to stay in them.

These older trust homes have damp walls and, as a result, many have black mould almost constantly on their walls during winter. The Minister said that the best thing trust tenants could do was to open the windows and let in the fresh air, because that would keep the mould down. I suggest that that would be an act of folly. One is trying to heat the house and keep the family warm, yet the Minister and his minions suggest opening the windows and doors and letting

the draught sweep through. That is hardly an appropriate solution—freezing the people of the South-East. It is like asking Eskimos to stay out in the open instead of building an igloo.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not think that members opposite heard. The Minister suggested that the windows be left open on a permanent basis when one is trying to heat one's house in order to keep warm.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not follow the Minister's rationale any more than I follow the interjections. If members opposite are not sympathetic to Housing Trust tenants in the South-East I ask them to say so, so that I can carry on with this debate in the minute I have left. In the case of a few homes, we need a drastic solution, and quickly. The commitment by the General Manager of the Housing Trust in March this year was not dependent on the findings of a committee. It was clear, unqualified and unequivocal. He said that Housing Trust tenants would be looked after and only the tenants of brand new homes needed to be worried. The number of complaints which have continued through the winter clearly demonstrate that that commitment has not been fully met. For that reason, once again, on behalf of South Australian Housing Trust tenants, I ask for help.

Mr RANN (Briggs): First, I should like to talk about the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. He was very proud of himself with that speech. Anyone who saw him prancing around last night would know it. It was two hours long—almost a record for a speech by a Leader of the Opposition in this State. We knew that he wanted somehow, somewhere to make the history books, but it was a case of 'Never mind the quality, feel the width.' It was supposed to inspire the troops. It was supposed to be a rallying cry. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the members for Mitcham and for Victoria showed their enthusiasm, or loyalty, by falling asleep for the greater part of the speech by the Leader of the Opposition.

I feel sorry for the Leader of the Opposition—and that might surprise people—because he and members opposite know in their hearts that they are going to lose. We shall see a few tricks. I remember last year after the Estimates Committees. On Estimates Committee A, when considering the Premier's budget lines, Government members decided to help the Opposition. We felt that they needed help and, with the concurrence of the Premier, we asked only one question each session rather than three. The Leader of the Opposition had 280 questions compared with about 45 on the Government side. However, he called a press conference to denounce the Government for preventing him during those 12 hours from asking the questions that he really wanted to ask. The simple fact is that he could not land a blow. Putting the Leader of the Opposition against the Premier is like putting Sonny Liston up against Mike Tyson—and Sonny Liston is dead.

There has been an enormous carry on in the last few days about the past. I am not sure what is going on, but every speech and every reference goes back to 1982. The Liberals are in a time warp. They are mesmerised by the past. One can hardly think that the Liberal Party's slogan at the election will be 'Into the past with Olsen' or 'Looking back with Olsen'. One can only assume that they know that their number is up. They are trying to tell their side of the story about their pathetic time in this Parliament and in Government before the balloon goes up. It is an attempt to try to put their side of the record. They make two-hour speeches

and so forth—their swan songs, and we all know it. The simple fact is that businessmen and swinging voters in marginal seats all say the same thing: they cannot do it with Olsen; he just has not got it. He is the Chauncy Gardener of South Australian politics and 'being there' will be a factor of the past.

This dwelling on history, this anxiety about rewriting history, is an interesting psychology. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in particular, seems to be in a time warp. He is in a political Tardis that has jammed on June 1982. That was obviously his finest hour—the Roxby debate. In the past few days we have seen an interminable attempt by the Deputy Leader to go through what happened in June 1982. He quoted extensively from the soon to be remaindered book, nicknamed 'Short Poppies', written by our former colleague, John Cornwall—the man they used to denounce every day. Suddenly he has become their guiding light and hero, or spiritual mentor. The only old chestnut that the Deputy Leader did not excavate was why he and David Tonkin did not have the guts in June 1982 to go to the people on Roxby. It is a very interesting question: why did they not have the guts to pull the trigger? That has yet to be explained.

The interesting thing is that the Deputy Leader did not speak about uranium enrichment. I believe that the State Liberal Party can be accused of a dishonest cover-up over its nuclear policies. The Olsen Opposition is refusing to confirm or deny whether it is still committed to building a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. We remember that between 1979 and 1982 we were told that this would bring us salvation. Even in 1985 the proposal was trotted out. Suddenly, members opposite (perhaps they have read their polls concerning the Green movement) do not want to talk about uranium enrichment. It is only the Deputy Leader who late at night occasionally flirts with the prospect. It was a key plank in their policy. It was heralded as an \$800 million development for South Australia. We saw all the negotiations with Urenco-Sentec about establishing a uranium enrichment plant.

I want to know why the Liberals are being so coy with the media. Are they still committed to establishing such a plant in South Australia? If they are, why will they not say so? Are they nervous about a backlash from voters or from the environmental movement? Last week I called on the State Opposition to say where it would locate an enrichment plant in this State. Surely, voters have a right to know. I was told by people from one newspaper outlet that they did not regard enrichment as a story. Perhaps that is because they do not have any confidence themselves that the Leader of the Opposition could lead the Opposition into Government. I am sure that that is the case. If it was considered that they did have a chance, surely the keynote of their development policy would be something worth talking about.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has a clear responsibility to tell South Australians where he would like to locate a plant which would be processing highly radioactive substances. Would the Liberals locate such a plant at Port Pirie, Port Adelaide or Port Stanvac? The Leader has also refused to say whether or not he supports nuclear power as a future power source for South Australians. It is quite clear that the Deputy Leader is the driving force behind the enrichment plant scenario. It is interesting that the enrichment technology which he embraced 10 years ago and which he still embraces is now out of date.

I believe that the Liberals would be foolish to endorse an enrichment plant. It would be a white elephant, costing hundreds of millions of dollars. As members opposite constantly remind me—almost every day—I was a member of

Don Dunstan's overseas fact-finding mission on uranium. During our visit to nuclear establishments in Europe, we found that the only enrichment facilities operating anywhere in the world were given 100 per cent Government backing for their investments. The taxpayer was forced to underwrite uranium enrichment wherever it occurred in the world. The very few efforts made to set up private enrichment facilities, particularly in the United States, foundered at the first fence, because private financial institutions would not provide backing. There was a worldwide over-capacity in enrichment, and there still is.

A South Australian enrichment plant would be a bottomless pit for South Australian taxpayers' dollars, and private industry and private finance in this State would not touch it with a barge pole. The Liberals' embrace of an enrichment plant proposal means that they are prepared to take a great leap down the nuclear fuel cycle. I ask members opposite: are they prepared to endorse canisters of uranium hexafluoride gas and highly radioactive enriched uranium being carted through the streets of Adelaide? If they are, they should come forward and say so. They should be frank with the public. They talk about honesty and about fabrication: let them come forward and say whether or not they support uranium enrichment.

It is quite clear at the moment that the Liberals are depressed. They are mesmerised by the prospect of an election. They are like the boy who cried wolf. It is interesting that two weeks ago the Liberal staffers were ringing up every journalist in town, saying, 'It is going to be called this Saturday.' Well, that was two Saturdays ago. Last Friday they were ringing up journalists saying that they knew for a fact that it would be announced at 3.30.

Mr GUNN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Mr Hamilton: You mongrel!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Quorum not present—ring the bells.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I submit that the accusation made against me by the member for Albert Park is not only unparliamentary—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: He can refer to me as a mongrel if he likes—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I have asked that the bells be rung for a quorum and I will take his point of order after that.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Sir, when I drew the attention of the Chair to the state of the House during the member for Albert Park's remarks, the honourable member referred to me by using unparliamentary language.

An honourable member: What did he say?

Mr GUNN: I will leave it to the honourable member. It was unparliamentary language which was offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will consult with the Deputy Speaker who was in the Chair at the time. Order! The Deputy Speaker was unable to hear the remark that was allegedly made across the Chamber by the honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: If it assists the House, I withdraw it.

Mr RANN: On a point of order, Sir, I have lost the final two minutes of my grievance contribution. Under parliamentary rules, am I entitled to that two minutes?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light. *Members interjecting:*

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Just because the Minister was miffed this afternoon because she was exposed for

having undertaken an action of anarchy, she does not have to get miffed now. I want to draw attention to two matters, the first relating to my own electorate, and the other being a situation which, I believe, creates problems for members on both sides of the House. I have a letter from a constituent who is an employer. I do not intend to identify individuals but, rather, to identify the purpose of the inquiry. The letter states:

I wish to bring to your attention a problem concerning WorkCover and one of our employees, which you may find of particular interest. It points to the fact that there could be a bit of a 'scam' going on . . .

It involves a certain medical practitioner. The letter continues:

The story begins about 11 months ago when the employee [and I will not name him] was involved in a car accident when driving home from work one night. He injured his neck and has been off work ever since. That's fair enough, but for much of this period . . . [the employee] has been telephoning us on the days he has been due to return to work with a one, two or three month extension after advice from the doctor. As this was getting a little beyond a joke—at one stage the extension jumped from one month to three months . . . so I contacted the WorkCover office and spoke to a very cooperative staff member. He told me that . . . [the employee]—

consulted the doctor who was involved (and the address is given)—

. . . [the employee] for the record lives . . . [in the northern suburbs]. The WorkCover officer also advised me that this doctor was the cause of some concern for them and also a number of other employers in Adelaide because of his rather liberal attitude in handing out medical certificates for WorkCover cases. The officer said that . . . [the employee] had a medical carried out on him by WorkCover's own specialist doctor in this field, and he had advised them that he would be fit enough to return to work in March or April of this year. But unfortunately . . . [the doctor whom this person was consulting is named] diagnosis—or any diagnosis by a qualified doctor for that matter—could override WorkCover's doctor.

The officer advised that it was up to us to take action over this matter—they were powerless to do anything. Being rather angry I telephoned [the doctor's] surgery to discuss the problem, but was advised by his receptionist that he didn't take calls. I explained the problem to the receptionist instead, and she said she would relay the discussion to him. I've heard nothing to date.

Since that discussion [the employee] has received a further three month extension of his time from work with WorkCover, of course, paying his wages, which means he is now scheduled to return to work in October this year. As I stated before, the whole matter has angered me greatly as I hate to see people making a mockery of a system which is already proving too expensive for small businesses like ourselves to support.

I raise that matter because it picks up the very important point that WorkCover, when approached by this insured person, indicated that it was fully aware of the activities of this particular medico. I repeat the alleged remarks of the WorkCover officer—and I have no reason to disbelieve them:

[The doctor] was the cause of some concern for them . . . because of his rather liberal attitude in handing out medical certificates . . .

This organisation was established to benefit the whole community. The Parliament has established this scheme—and rightly so, because workers should be protected—but, at the same time, while this situation is occurring, everyone in the community is paying for what is deemed to be a scam. It is a scam against the background that WorkCover's own medical officer had cleared this employee to return to work in March/April 1989. However, he currently has a three-month extension of leave.

This situation is against the best interests of the community of South Australia. I am quite prepared to discuss the issue with the Minister concerned. I have been very careful not to name the doctor, the employee or the employer. However, I highlight an untenable situation which I know members on both sides of the House have encountered and for which there appears to be no relief.

The second matter I wish to raise relates to the extension and completion of the western by-pass at Gawler. Considerable work is taking place on that by-pass. My colleague the member for Chaffey is not as keen about this project as I am because, originally, as members will recall, the funds used for this project were to have been used on the Berri to Loxton bridge.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is all happening in my electorate, and I am pleased to know that the broader community is benefiting. The current budget documents provide nothing for the final stage of this project, notwithstanding that the Highways Department is currently measuring out and putting up fences. It has Telecom deepening the cables which traverse the area. Much public debate has occurred relative to the design for the final fourth stage, but no funds have been provided this year. So be it. The point is that the Highways Department, in putting forward plans for the final stage, has told the Corporation of the City of Gawler—indeed, it has told the public—that plans are so advanced (even though no funds have been allocated for the next 10 months) that it is impossible to change them to provide for what might be termed a 'slip road' into the southern Gawler area. In other words, once people get on to the bypass they will enter Gawler either at a point in the Willaston area or somewhere close to but a little south of the Gawler trotting track. However, from that point they will not be able to turn back into Gawler. That involves a further 2.5 kms.

Mrs Appleby: How many millions more?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: How many millions more? I am advised by the responsible officers who have tested this factor that it may extend to an additional \$300 000. In this House I have lauded the action of Geoff Virgo as Minister of Transport. When advised that work relating to the Greenock bypass would cost, in 1973-74 terms, in excess of \$100 000, but that it would help with safety and overcome the possibility of accidents, he said 'We will do it at the extra cost. It might take three to six months longer, because the expenditure must be extended over a period of time. However, we do not want blood on our hands, which would result from providing a road that was subject to head-on collisions or collisions associated with its design.'

In this case I am suggesting that the failure to provide a slip road into Gawler at its southernmost point will cause a number of people who are using that western bypass to turn against traffic when they become bewildered as to how to get back into the town, which they see disappearing on their left or in their rear vision mirror. That additional \$300 000 worth of work, if it takes an additional four months to complete, is quite important, and the matter ought to be addressed.

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 26 September at 2 p.m.