

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 27 September 1989

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

PETITION: HUNTING AND FISHING

A petition signed by 2 532 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to further restrict hunting and fishing was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: AUSTRALIA DAY HOLIDAY

A petition signed by 14 185 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to provide for the Australia Day public holiday to be observed on 26 January each year was presented by Mr M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

A petition signed by 11 980 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reverse its decision to create a City of Flinders and review the process for changing local government boundaries was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: ADOPTION

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the veto requirements for restricting information released about adopted persons and relinquishing parents was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOYS AND SWEETS

A petition signed by 654 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the sale of toys and sweets resembling drugs was presented by Mr Tyler.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

MARINELAND

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier immediately initiate an independent investigation into the scrapping of the Marineland redevelopment in February of this year and, until this investigation is completed, stand aside the Minister of State Development and Technology? The Minister of State Development and Technology told the House on 2 April this year that the Government had not put pressure on Zhen Yun to withdraw from the Marineland redevelopment. He has repeated this claim sub-

sequently—to the House on 5 September, to the Estimates Committee on 21 September and as recently as this morning on ABC radio.

However, the Opposition has now been provided with evidence directly in conflict with what the Minister has said. The decision that the Marineland redevelopment should not proceed was finally made on 2 February this year, according to all the information we have. The Opposition has been provided with a record of two discussions which took place on the following day, 3 February.

These records were made because of the concern by some parties to this project that they were about to become the victims of a scandalous deception. The first record to which I refer is signed by Mr Rod Abel and two witnesses. The discussion involved Mr Abel, a principal of the Tribond Corporation and Mr Gary Chapman, an agent of Zhen Yun, which had been negotiating with Tribond to take over the project while still retaining the involvement of the Abel family on a consultancy and managerial basis. The record of this discussion shows that Mr Abel asked Mr Chapman if he knew whether the Government intended to proceed 'without the dolphins'. I now quote directly from the record of the discussion:

He (that is, to Mr Chapman) said 'yes, the Government had been discussing that aspect for a few weeks now'. I asked him why he didn't advise us. He said that he was not able to: it was in confidence.

Later on 3 February there was a discussion between Mr Rod Abel and Mr Lawrence Lee, another agent of Zhen Yun. A record of that discussion, which the Opposition has, shows Mr Lee saying the Government did not want the redevelopment to proceed because of opposition from unions and Greenpeace. I quote directly the words of Mr Lee, as follows:

They—

referring to the Department of State Development and Technology—

just say because of the Greenpeace and union bans. They suggest it is not appropriate for us to be involved in the development of Marineland.

Mr Lee then referred to his contact with the Government saying:

I myself talked to John Frogley at least 10 times, and I also talked to the Deputy Director of their department, Miss Sandra Eccles several times, and I also talked to Lynn Arnold, the Minister, twice about this matter, and they didn't give us a clear indication.

Mr Abel then interjected as follows:

What you are saying to me is—the only condition that is stopping us is Government have requested that it is not appropriate for the Marineland to be developed because of Greenpeace. . .

Finally, Mr Lee said:

This delaying is not from our side—we have been chasing this matter up for at least two weeks.

The Minister of State Development and Technology has previously endorsed the *bona fides* of Zhen Yun. In a press statement on 13 February this year, announcing the scrapping of the Marineland redevelopment and the go-ahead only for the hotel on that site, the Minister said he was confident that this first investment in Australia by Zhen Yun 'will lead to further investments in the State and build on South Australia's growing relationship with China'. He said this corporation had 'international experience in hotel development and management and in a range of trading and investment activities'.

I have just quoted evidence involving two agents of that corporation which directly contradicts assurances given to this House by the Minister that the Government had not pressured Zhen Yun to withdraw from the Marineland rede-

velopment, a decision which will cost taxpayers at least \$6 million, and South Australia our second most attended attraction. The Opposition is prepared to place this information before any suitably independent investigation the Premier is now and should be willing to initiate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Opposition has worked hard to whip up this issue. It has been made easy for it by the obvious emotion connected with the fact that dolphins are involved, and that the fate of those dolphins has proved extremely hard to fix or settle. In consequence, the whole progress of this project has been difficult. It is also true that people are involved in the care of those dolphins, people who have been involved in previous stages of Marineland development and who have a particular perspective and interest to push. I guess that they have been happy in the emotional circumstances surrounding the fate of those creatures to play that for all it is worth. However, that is very different from the objective facts that relate to this situation.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If we are talking about putting things on the record, an interesting thing that might be put on the record is the Leader of the Opposition's views as to whether we should have a dolphinarium.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is one of the crux issues involved, because the Opposition has been attempting to create a general impression that the key issue of the dolphins and their future can be safeguarded only by having some sort of dolphinarium, some performing facility *a la* the old Marineland, with hoops of fire and balls on the nose, and whatever else is involved.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My Government does not support that; and I would be very surprised if all members of the Opposition supported it. I know for a start that the member for Coles—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the third time. I ask the Premier to resume his seat. The Chair extended a fair degree of tolerance to the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the conformity of his question to Standing Orders, and he was uninterrupted for five minutes. In the space of a little over one minute he has been called to order three times for interrupting the Premier's reply. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I note that the member for Coles does not agree. She was quoted on radio this morning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order for the second time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —as saying that she cannot speak for the Liberal Party and would have to consult her Party on it. In that context, I outlined the Government's policy. In the current circumstances, we do not see it appropriate that performing dolphins and a facility for them to perform in should be developed in South Australia. That is last decade's project. However, if the Opposition members are saying that that is what should be done in the current circumstances, let them state it clearly. At the little demonstration that has been organised for this Sunday, let the Leader of the Opposition, who has cancelled a very important function that involves the Aborigines of South Aus-

tralia so that he can go down there and politic on the West Beach site at Marineland—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. Let the Leader of the Opposition, who has made that decision, tell the people who assemble there, thinking that he will be talking about the future of the dolphins and how this problem can be solved, what he really means—a performing facility. It is also true that the project, under Tribond, was proceeding on the basis of approvals given for a continuation of a dolphinarium, and a right to take dolphins from the wild.

That issue was looked at very closely, in light of the changed policy of the Government. We made clear that the Government would sustain that policy—those rights remained resided with Tribond. When Tribond got into financial difficulties that were not only connected with union problems but were more fundamental than that (and I will not go into any more detail, but the Minister could and so could anyone who looked at the books) and was going to collapse, and when Zhen Yun came on the scene and was identified as a prospective developer, the question then arose whether that approval given to the Abels and Tribond would continue in the transference of business.

Quite appropriately, the Government at that stage should have said, 'No, a new transaction means a new arrangement.' We did not do so. We made clear to Zhen Yun that those rights that had been conferred by Cabinet prior to the policy I have just enunciated would be sustained if it wished to proceed with the dolphinarium. We could not solve all the other problems that related to it; we were not able to deal with all those other problems. That was made clear to Zhen Yun by the Minister and by our officers, and that is clear in the documentation.

What the Opposition is saying should be independently investigated is whether some sort of conspiracy took place whereby, notwithstanding those approvals that had been given, Zhen Yun was to be prevented by the Government from going ahead with the project, with the dolphinarium involved in it. It is true that major problems were facing the dolphinarium, and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to proclaim that—and so far he has not had the guts to do so too openly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —he will discover those problems. But, the fact remains that the approval was there. Zhen Yun decided, in the circumstances it was confronted with, not because the Government required it, that it would withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me move to the independent investigation and the standing aside of the Minister. That is absolute nonsense. The Leader of the Opposition's so-called evidence is a transcript or record, he says, of conversations, not with the Minister, not with officers of the Government but between certain principals who, incidentally, have particular interests to protect in this matter. So, that is point one. This is hearsay evidence. It is not evidence in a sense that can be used in any way other than as the views of those parties. It is not a direct report of what the Minister said. He has told the House what he said.

The Minister has in fact put on record the minute that was sent following those conversations. They do not confirm that interpretation of the discussion. So, there is nothing to investigate. If Mr Abel and Mr Chapman, and even Mr Lee, believe, or rather are asserting, that certain things were said, they were wrong, and they know that. Those who

took part in the conversations would know what is the fact. Therefore, there is no cause for independent investigation. We are going to have another series of questions on this, and innuendo. We are going to have the little demonstration on Sunday as a rival to the Tandanya opening, and various other things. I have the greatest confidence in the Minister and his integrity, and I believe that the people of South Australia, who have known him in public affairs going right back to the late 1960s and early 1970s, know the integrity of this man. If that is going to be impugned, let us have it out. What I suggest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let us have a debate about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order—for the last time, because I am now warning him.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I call the Opposition's bluff. I want the Leader of the Opposition now to stand up and move a vote of no confidence in the Minister—instead of asking a question which, essentially, says 'stand him aside'. Rather than asking a sneaky cowardly question, let the Leader of the Opposition get up and move a no-confidence motion.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I invite the Leader of the Opposition to do that here and now. My colleague the Leader of the House will move a motion to facilitate it. I would like to hear an answer from the Leader of the Opposition. Does he want a debate? We can move the motion and have it now. I am ready and my colleagues are ready, as is everyone else, and you can have your say instead of this innuendo. How about a debate?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not for the moment entertain the honourable Deputy Premier. The Premier is out of order in referring directly to members opposite in the way that he did. The Leader of the Opposition is perilously close to being named, it being only two minutes or so since I gave him what should have been his last warning. Such behaviour cannot be tolerated. I ask members on both sides of the House to cooperate with the Chair in my endeavours to maintain order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as would enable the Leader of the Opposition to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction to order.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And rightly so.

The SPEAKER: And the member for Light. I point out that transgressions when the Speaker has risen to his feet are particularly out of order. I have counted the House—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Government members: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I submit that this motion is patently absurd.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. For the question say 'Aye'.

Honourable members: Aye.

The SPEAKER: Against 'No'.

Mr Olsen: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being a dissentient—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: This is absurd.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will be named.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will entertain the point of order of the Deputy Leader after I have consulted on something with the Clerk.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to try to conduct himself in a way that is appropriate for a member of this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair erred in not calling on a member wishing to speak against the resolution before putting it before the House. Was that the intention of the Deputy Leader?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I had a point of order which is pertinent to this resolution. If this is to follow the course, Mr Speaker, you can take it as a speech or what you like, but I want to say something about it. We have the patently absurd situation where the Government is seeking to force the Opposition to debate a resolution which the Opposition has not even framed. Is the Government going to move a no-confidence motion in itself? This is an absurd situation; absolutely absurd! I would defy you, Mr Speaker, to find anywhere else in the British Commonwealth, in the Westminster system, where a Government has forced an Opposition to debate a no-confidence motion which the Opposition has not even moved. If the Government wants a motion of no confidence in the Minister, we will have it tomorrow. Let us follow the normal—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:—traditions. We have this absurd situation where we are to debate a motion of no confidence in the Government. We have not moved it; we have not even drafted it. Is the Government to draft a no-confidence motion that we are to debate? This is plainly and absolutely absurd! Are we to say, 'Okay, pass us the motion that we are to debate'? Is that what the Premier wants us to do? Are we to have the motion passed across the House and say, 'This is what we are to debate.' How stupid! This is a ruse to cover up, to stop questions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We will have the debate tomorrow, after we have framed the motion, after we have got on record the Government's answers to legitimate questions. It is the Opposition's right in this place to ask a question of any Minister on a matter of public importance. These questions are matters of public importance. We want straight answers. We have not had them yet and we will seek them again today. If the Government wants a no-confidence motion, we will give it one tomorrow, with pleasure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I put the question—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's not a matter of gutless.

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: Let's hear—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will put the question again: for the question say 'Aye'; against say 'No'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division: ring the bells.

While the division bells were ringing:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been customary during divisions for previous occupants of the Chair and myself to allow a small amount of interplay between the two sides in the two minutes that the bells are ringing. I will not extend that tolerance to behaviour such as that which occurred a few seconds ago with members shouting loudly across the Chamber.

Ayes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller) and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Noes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Olsen and Oswald.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Keneally and Plunkett. Noes—Messrs Meier and Wotton.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders have been so far suspended as to enable the Leader of the Opposition to move a motion without notice forthwith. Does he now wish to exercise that opportunity?

Mr OLSEN: It is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat while I attempt to get the House to order.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

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

Mr OLSEN: No, Mr Speaker, it is not the Opposition's intention today to accept the invitation to facilitate the absence of the Premier tomorrow from the Parliament. This is clearly an attempt to gag further questions on this matter. It is an attempt—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader was not given the opportunity to make a speech on the subject, merely to reply to the request from the Chair whether he wished to exercise that opportunity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader was not called on to make a speech on the matter, merely to reply to the request from the Chair, in order that matters could proceed, as to whether or not he wished to exercise that opportunity? If not, Question Time will now continue.

Mr OLSEN: No, we do not.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Briggs.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN (Briggs): At least I'm not gutless!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Briggs will have leave for his question totally withdrawn and I will call the next member of the Government if the honourable member continues to behave in that manner. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN: Does the Premier share the view of the Leader of the Opposition that nuclear power is suitable as a source of electricity generation for South Australia, and will he inform the House whether the construction of a uranium enrichment plant is prohibited under existing legislation?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. There is a motion on the Notice Paper—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Just prior to this I had had my attention drawn to the fact that the honourable member for Briggs was anticipating debate on a matter that is on the Notice Paper. I therefore do not need to uphold the point of order of the member for Mitcham because the question is out of order on that basis. The honourable member for Coles.

MARINELAND

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): What role did the Premier play in discussions early in February about the Marineland redevelopment? The Opposition has a record of a discussion which took place on 2 February—the day on which the project was scrapped—involving Mr Rod Abel and a senior officer of the Department of State Development and Technology, Mr Henry Oh. Mr Oh says:

The Premier wanted to work through what has been discussed and . . . once he has made up his view then the Minister would be in a position to talk about the project with Zhen Yun.

There was no reference in this discussion to Zhen Yun's concern about the viability of the Marineland redevelopment; rather, throughout, Mr Oh was conveying that it was the Government which had to decide whether or not the project should proceed. The Opposition is prepared to place this and other information before an independent investigation to examine whether the Government, and not Zhen Yun, decided that this project should not proceed and, if so, who within the Government was responsible for this decision.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will ignore the comment at the end: it is just part of the drip feed operation the Opposition is hoping to run—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Now they want to shout me down because they do not like what I am going to say! These great questions that the members of the Opposition are going to ask—they are all sitting there with their little bits of paper typed out in the Leader's office, and they will get up and dutifully read them out in a minute—are all part of an attempt to get at the Minister of State Development and Technology and to say (as, in fact, the Leader directly said, although I suggest that he might not have been in order in saying) that this is a matter of confidence in the Minister. We have invited the Opposition to debate that matter of confidence but it has squibbed—members opposite have refused to do so. All the material they have could have been put into the debate. The interesting little point about a debate tomorrow is that members of the Opposition know that I, in fact, have a pair all day tomorrow in order to attend—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: To visit a couple of farms, the Leader of the Opposition says. He had better talk to some of his members about that. I can see a number of members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will be a guest of the Yorke Peninsula Field Day Committee. It is the pre-eminent field day in Australia. I was invited many months ago to attend, and it was pointed out that the only time possible for me to attend was on one of the sitting days of Parliament. In fact, I delayed the visit until the Thursday. Quite appropriately, I have received a pair from the Opposition to attend. I would have thought that the member for Goyder, for one, would be pleased indeed that I have accepted the invitation: in fact, I think he has said as much. I would have thought that the members for Eyre, Chaffey, Murray-Mallee and other electorates, who know the importance of this function, would be delighted that I have accepted the invitation. It is not to 'just visit a few farms' as the Leader dismissively said—it is to attend the largest agriculture field day in Australia.

It is interesting that the Opposition planned (it has just told us now) to move a no-confidence motion tomorrow, knowing that I would be 200 miles away on Yorke Peninsula. Very nice: the Opposition wanted to make sure that I was not around to debate the matter. The Opposition wanted to be quite sure that it could say 'The Premier was not here', because I would have left at the crack of dawn tomorrow to be at Yorke Peninsula. The Opposition would have advised the Government of its no-confidence motion, but I would not have been here to deal with it. That is a smart tactic, because the Opposition does not have the guts to face me in debate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader laughs: it is interesting that he laughs. The Opposition knew that I would not be here. It planned today to avoid a debate, when this is the day when they should have the debate—this is the day the allegations have been made. The Opposition has not got it together; it has not got anything there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What role did I play? I played the role that I appropriately should as Premier. In the Cabinet discussions that took place, as I have already made the point, this was a matter of extreme importance to the Government, particularly the continuation of the right to take dolphins from the wild—the right that apparently some members of the Opposition fully support, and on Sunday the Leader of the Opposition is going to support that. He wants a dolphinarium and he wants dolphins taken from the wild. That is interesting. He had better consult with some of his colleagues before he does that. Be that as it may, we had to make a careful decision about that, and the decision was fully canvassed and discussed. What the Minister communicated was communicated with the full authority of me and the Government. Again, I say for the Opposition to claim hearsay discussions of what might have been said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Oh had no direct knowledge of what I said, or the role that I was taking—none whatsoever—and he is reported as having said that to someone else. We have noted many times the absence of a lawyer on the Opposition benches, because time and again it shows up. The Opposition is flourishing this document with great aplomb, as if in fact it says that this is the truth—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, this is purely an indicative attitude—as if these conversations are an end to the matter. I have already said, and I say again about this particular conversation, those people who were discussing it did not have direct knowledge, and were placing their interpretation on second-hand evidence. What the Government did, what its position was, and how that was communicated, has been made clear by the Minister of State Development and Technology. There is no question on the facts that have been put before this House: there is no cause for an investigation. There is no cause for this drip-feed interrogation, but there is cause for the Opposition to have the guts to say what it is trying to do, which is to have the Minister of State Development and Technology sacked. Let us debate that in this forum and we will deal with it right here and now. I repeat the invitation of a moment ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ISLAND SEAWAY

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): Can the Minister of Marine say when the *Island Seaway* will be available to recommence its run to Port Lincoln?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Why don't you dip your eye in fig jam!

The SPEAKER: Order! Remarks like that should be conserved by the honourable member: he should stick to his question.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yesterday the member for Bragg asked the Minister whether he could say when the ship would recommence its service to Port Lincoln. Contacts I have in the marine industry have informed me that decisions taken this morning at a meeting at Port Adelaide may have an impact on when the service can resume.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Members will recall that yesterday, when asked a similar question by the member for Bragg, I said that when all the appropriate information had been collected the ship's operators would have discussions with the crew. After the tests were conducted over the weekend, the return service to Kingscote, and discussions with the crew this morning, the crew determined that they were satisfied with the results and agreed to lift their ban on the siding of the vessel at Port Lincoln. During the tests on Saturday, with the vessel travelling at at least 11.5 knots, it executed a 180 degree turn in the length of the ship.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The crow from Mitcham is squawking on his wire again. That turn by the vessel indicates that, if someone were to fall off the vessel, it could turn alongside the person. I have been told that in conventional ships it sometimes takes up to a mile to turn the vessel around. Ships masters say that it is difficult to see people in the sea and that they usually aim for the life buoy that may have been thrown over. This turn by the vessel shows that it is very safe for passengers. The member for Victoria wanted to know whether I was on the vessel when it executed some of its trials. The answer is 'Yes'. I actually know where it is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is one question only before the House. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I can also advise the House that, during the tests the vessel operated at about 8.5 knots

full astern with water lapping over the rear door. Inspections indicated slight moisture around the seals, which means that the seal on the rear door is excellent. Usually tests on such seals are conducted in the yards by squirting the doors down with a hose. The ship's agents will be offering a service from tomorrow week, which will be 5 October, and are now commencing to canvass cargo for that service.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Premier agree that there are serious conflicts between statements made to the House by the Minister of State Development and Technology about the Government's role in the Marineland redevelopment, and the recorded comments of principals of Zhen Yun and, if so, what action will the Premier take to determine who has been telling the truth? The issues now in dispute involve the word of a senior Minister of this Government against the word of representatives of Zhen Yun Corporation, which is an investment arm of the Municipal Government of the Jiangsu Province of the People's Republic of China, and an organisation with which this Government has been negotiating on a major development in this State.

The Premier is standing behind his Minister, which means, in the view of the Government, that Zhen Yun has told untruths to Tribond and deliberately deceived that company. Another scenario put to the Opposition is that the Government and Zhen Yun have acted in collusion to scuttle Tribond and to renege on written undertakings given to Tribond on 30 December last year that Zhen Yun would take over the Marineland redevelopment and retain a major role for the principals of Tribond in the project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There may be apparent conflicts, but I have no doubt that the version of events I accept and understand and know to be the truth is that which has been put before this House by the Minister of State Development and Technology. It is as simple as that. He has no motive and no reason to say other than what he has said—and this relates to the ultimate decision which was made and which the Minister conveyed with the full authority of Cabinet and the Government. There was no reason to doubt—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, we get these silly interjections from the member for Mitcham—hardly worth referring to. I have no doubt that what the Minister conveyed to Zhen Yun was exactly that position: it made a decision in the end, and knew the basis on which it would make that decision. It was probably a sensible decision to make in the circumstances but, had it wished to persist with the original proposal it had the approval to do so—and that was made clear.

That is the essence of this debate. The Opposition is saying that the approval had been withdrawn and that Zhen Yun was told that it could not develop a project with a dolphinarium. That is what members opposite are saying. That is not the situation. Indeed, the record of conversation which was conveyed to Zhen Yun and which has already been put in the public domain shows quite clearly what was put. This relates to a minute from Mr Frogley of the Department of State Development and Technology in which he asked for confirmation of the main issues discussed between the Minister of State Development and Technology and Mr Lawrence Lee on Thursday 2 February. This is what was noted in the minute:

1. That given perceived construction and operational difficulties with the Marineland redevelopment it may not prove viable and therefore it may be in Zhen Yun's interest not to proceed

with the redevelopment and in consequence not proceed to acquire the shares of Tribond Developments Pty Ltd.

2. If the Marineland redevelopment were not to proceed, the Government would encourage Zhen Yun to develop a hotel and convention centre at West Beach, and the South Australian Government would address the question of the future of Tribond Developments.

3. Zhen Yun will submit a proposal to [the Government].

That minute is quite clear, and totally in line with both the policy and what the Minister was conveying, namely, that there were indeed construction and operational difficulties which Zhen Yun had to take into account; that the project may not prove viable, and that it may not be in its interests to proceed. Ultimately, it was up to Zhen Yun. The minute states clearly that 'If the Marineland redevelopment were not to proceed'—not 'because you cannot proceed'—then the Government would encourage a different sort of development. We were not saying to Zhen Yun that, if it thought it was too difficult in these circumstances, it would be an all or nothing situation. We were saying, 'Come up with another proposition', and that proposition was announced by the Minister.

This is one of the things that hurts the Opposition, one of the things that the Opposition finds hard to take, and members opposite have been working hard to sabotage it. With a dolphinarium excluded they were hoping that there would be no project at all and that they could dance on the grave of the West Beach Trust. The Minister was able to negotiate a major project, much to the disgust of the Opposition. Since that was announced members opposite have worked unremittingly to ensure that it does not happen. They may succeed, but if they succeed it will not be because we have not tried.

ADVANCED ENGLISH PROGRAMS

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education say what, if any, representations he or the Government have made to the Federal Government about the funding of the advanced English programs for migrants? From representations that have been made to me, I understand that changed funding arrangements in the 1989 Federal budget for the advanced English programs may have the effect of eroding the quality of English language teaching for professional and skilled migrants.

Further, in a letter sent to me by the South Australian Association of Teachers of English to speakers of other languages, the president of that organisation said that if funding arrangements are changed from a designated Government grant to TAFE to a bidding on a course by course basis arrangement, this would have a number of detrimental consequences, including dislocation, distress and frustration for students and dissipation of staff, wastage of effort and difficulties of planning for teachers. It was further submitted to me in a follow-up telephone conversation that strong representations need to be made to the Federal Government to effect a review of these changed procedures.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure many people in the community are very concerned about this matter, particularly the South Australian Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, which has written to the honourable member and other members of this House and which has raised the matter with me directly with regard to the changes announced as part of the Federal budget. It is fair to say that a number of programs under the non-government adult education grants area have been administered by the State Government through DETAFE since about 1983, and Commonwealth funding has been on the

basis of those grants being administered through the State department. As I understand it, that applies in the other States as well and has worked very successfully, because the States, through DETAFE and the non-government sector, have been able to carefully pinpoint the areas of need and direct the funds to those areas most affected and most in need.

That has been an efficient and successful program, and the concerns expressed to both the member for Adelaide and me by the community and, particularly, the association have highlighted the fact that they would like the Commonwealth funding program to continue to be administered by the State department. I must agree with that situation.

With regard to what we have done, I had heard on the grapevine prior to the budget announcement that there could be a rearrangement of the grants program and that the non-government adult education grants would go back to the Department for Employment, Education and Training and be allocated through DEET offices based in each State. That was of concern to me so, on 14 August, I communicated with the Minister for Employment, Education and Training (John Dawkins) and expressed my concern and the concern of this Government regarding a change in that program, given the success that we had achieved in what I see as a valuable and highly effective program of providing small amounts of assistance to a large number of community based groups. That adult education program was effective and a careful and efficient administrative way of providing those dollars to the community.

So, I expressed that concern pre-budget, but the Federal Government announced in the budget the allocation of funds through the local CES network. Again, I have grave concerns about that program and fear that it will move away from the community based program that we have had established, very successfully, for three areas—advanced English for migrants, the adult literacy program and the non-government adult education program. As I understand from the budget statement, those three programs are to be combined and administered directly by the Department of Employment, Education and Training through its State offices and then through the CES offices.

The Australian Council for Adult Literacy and the South Australian association both have grave concerns, and I share those concerns, because I believe that the present system is much more effective and efficient. It has established *bona fides* with the community. It has established an efficient way of delivering those three programs and I believe it is much more effective and grass roots based and, therefore, able to deliver the services to the community. So, as a consequence of that budget decision, I again wrote to the Minister (John Dawkins) on 31 August and reinforced my earlier comments. I asked whether the programs could be reviewed and whether they could continue to be administered by the State department. I also asked, if the Commonwealth continues with its program, how it intends to implement the three programs on the ground.

There is another reason for my expressing that concern, not only from the point of view of the removal from the grass roots contact and the community-based program but because we, as a State Government, have a program for adult education. We anticipated that the literacy program and the program that we have talked about in terms of delivery of service would be administered through a mechanism similar to that which existed previously for those three programs. With the program outlined by the Federal Government, we would have two programs being administered by two separate mechanisms. That could lead to some overlap, confusion and lack of efficiency. Again, if

the honourable member would care to communicate my views to the association—I have done that, but in a broader sense through the South Australian Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages—I would be happy, because it can be assured that I am as concerned as it is about these changes, and I have expressed my concern to the Federal Minister regarding his suggestion as to the way in which these grants are to be administered. We have a good system, and we should stick with it.

MARINELAND

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I refer to statements made by an agent to Zhen Yun to a principal of Tribond on 3 February this year suggesting that the Government and Zhen Yun deliberately concealed from Tribond their joint intention to scrap the Marineland redevelopment. Did the Minister of State Development and Technology have any knowledge of or involvement in this deception and, if not, does he intend to seek an explanation from Zhen Yun of the statements made by its agents to Tribond?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The comments reported to the House today by the Deputy Leader and other members of the Opposition are as put by one of the parties involved in this incident as reported by that party of another party, neither of which is directly the Government. There has been no deception by the Government on this matter. Any attempt by anybody to say that, as the Premier has clearly outlined to date, is entirely incorrect.

O-BAHN

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister of Transport advise the House how stage 2 of the O-Bahn northeast busway has been received by the public since its opening on 20 August, that is, in a little over four weeks of operation? People in the north-eastern suburbs are keen to know how the patronage of the O-Bahn busway is going and how the operation of the commuter car parks is working.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Newland for her question and commend her on the interest that she has taken in this particular project.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Chaffey says that this was a Liberal initiative. The Government and the Labor Party have always acknowledged any function or anything to do with the O-Bahn—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not grudgingly at all, but with all the generosity that we are capable of displaying, and that is a great deal. It was the Hon. Michael Wilson who pushed this project when he was Minister of Transport, and a fat lot of thanks he got for it: he lost his seat. Nevertheless, it was his idea. The difference between the Liberal Government and this Government is that the Liberal Government only talked about it, whereas we did it. It is there. I am pleased to advise the member for Newland and the House of the operation of the busway services since stage 2 was opened.

The average weekday patronage has increased for all the busway routes by 8 per cent on initial boardings and 14 per cent on total boardings. The difference in these two figures is due to an increase in the number of persons now transferring from connecting feeder services. These figures include all users of all busway routes; that is, it includes those

passengers not travelling through to the city. It is estimated that patronage on the busway itself between Paradise and the city has increased by 10 per cent. Average total weekly boardings on busway services have risen from about 21 400 to about 24 600 boardings per day—a very clear indication that if public transport is fast, clean, efficient and relevant it is possible to attract commuters to use it.

One other very important matter mentioned by the member for Newland in her question involved car parking. The STA car park south of Smart Road on the western side of the busway track has a capacity of 339 vehicles and the present usage is approximately 75 per cent of that capacity, so, it is very well patronised. The area on the eastern side of the busway track, which is not as well used, has a capacity of 82 vehicles and the STA estimates that the present usage is approximately 20 per cent of capacity.

It is clear from those figures that a number of commuters still appear to be using the Westfield shopping centre car park adjacent to the Tea Tree Plaza interchange. I ask the member for Newland to make it known in the area that this ought not to continue; that the people using the O-Bahn ought to use the car park provided and not the Westfield car park. The cooperation we have had from Westfield has been excellent, and I would not like commuters to abuse that cooperation. The O-Bahn busway project has been an outstanding success and a credit to all concerned, including the Hon. Michael Wilson, to whom I give full recognition, but particularly to this Government over the years which has actually constructed the project.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for asking questions be extended by 10 minutes.

Motion carried.

MARINELAND

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Premier reconsider his refusal to initiate an independent investigation into the scrapping of the Marineland redevelopment so that the role of the Chairman of the West Beach Trust (Mr Virgo) also can be examined? Information in the possession of the Opposition records the concerns of Zhen Yun and a senior officer of the Department of State Development and Technology with the role of Mr Virgo. This includes recorded comments by Mr Lee on 30 January this year about difficulties in negotiations with Mr Virgo over the rental Zhen Yun would pay for use of the Marineland site administered by the trust. I quote Mr Lee's words as follows:

It is ridiculous. When you are in business and you negotiate with one person and you ask for one dollar and somebody give you two dollars and he suddenly jumps up to four dollars.

This was a reference to Mr Virgo's habit of constantly shifting his negotiating position. There are also recorded comments by Mr Henry Oh of the Department of State Development and Technology on 1 February this year, when he said of attempts to get the agreement of the West Beach Trust:

We had a meeting yesterday with Mr Virgo, who couldn't agree with the latest offer—negotiations have always been difficult.

The Opposition is willing to put this information before a suitably independent investigation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, the honourable member is able to ask his question because we have extended the time for questions to cover the time lost when the Oppo-

sition piked out of bringing this matter on for direct debate. Members opposite have these vital questions: we are happy to hear them, so we will have a full Question Time. It is interesting that Opposition members, in these further questions, are apparently going to cast their net much more widely, and now we have come to the Chairman of the West Beach Trust. I hope that there are a few citizens out there who are beginning to wonder when their number will come up in this Parliament, because that is the way this Opposition operates. All I can understand from what the member for Light is saying is that one party to a transaction is claiming that he is dealing with a pretty tough negotiator. All of us who know the Chairman of the West Beach Trust in his public life and elsewhere would know that that is correct: he is a tough negotiator and would be driving a hard bargain—but he would be straight as a die. That is his reputation on all sides of politics and in the community at large.

Therefore, I see nothing to investigate or question in a description of transactions made by one side of a negotiating process. What bearing or relevance does it have to the central issues in this matter? These issues are the fate of a dolphinarium at West Beach—the dolphinarium that the Opposition wants: it wants to have the hoops and fire show down there—and the question of whether or not the Government instructed a developer to have a certain type of development—which is not true and has been established as being not true. This sort of thing is peripheral, and I am sorry that people who are not in this place to answer for themselves will be caught up in this debate. We in this place are quite happy to answer for ourselves. At the moment, of course, we do not have to, because the Opposition will not move against us and will make sure that at least one of the parties is away when it does.

URANIUM PROCESSING

Mr RANN (Briggs): My question is to the Premier. Are any forms of uranium processing outlawed in South Australia? On 14 September the Leader of the Opposition announced his Party's mines and energy policy and backing for a centrifuge plant to be established in South Australia—apparently at some location well to the north of South Australia. However, the Leader of the Opposition did not specify the location nor the South Australia port from which canisters of highly radioactive material would be transported. I understand that the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Peacock) has failed to endorse the South Australian Party's policy in this area.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That would involve a range of processes—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Murray-Mallee may be a strong advocate of this nuclear policy the Opposition has adopted.

Mr Lewis: Very strong.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is his right and prerogative to argue that out in the community. We happen to disagree with that policy, and the concept of a nuclear power plant in South Australia is not one we accept. But for the Leader of the Opposition to say, 'Yes, this is what we are going to move to,' suggests that he has ignored a number of factors, not the least of which is the attitude of the Federal Government, which will be required to give any approval if this is to go ahead.

In fact, it is quite clear that the current Federal Government would not give such approval. If it were a Government

led by Mr Peacock, it is equally clear that such approval would not be given. In fact, the Federal spokesman (Senator Puplick) has said that a nuclear power plant in Australia is not viable for a variety of reasons, primarily economic. So, this little bit of a hoax on the public, if one can see such a reckless policy as such, was obviously not researched by the Leader.

I found even more extraordinary his reference to the intention of a Liberal Government to move to a uranium conversion and enrichment plant. This was said as if it were something about which the Government of the day makes a decision and it happens. What the leader did not say and has not made clear to the public is that, in fact, that is prevented from happening by an Act passed by this Parliament. Indeed, the clause in the Act which prevents this happening was not moved by someone on our side of politics—although we supported it—it was moved by the then Government whose members now sit in Opposition. It was, in fact, moved by the member for Coles, who was concerned to ensure that the conversion and enrichment of uranium was specifically excluded from the Radiation Protection and Control Act. She said:

In order to put it beyond doubt, the amendments are made—it was moved as an amendment, even further underlining the desire of the Liberal Opposition not to go down this track—

specifically to exclude, not to include, and to make clear that this Bill does not cover those processes.

Later she said:

This clause makes clear that a conversion or enrichment plant cannot be established until such time as proper legislative controls are in place.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Are you saying that you have changed your views since then? Is that the position that the honourable member takes?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier cannot refer directly in that way to members on the other side and the member for Coles should not have been interjecting in the first place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: She was indicating to me that she has changed her mind and supports her Leader's policy of going pell-mell into uranium conversion and enrichment, and on down the nuclear cycle track. I hope that she stands up and tells that loudly and clearly, particularly to the green or conservation lobby that she has been so keen to cultivate lately.

MARINELAND

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): In view of the Premier's refusal to initiate an independent investigation into evidence that the Minister of State Development and Technology has misled Parliament, will he have immediate discussions with Mr Gary Chapman and Mr Lawrence Lee of Zhen Yun so they can explain whether or not they told the Tribond company in February this year that the Government did not want the Marineland redevelopment to proceed because of opposition from unions and Greenpeace and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting that the honourable member's question is fully typed out, and he has been sitting there and hanging on to it through Question Time. He referred to my refusal to hold an independent investigation. If he anticipated that response, I wonder why he bothered with questions. The fact is that I do not believe that I have any reason to question the individuals con-

cerned. There is nothing exciting or dramatic about these so-called transcripts of hearsay opinion that the Opposition has produced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am interested in ensuring that the proposed development takes place. I understand the Opposition's position: it is determined that it shall not take place. It will be answerable to the people of South Australia, accordingly.

PODIATRY SERVICES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Health consult with the Health Commission to ascertain whether podiatry services for the elderly are adequately organised in the southern area? Recently the Minister announced an increase in funding for podiatry of \$150 000, which is certainly welcome. However, a recent experience I had in my electorate office would indicate that possibly organisation is not all that it should be in the southern area. In trying to assist an elderly lady of 75 years to obtain podiatry service, I discovered after a long time and after telephoning many agencies, that there did seem to be gaps in this area.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I shall be pleased to do that. This is an important service, and we believe that the initiative of making additional funds available will be applauded by many people, particularly by the more elderly people in the community who often have recourse to these services. I will be concerned to ensure that there is a proper spread of availability of the service, and I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. I will certainly take it up with the commission.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: MINISTER OF STATE DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the Leader of the Opposition to move, without notice, a motion of no confidence in the Minister of State Development and Technology.

Motion carried.

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

That the time allotted for this debate be not later than 4.45 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in view of the statements of the Minister of State Development and Technology, which have clearly misled Parliament and the public, this House no longer has confidence in him and calls on him to resign.

What we saw today at the start, or immediately after the first question, was the tactic of the Government. The Government knew it was in trouble on this issue: it knows that it is in trouble on this issue. How do you deflect the issue, how do you muddy the water; how do you blur the issue for media reporting tonight; and how do you deflect it away from the real core of the issue? It is by having a debate in the middle of questions, first, to try to block out part of Question Time; secondly, it is to take it away from the real substance of the questions today, the real substance of this motion. The fact is that the Minister has deliberately on

several occasions misled this House, the Estimates Committee, and this Parliament. It will be established without doubt that that is the case. The Opposition saw the Government attempt to gag it in Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Government attempted to gag us from asking specific and legitimate questions in today's Question Time. The Government wanted to get the matter on as a motion, to debate it straight away without specific questions asked so that it could blur the issue. In that way its responses would be general and they would have had nothing to do with the specifics of the case. The Opposition decided not to cop that, and decided to push on with its questions so that immediately after Question Time we would put the motion for the debate. We decided to have the motion put today—there were no worries about that.

However, I want to put the position on the record clearly and concisely, because the Premier just happens to be going to the Yorke Peninsula field days in no official capacity, I might add. The Yorke Peninsula field days are open today, not tomorrow. As the Premier said in the paper, he is visiting a couple of farms in Kadina. They are good farms in Kadina, and I can give him a guarantee on that. I remind the Premier that when there is an issue of this importance before this Parliament, his responsibility and duty is to be here in Parliament. It was my duty today. I was asked and had accepted to attend the opening of the Northern Yorke Peninsula field trials today and, as a person who has been involved with those field days for the past 15 years and as someone who has exhibited there for the past 10 or 12 years, I have an understanding of how important they are. However, my priority today was to be here and to take up to the Government this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Briggs to cease interjecting, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition—although he is not the only member who errs in this regard—to not speak with his back turned toward the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We are willing to debate the motion today, but we wanted to have Question Time today as well. I remind the House that, previously when we have asked the Government without notice to suspend Standing Orders in order to move a motion straight away, it has always said 'No, that is not right. What you have to do is go through the procedures of Standing Orders and give due notice and due regard.' That meant the debate would be tomorrow. Let us have none of this nonsense.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright has a point of order.

Mr ROBERTSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A few moments ago you requested the Leader of the Opposition not to turn his back on you, and since then he has not faced you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order, but I remind all members that the direction I gave to the Leader of the Opposition applies to everyone when they are making a contribution in this Chamber. If possible, they should present their best profile to the Chair. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: The tactics of the Government during Question Time were to gag the questions that we wanted to put with specific explanations to try to get specific answers from the Government. The Government wanted to blur the issue and muddy the waters. We all know what the Minister of State Development and Technology is like—if you ask him to talk about anything he says nothing and takes an hour to do so. What we wanted to do was get some specifics and not let the Minister drone on, as is his wont—and everybody

in this Parliament knows his capacity to drone on and kill any issue at any time.

I want to respond to what the Premier said about Mr Abel and Zhen Yun having a vested interest and not being independent—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Mr Oh.

Mr OLSEN: And Mr Oh, an officer of the Department of State Development and Technology, who has given veracity to what we put before Parliament today. The Premier today said that they are not independent and that they are liars. Although we have tape recordings and transcripts, the Premier says that they are all liars, and that the Government is right. Well, let us test that point. Let the Premier institute an independent investigation and call Mr Abel, Mr Chapman, and Mr Lee from Zhen Yun, and let them give the independent investigator information. I challenge you to do that. If you say that they are lying—and you are trying to tell the House and the media they are lying—then you front up and have an independent investigation and call them as witnesses. The Premier should call them as witnesses and let them tell the independent investigation what the truth of the matter is and the truth of the matter is that the Minister has repeatedly and consistently misled this Parliament not only in Question Time but also during the Estimates Committee as well. Why would the Minister—someone whom I have always given absolute credit as an individual—be forced into misleading this Parliament? He is the last person on that bench I would have expected to do that.

Let us trace a bit of history. The Government entered into a \$9 million Government guarantee with Tribond to redevelop Marineland. The Deputy Premier wrote to Tribond and said that it could have dolphins and that it was entitled to capture more dolphins because the Government knew the viability of the project was based on its being able to capture more dolphins; and that the Government would persist and guarantee Tribond that the project would go ahead. This Government entered into an agreement with Tribond and gave it every encouragement to come here and set up, and nominated the Abel family as being of high repute in animal husbandry and in the care of dolphins.

What happened in the meantime? The agreement was entered into and, subsequently, the State ALP convention intervened. I will read to the House what that ALP convention stated. It is as follows:

Convention supports the conclusions and recommendations of the Report of the Senate Select Committee on Animal Welfare, Dolphins and Whales in Captivity. Convention calls upon the State Government to implement these recommendations and, as a first step, to move to ban the import or capture of Cetacea in South Australia . . .

This is happening in the meantime. Let us keep this clearly in perspective. It also states:

In view of the 1986 State conventions policy on dolphins, this State convention directs Cabinet to revoke all permits issued for the capture and importation of dolphins into South Australia, and to initiate an urgent inquiry into the financial backers of the proposed Marineland developments and their appropriateness as managers of dolphins in captivity.

So, the ALP convention intervened and stated that this was not on, that it knew the Government had entered into this agreement but that the convention wanted the Government to get out of it. Then, there were the union bans—and many unions bans were applied in relation to this particular project. During the Estimates Committee the Minister said that he was not aware of any union bans. What an absolute farce and nonsense that was. Obviously, he does not listen to radio, watch television, or read newspapers—and he does not read his own correspondence. The fact is that that was

a totally inaccurate answer. Let me quote some correspondence to the House, as follows:

The third issue of significant importance relates to the current union bans which apply on all development of Marineland. Those bans were imposed prior to the ALP State convention and again this is a matter which could well sway the decision of potential investors. We therefore seek your urgent assistance in the commencement of the negotiations with the relevant union bodies, with a view to having these bans lifted.

That correspondence came from the Minister's department asking him, as Minister, to take on the unions over the bans—and he has the audacity to tell this Parliament that he is not aware of any union bans. What an absolute nonsense: what an absolute farce. Once again, the Minister has not got it right. We have many examples of headlines about dolphins not being—

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Briggs to order. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: We will ignore the fabricator from the back bench. We know his credibility amongst journalists and that he takes pages out of reports and stamps them confidential. So, the ALP State convention intervened and directed the Government to get out of this development. Union bans were applied, and the Government was not prepared to take on its union mates.

So, what did Cabinet decide to do—scuttle the Abel family, a small trading company—say that it is irrelevant and that the Government would pay them out and have them sign a heads of agreement that contained a secrecy clause so that they would never be able to tell anyone after the event. The Government decided to spend \$6 million of taxpayers' money and shunt the Abels off. In that way it overcame the problem of the union bans. The Government decided to bring in someone else to redevelop the site—that was the plan devised by Cabinet.

Then, the poor hapless Minister of State Development and Technology was deputised to go out and do the work—scuttle the project, pull the rug from underneath the Abel family. And that is what has happened since February this year—the Minister has been the fall guy for the Government. We know the Premier was involved in it because of a taped conversation between senior officers of the Department of State Development and Technology and other interested parties.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Oh, yes you did. You were not listening. This proves the point: they do not listen to half the questions we ask; they just give an answer that is convenient. If the Premier had listened to the questions that we asked today he would have clearly identified that an officer of the Department of State Development and Technology clearly implicated him as having made the final decision about whether Marineland could or could not be redeveloped. What the Government devised was a scheme to say that the Abel family could not proceed because the project was no longer profitable. The reason it was no longer profitable was that it had to close down and its cash flow ceased; and the reason for that is that the Abels were sold a pup by the West Beach Trust, under the direct guidance and responsibility of the Minister.

It had asbestos in it to start with, and the Abels were not told that. It had structural problems, rust, and the filtration plant had to be renovated and replaced. This meant that it was not safe for the public. The Abels were told they had to shut it down, and as a result they had no cash flow. This is the pup they were sold by the West Beach Trust, on behalf of the Government, which has ultimate responsibility. So, they were in this difficult position and sought and

got from the Government some carry-on finance. Since then, the Government has devised a scheme to get rid of the Abels, and pay them out of taxpayers' funds.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Shut them up forever.

Mr OLSEN: To shut the Abels up, so that they could never explain.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Premier says that that is not right. Let me quote some of the correspondence to prove that it is right. Sandra Eccles, the Acting Director, stated:

... the Minister is desirous of making public the amounts paid to you under the terms of the agreement and other relevant details of the terms of agreement ...

Corrs, the Australian solicitors acting for some of the parties, wrote back and said:

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.

In other words, take the muzzle off them; let them speak up; let them answer the questions of the media in relation to this project. The letter goes on:

You will no doubt be aware that our clients have been repeatedly warned by the receiver, Mr John Heard ... that any public comments by them on this or any other issue relating to Marineland will result in their immediate dismissal. We therefore seek your written assurance that public comments by our clients will not result in their termination of employment.

So, they said, 'We don't mind you telling everybody how much we have been paid as long as we can now speak up, as long as we, the Abel family, can now respond publicly to these circumstances, as long as we can now tell our side of the story.' What did Ms Eccles say in response to that? She said:

It is inappropriate that your clients should be able to comment unilaterally in those circumstances in view of their agreement on confidentiality.

In other words, yes, we can let the figures go but you are not allowed to say anything to anyone on any subject or to pass on any information to anyone in relation to Marineland. The gag was still being applied. That letter was dated 11 August this year. Then Corrs wrote back to the Minister and said:

We reject your assertion that Mr Heard's ongoing threats of dismissal are merely a matter between him and our clients. Arthur Anderson have advised our clients that they have a consultancy arrangement with the Government to act in this matter, and therefore they must surely be subject to reasonable directions from Government. The fact is that our clients have been unfairly 'muzzled' on all Marineland issues ...

That was the reply from the solicitors acting on behalf of these parties. Let us have none of this nonsense of saying that they were not muzzled. Clearly they have been. They wanted to speak up. They wanted the opportunity to tell their side of the story to the public of South Australia, and they are entitled to that. This involves some \$6 million of taxpayers' funds, which money was spent to get the unions and Greenpeace off the back of the Government. In the process the Government has scuttled the Abel family and has brought into question the reputation of members of that family, which should be above and beyond doubt in this community. We have also had the Premier saying that these three independent people do not know when they are telling the truth.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Including one of his own officers.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, including one of his own officers, I might add—so that makes four. An officer within the Department of State Development and Technology has confirmed in a telephone conversation what Mr Lee and Mr

Chapman from Zhen Yun have said, and certainly what Mr Abel has said, and that is that the Government is covering up this matter, because it has been caught out. We all know that when you tell a half-truth to start off with you then have to tell another one, and then another, and another, in order to keep covering up. That is what has happened here. This whole matter, in terms of misleading Parliament, hinges on who decided to bail out of Marineland or the oceanarium for the dolphins. Who decided to bail out? The transcripts that I have read on to the record during Question Time, and those read by some of my colleagues today, clearly indicate who decided to bail out of Marineland. It was the Government and the Cabinet who decided to bail out. It was not Zhen Yun. Zhen Yun has said that for two weeks it tried to get agreement from the Government for it to go ahead with the proposal, to include the oceanarium. A letter of 6 February gives veracity to the statements I have made:

We have been instructed by our client to indicate that the firm consent of the Department of State Development and Technology to our clients' original proposals in relation to Tribond has not been forthcoming as required.

In other words, by not giving agreement and encouragement, the Government took away the option for this redevelopment to take place, including the oceanarium for the dolphins at Marineland. The Minister has said that he did not pressure, nor direct, nor blackmail Zhen Yun out of it. However, what we have put on record clearly demonstrates that the Government did. There are a number of extracts of interview, and let us look at those, because they contradict what has been said.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Is the Premier worried that I am taking too much time now.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Go for your life.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you. We can have another go tomorrow, if you like; if members are prepared to stay here and debate this matter of importance we will have another go tomorrow.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides of the House to cooperate in relation to one of the most serious motions that can be put before a House. I particularly ask for the cooperation of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: The documentation provided today contains information showing that the Minister of State Development and Technology has persistently misled Parliament on the key points of whether it was the Government or Zhen Yun which decided that the Marineland redevelopment should not proceed. The documents that I have referred to clearly substantiate the facts. They include a lawyer's letter that I have just read, from the legal representatives of Zhen Yun to the Tribond legal representatives. This was a letter dated 27 January this year, only a fortnight before the project was scrapped. That demonstrates Zhen Yun's continuing interest in proceeding with the Marineland redevelopment. Zhen Yun consistently said that it wanted to proceed, that it had pressured the Government for weeks, that it wanted an answer from the Government but could not get one.

It said that the Government would not give it a commitment that Marineland could be redeveloped. Clearly, the facts are beyond doubt. There are taped transcripts of those conversations. I have a file of all the conversations that have been held since early January this year in relation to this matter. This relates to the telephone conversations between the various parties and the Department of State Development.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Which parties?

Mr OLSEN: 'Which parties?' the Premier asks. I have already said who they are; they are the interested parties in this whole deal—Zhen Yun, the Abels, the whole lot. They have already been quoted, and yet the Premier asks which parties.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Members opposite do not like this because they have been caught out. Clearly, the position is that the Government, and in particular the Minister of State Development and Technology on behalf of the Government, has misled this Parliament. He had a Cabinet direction—he might have not liked it, but he fulfilled it, and in doing so misled this Parliament and the public of South Australia. There can be no greater condemnation on a member of this House than that which relates to misleading the House—and repeatedly in this case. The Government has been caught out on this issue. Let us put this to the test right in the lap of the Premier.

The Premier can have this thing sorted out once and for all. Let us take it out of this arena and put it in the hands of an independent investigator, and let Mr Abel, Mr Lee, Mr Chapman, Mr Oh, Ms Eccles, and others, come before an independent inquiry and give evidence. I will abide by its decision and its recommendations and findings—because I know what such an inquiry would find. The Government would not like it. That is why the Premier said that there would be no inquiry or investigation, but that was not on. That is why he wanted to get on with a no-confidence motion and to get away from questions. It was to once again blur the issue. So, the test is yours, Mr Premier. Do you want to put this beyond doubt, or don't you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat for a moment. I remind members on both sides that even though in practical terms it may be a fiction, nevertheless, remarks should be addressed through the Chair, and members should not refer to each other across the Chamber as 'you'. This applies both to the Leader who is at present making his contribution and to the Premier who is interjecting. I would ask members on my right to show the same courtesies to members on my left when they are participating in debate as they would expect when they are contributing to a debate. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier has also issued a challenge to me today as to my position in relation to dolphins at Marineland. I will run through that because I am more than happy to tell him my views. He put out the challenge two or three times, not in answering the question but in talking about dolphins with red balls on their nose, jumping through fire rings, etc., trying to deflect and get away from the emotive issue rather than the substance of the motion before the House.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Pretty clearly the king of fudge. There was an attempt to whip up a great deal of emotion on this issue. We have seen that again today with the Premier's responding to the initial question. It was important originally to Tribond to have a guarantee that dolphins could be captured to maintain the viability of the project because they did not know the health of the animals in Marineland. That guarantee was given by the South Australian Government in correspondence, publicly and, I think, in answer to questions in this Parliament. It said that it would be prepared to follow through on that matter.

We know that some of the dolphins were maltreated and in poor health at the time of the takeover. The Minister for Environment and Planning well knows that in her capacity when she had evidence put before her several years ago that

clearly dolphins had been maltreated in Marineland. However, with the expertise of animal husbandry of the Abel family, they have been able to begin a breeding program, and even the Government initially acknowledged the capacity, ability and integrity of the Abel family, but that has now been put to one side. We all know that young dolphins from time to time stranded at sea also come to Marineland for rehabilitation. It is often inappropriate to send them back to sea because, simply, they would not survive. So, through breeding, rehabilitation—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Buttons just happens to be pregnant at the moment, if the Minister had not noticed. The viability of that marine park could be maintained without the need to capture further dolphins. The parties have been talking for some time with people wanting to pursue this project, and there is strong interest in maintaining a marine park at that site as our second major tourist attraction in this State. That is something we will continue to pursue in Government and we will continue discussions with these people, because it is important. It is an important project and tourist attraction for South Australia, and we will continue on that track. That responds specifically to what the Premier has asked.

Returning to the motion, today we have established irrefutable evidence, we have tabled in Parliament and repeated it publicly, that four independent people have demonstrated clearly that the Minister misled this Parliament. It is irrefutable evidence that you cannot walk away from. If the Premier wants to discard and ignore that evidence, he does so at his own peril. Let him put it before an independent inquiry or commission and let it make the findings publicly. We will then see who is telling the truth—whether it is the Minister and the Government, or the four people out there who are bearing the brunt of this Government's decision.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier): There is no question who is telling the truth, nor whose integrity, which has been questioned at present, is beyond question. In a period of more than 20 years involved in public affairs in one way or another in this State, many things might be said about the Minister of State Development and Technology, but I have never heard his integrity impugned. He has never put himself into a position whereby he is misleading or in any other way attempting to override his responsibilities as a Minister or show contempt to this Parliament. I defy anybody to produce evidence of that kind.

The Leader of the Opposition, untrained as he is in these things, purports to put before us the usual sorts of innuendo, hearsay, and smear in which this Opposition trades. That is not good enough when dealing with the Minister of State Development and Technology, and that is not good enough to support this motion. I say again, quite categorically, that the actions the Minister has taken in relation to this matter were actions taken with the full consent and consultation of his colleagues in Government; were properly conveyed to those persons with which the Government was dealing, irrespective of what others might be saying was alleged to have been said or not said; and that everything the Minister has put before this House and before the public has been accurate and not misleading.

They are the facts, and if the Minister had not been prepared to talk about this issue but had kept it under wraps or under cover, and had not raised it, then one might suggest that perhaps something wrong was going on. At each and every stage of this transaction—and the *Hansard* record can be examined to show it—the Minister has usually of his own volition placed statements before this House that made it clear what was going on. He has answered questions

directly. In fact, he was presented with a farcical list of 63 questions with a 'stand and deliver' demand the other day, and he responded to each and every one of them.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: To each and every one of them, he responded rapidly. Having done that publicly, he found that they had been repeated by this hard line questioning of the Opposition, wasting our time in this House. He had already answered them, but the Opposition asked them again. Its members thought that perhaps they could get a different answer, but they could not because the Minister had answered them truthfully and accurately to the best of his knowledge, based on the facts as he had them, and that has been his position throughout. If the Opposition expects us to see this ridiculous motion supported or carried in any way in the eyes of the public, then they do not understand the object of the motion and the standing in which the Minister is held. We have finally had this motion, and we have had it with the good grace of the Government that has been prepared to accept it and have it on—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition told us when he got to his feet, 'We have always intended to have this motion today.' That is what he said. That was funny, because the Deputy Leader, somewhat earlier in the proceedings, said that it was ridiculous to have this debate today. He argued that it should be tomorrow. He wanted it tomorrow, and the Leader of the Opposition is saying we should have it today. Well, a little bit of breathing space was needed so that the instructions could be collected, a few prompt sheets provided with a script in order to try to get the facts straight, and so we had this debate.

We knew what was going on. We knew the tactics that the Opposition had. It was going to ask these questions. It would ask them in the most sensational and misleading way, allow that to proceed, and try to get as much mileage out of it without actually having the courage to personally confront the Minister in the form of a motion. Indeed, I found subsequent to this little exercise that it was all flagged today in this afternoon's press because an article in a newspaper delivered to us states, 'New Liberal attack in dolphin row. Mr Olsen said today he would stay on the attack in Parliament, although he would not call for Mr Arnold's resignation.'

What sort of performance is that? It is pitiful! We know why. The Opposition knew—because it granted me a pair—that I would not be in the House tomorrow but would be many hundreds of miles away and, having asked their questions and done their trickle feed today, they could then jump to their feet tomorrow and give notice of a no-confidence motion, firm in the knowledge that I would not be able to get back to handle it. That is a great little tactic.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader said, 'We are going to have the motion tomorrow.' He told us that when we tried to have it today. He said, 'It is on tomorrow. This is the first we have heard about it.' He knew I would be safely out of the country. What would I be doing?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Sorry, out in the country.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is correct; it is in rural South Australia, a place that the Leader of the Opposition has not visited too often lately.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. When the Leader was making his contribution, I gave him

the protection of the Chair and asked members on my right not to interject. I ask members on my left to now show the same courtesy to the Premier as I requested of members on my right.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition tried to lecture me about my duty to be here in Parliament. He said that all I was going to do was visit a few farms. That is interesting. It is symptomatic of the interjection he made a minute ago. He has forgotten Kadina. The people at Kadina would be very interested in that. He has forgotten that he represents the rural electorate of Custance. He has forgotten that Paskeville is near Kadina and those cities. He has forgotten that this is one of the biggest field days held in Australia and that I have been specially invited to go there not to look at a few farms but to inspect various exhibits, to talk to the rural community, to be present at a luncheon to which I have been specifically invited and, yes indeed, to inspect a few farms.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Do not bother to defend him. The member for Victoria demeans himself by trying to protect him on this. The man who perhaps aspires to be the Leader has just seen the fleet flight to the city by the Leader of the Opposition, forgetting where he comes from, forgetting all that he has said about the importance of these areas and dismissing it by saying 'visiting a few farms.' I do not have to be reminded of my duty to be in Parliament. It would only be for an important engagement that I felt it was necessary in the circumstances to accept, with the courtesy of the Opposition through the pair system, that I would do so, and I might add that it is a deal more important than a country race meeting, which the Leader of the Opposition attended without appearing in Parliament on one occasion last year. It is a bit more important than that. If the motion of no confidence was on, and I knew about it, I would be here; do not worry about that.

Why today? Let us look at the motion that the Leader of the Opposition has moved. The Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion which at last frontally tackles the issue. I note that it asks the Minister of State Development and Technology to stand aside. I have been listening to the Leader of the Opposition's speech, and much of it was about the integrity of the Minister, but that he cannot be believed in this instance. That seems rather at odds. He then said that the Minister was the hapless victim of Cabinet or the Government, carrying out the mischievous instructions of the Government. In that case, why is he being asked to stand aside? It ought to be a no-confidence motion against the Government as a whole. No, the focus is on the Minister because it suits the Opposition to try to play the person in that way. Opposition members will have it both ways in their argument. Either the Minister is responsible, as the motion suggests, or he is not.

The answer, as I stated at the beginning, is that the Minister, in exercising his ministerial authority, has done so with the full backing and support of the Government of which he is a member, and he has done it very well indeed. All the putdowns about droning on, and so on, were an attempt to cover up the complete disarray of the Opposition on this issue, thinking that it was going to have this marvellous evidence that was to prove categorically that the Minister of State Development and Technology had misled the Parliament. It does nothing of the sort. It is not direct reporting of what the Minister says or what the Government says, and that is the prime aim of any evidence. That is the only time when that evidence is properly admissible in terms of proof, and it is about time that some members of the Opposition learnt those lessons.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to quote ALP policy. It is true that that policy was formulated at a time when the approval had been issued to the Abels to undertake the Tribond development of Marineland. It was made abundantly clear that the approval for Tribond remained valid, despite the policy that had been enunciated. If circumstances changed, if that development was not going ahead and other developments were sought to be promoted, that policy would apply. We do not back away from that policy. I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition quoted it. It is true that this Government does not have a policy that supports dolphinarium. We believe, along with the Senate Select Committee report, the various other inquiries and a large proportion of the community, including the member for Coles by her admission today on radio, that we should keep these creatures in the wild. They should not be there performing tricks for the amusement of human beings.

The approvals that have been given were approvals that we were prepared to honour, and we did honour. Indeed, we went further; we said that those approvals could be transferred to Zhen Yun. Anybody undertaking that sort of development in the climate of public opinion—public opinion ignored by the Opposition, which wants these sorts of facilities—would have had to have regard to the long-term viability of such an establishment. That made commercial sense to a newcomer on the scene, Zhen Yun, in looking at what it had to do and what the possibilities were. It made a lot of sense to gauge community feeling, to understand the difficulties and problems and eventually to say to the Government, 'We will proceed with a different sort of development.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It was as simple as that. As I have already put on the record, the Minister conveyed to it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—our decision that, if it wished to proceed with the dolphinarium component, it could do so; that approval would continue. He also, rightly and properly, pointed out some of the problems involved. No-one can deny those problems. Is it not commercially sensible to make those points? Why would we mislead the proponents of the project? They took their own soundings, too. They are not silly. They are commercially capable. They took their own soundings and came back with a proposition that did not include the dolphinarium. That proposition has been approved, and that is the one that the Opposition is trying to gun down. That is what Opposition members are after. They want to see the withdrawal of Zhen Yun from the project. And I have said nothing to suggest that the Abel family are incompetent in handling or caring for animals and dolphins; I have the highest respect for their abilities in those areas. It may be different if one talks about their financial viability and their ability to service and finance the ambitious project that they had undertaken, and that obviously they could not do.

But, when newcomers come along, they have to take the soundings and make that decision. The Opposition wants them out. It has done everything. It has even raised the fact that this is a Hong Kong-based company, hoping to whip up a bit of prejudice against foreign investment, particularly from Asia. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Coles have raised that issue. They have raised questions: what is the origin of these people? The member for Hanson has said that they are foreign; they are from outside. Zhen

Yun—the very name itself sounds strange. The Opposition wants them out, and it is doing its best to get them out in the most unscrupulous and outrageous way. I sincerely hope that Zhen Yun will not get out, because it has a good project. We support it and it will benefit our community, and that is clear.

As regards the details of the proposition of Tribond and its failure, we have not put the whole story down on the record, because commercial and other considerations are involved. But we made clear the basis on which Zhen Yun wants to proceed and what is going. It is not clearly beyond doubt, as the Leader of the Opposition would say. It is not because he has a file; the file is meaningless. It deals with interested parties, and so on. All this innuendo, leading to the call for an inquiry, is meant to imply and put the worst possible complexion on it. The attack has changed. The target has been a shifting one in terms of what the Opposition is trying to do. The central issue, as I have said, is the dolphinarium, its future, and dolphins in captivity.

I have made our policy clear. The Leader of the Opposition, having stalled for time to get his script so that he could put some words on the record (and it was not very convincing at all; I look forward to what he will say at the weekend)—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will come to the member for Coles in a minute, as she knows. That is the central issue. Zhen Yun's decision not to proceed with an oceanarium after taking into account all the factors, the local opposition and worldwide trends against those facilities, is a reasonable decision and one that the Government was prepared to deal with. Indeed, we pointed out some of these difficulties to Zhen Yun.

I come back to the central issue: if they had said, 'No, Minister, we want to continue on the same basis; we think we can make a go of it and we want to call to account those approvals,' that would have been done—there is no question of that. That would have been done and that was made clear to them. All the questions have been answered. I talked about the 'moving target'. Before, secrecy clauses was the big thing. What was the Minister hiding? Why was he calling in question this odd commercial confidentiality proposition? The fact is there are a number of parties involved in this, not just Tribond but a number of other creditors and organisations, and they have some rights in this matter, surely. One would have thought that Opposition members understood that, but they certainly do not.

An enormous amount of financial information has been put in, but we were told that in some way these confidentiality clauses were unusual or odd. The member for Coles said this morning that commercial lawyers had advised the Opposition and several sections of the media that they are not standard clauses. That is at odds with the statement this morning of the President of the Law Society when he said that confidentiality clauses in commercial agreements are not uncommon—and we all know that they are not uncommon. He went on to say that it is not uncommon for commercial parties to an agreement to recognise that information which is in agreement and has been provided by one of them might be confidential to their business and ought to be protected from being made public.

So, there is nothing sinister, odd or unusual about that. We then come to this whole question on which the member for Coles says she cannot speak for the Liberal Party, that the Leader of the Party will have to speak on that—the taking of these animals from the wild and the future of the dolphinarium. All this is an attempt by the Opposition to trade on an extremely difficult and, we agree, emotional

situation. The plight of those animals and the difficult problem of how to deal with them in a humane way, how to clear the way for an appropriate development on the Marineland site—that difficult problem has been addressed by the Minister. He has addressed it directly, openly and with full authority, and therefore to call for his suspension and an inquiry and the making of these allegations must be rejected totally by this House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Premier talked about everything except the defence of his hapless Minister. We have heard about a trip to Kadina and a couple of farms up there; we have heard the assertion that this man is above reproach; but in terms of dealing with the whole nub of this question, the fact is that the Premier has dodged the issue. The fact is that the Minister has clearly misled Parliament. Let me refresh the Minister's memory about what he said on 12 April:

The Government did not blackmail Zhen Yun nor did the Government put pressure on Zhen Yun to change its plan to delete an oceanarium from its proposal.

If that is correct, Mr Lee of Zhen Yun is telling lies to Mr Abel. It is perfectly plain from the transcript of the telephone conversation which took place that the Premier and the Minister are saying that the agent of Zhen Yun is a liar. That is the alternative. Here is Mr Abel, who has been mucked about by this Government, 'conned,' I guess is the word to use, into buying Marineland when the trust had a report suggesting that the building was faulty, taken on and given a lease. A program for redevelopment was put in place, and what happened? The unions put bans on it. The Minister suggests—and I have that transcript, too—as recently as last week that he was not aware. His words were, 'I am not aware of formal bans being placed on this project.' He must be about the only person in South Australia who was not aware of that fact. I suggest that if any member of the Government went outside this House and asked people, 'Do you recall union bans being placed on Marineland?' they would be hard pressed to find a member of the public who was not aware of that fact, yet here we have the Minister in charge of the project suggesting that he did not know that any bans had been placed on Marineland.

Let me refresh his memory on that point. It is not the main point I want to make: the main point is in relation to this transcript, which indicates quite clearly that either the Minister or Mr Lee is telling lies. It is one or the other; we cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Or Mr Oh.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Or Mr Oh of the Minister's own department. 'Dolphin Site Hit by Bans' is the fairly large headline in the newspaper; the article stated:

Union officials confirm the Building Trades Federation had placed bans on the site and the Australian Workers Union had supported the measures. However, the AWU had no members on the site. The union supported Greenpeace's objection to dolphins being held in captivity. Work on the site has stopped and there is not much we can do about it until the problem is cleared up.

We were asked to believe as late as last week that the Minister in charge did not know there were any bans. If that does not stretch the bounds of credibility, I do not know what does. But that is not the real nub of the question: the nub of the question is that in April the Minister said that the Government used no influence whatsoever to suggest that an oceanarium was not appropriate. Earlier conversations recorded, the veracity of which I do not think even the Government will challenge, indicate that that is patently untrue. Let me recount the transcript of the conversation. One of the parties to this dispute had the good

sense to record these conversations. It certainly was not illegal, as scrutiny of the Act will indicate. This is what Mr Abel said in a phone call to Mr Lawrence Lee on 3 February before the Minister made his statement in Parliament in April. The transcript of the conversation is as follows:

Abel: Just calling to remind you that the day is drawing to a close here and ask what time we are settling?

Abel was up in the air: he had not been told what the deal was and had been led to believe that the project was going ahead. It continues:

Lee: Did the Department of State Development call you up?

Abel: Yes. They didn't know what you were doing.

Lee: They didn't tell you anything what is happening on the decision?

Abel: No.

Lee: There is obvious a little problem on their side [State Development and Government]. What they call us yesterday may be because I want to be open with you . . .

This is Lee being open with Abel:

. . . they want us to consider not to develop the Marineland.

Either Lee or the Minister is lying: it is perfectly clear.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Either Lee is lying or the Minister is lying. It is as plain as that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader knows that that particular remark is considered completely unparliamentary when it is a reference to a member of this House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In relation to the Minister, I must withdraw it. I realise that: one must use other words. But I think everybody has the drift of the point I am making.

The SPEAKER: Order! It does not necessarily rectify an error of that nature in this House, or any other Parliament for that matter, to simply substitute other words. Remarks regarding the veracity of a member of this House are not permitted, full stop. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me repeat what Mr Lee said:

There is obvious a little bit problem on their side [the Government and State Development]. What they call us yesterday may be because I want to be open with you is they want us to consider not to develop the Marineland.

This was in February, prior to the Minister's April statement. I continue:

Abel: They can't do that because there are permits, licences and town planning permits, to do that, so they can't actually not do it.

Poor old Abel was out there swinging under the understanding that it was going to go ahead. They had agreements. The transcript continues:

Abel: They disapprove the takeover? On what basis?

Lee: They didn't say on what basis. They just say because of the Greenpeace and the union bans. They suggest it is not appropriate for us to be involved in the development of Marineland.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is a transcript of a telephone conversation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: These are the actual words. There is a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It continues:

Abel: Not appropriate for you to be involved with the development of Marineland?

Lee: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat for a moment. I remind members—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister for Environment and Planning is out of order. I remind members on both sides that parliamentary courtesy is a two-way process.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a conversation where poor old Mr Abel or one of his family is trying to ascertain what in the dickens is going on with this Government. They have been told the project is going to proceed and they are desperately seeking information from Zhen Yun, the principals. Mr Lee of Zhen Yun, is telling them:

I am sorry, haven't you had a ring from State Development? Because there is a problem. The Government are telling us that we have to drop Marineland.

The Leader quoted the other sections of the letter earlier. Let me repeat the 3 February conversation of Mr Lee and Mr Abel, as follows:

Yes, we have been chasing them about their concern for two weeks—

this is State Development—

I myself talked to John Frogley at least 10 times and I also talked to the Deputy Director of their department, Miss Sandra Eccles, several times, and I also talked to Lynn Arnold the Minister twice about this matter and they didn't give us a clear indication what's . . .

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it is a transcript of a phone conversation which was legally taped.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is an accurate transcript of a taped conversation in February before the Minister made his statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg and other members will cease interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In the transcript Mr Abel then interjected, as follows:

What you are saying to me is—the only question that is stopping us is government have requested that it is not appropriate for the Marineland to be developed because of Greenpeace . . .

Then Mr Lee said:

The Government suggests that due to the pressure movement of the union and Greenpeace, and they ask us to reconsider the proposal.

Either Mr Lee or Mr Oh is a liar. Mr Oh states:

The Premier wanted to work through what has been discussed and . . . once he has made up his view then the Minister would be in a position to talk about the project with Zhen Yun.

We are asked to believe by the Minister that he did not know that there were any union bans on the project. He must have been in cloud cuckoo land on one of his overseas trips as Minister of State Development and Technology. The Minister would be the only South Australian citizen who did not know that the unions have cost South Australian taxpayers no less than \$6 million. Here is the Minister suggesting that he did not know that it would cost taxpayers about \$6 million-plus concerning the Marineland scandal where the union bans—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is \$6 million. The unions had put bans on this project and the Australian Labor Party for the third time in three years—the ALP conference is controlled by the unions, let us not kid ourselves, because the ALP conference passed a motion directing Cabinet to scuttle the project. The Premier, in reply to what the Leader put to the House today, talked about his trip to the north; he can talk about what he likes, but he cannot get around the facts. I suggest that he read this

morning's *Advertiser* editorial, which talks about a smell. I would say that this is very smelly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government is calling Mr Lee a liar. The Government is calling Zhen Yun's negotiator a liar.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government persists in the view that the Minister's reply on 12 April was correct, but this is what he stated:

The Government did not blackmail Zhen Yun nor did the Government put pressure on Zhen Yun to change its plan to delete an oceanarium from its proposal.

If that is the case, then Mr Lee is telling lies. Let me wind up by quoting the *Advertiser* editorial as follows:

The Minister of State Development and Technology, Mr Arnold, has got himself and the State Government into an extraordinary mess of apparent duplicity and financial blackmail. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money have been unaccountably thrown at Marineland as the Government tries to cover up incompetence, inaction and obsequious bowing to union pressures.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that any member of the public who is informed in this matter would most certainly concur with those sentiments.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I am amazed that the Opposition has chosen to go on and on about this project, while refusing to listen to the extensive answers that I have given on many occasions. It is clear that the Leader and other members of the Opposition prefer to reinterpret the facts as they have had them given to them as being a droning on by me. My efforts have been to provide as much information as possible to the House, to the Estimates Committee, and to other fora about the issue of Marineland.

The Opposition is making a number of serious allegations—allegations they are. First, it has made the allegation about who made the decision to cancel Marineland. Secondly, it has suggested that I or the Department of State Development and Technology have dragooned other parties into signing an agreement against their will, and they have made other assertions about how we have handled the proceedings of the development with Zhen Yun.

I make a number of points about this matter. First, it needs to be clearly understood that I have not misled the House. All the information that I have given to this House is consistent and is a correct reflection of the facts available to me. Let me go through some of them. Before going into one of those areas, I want to come to the issue of the Government's commitment undertaken previously to allow the issuing of permits for the taking of cetacea and the granting of that to the Tribond Corporation. That was carried on to the Zhen Yun proposal. I identify a number of issues in that respect. First, on 16 December last year a letter was sent from the Department of State Development and Technology to the Zhen Yun Corporation. In that letter Mr Rod Hartley, Director of State Development and Technology, stated:

I have been asked by the Minister of State Development and Technology to convey to you the South Australian Government's in-principle-support for your company's proposal to redevelop Marineland.

At that stage they had a Marineland component within their proposal. That commitment was on the basis of discussions that had taken place within the Government on that matter. Of course, it merely reiterated undertakings that I had given at the meeting I had with some Zhen Yun principals on 23

November when I was in Hong Kong. Those commitments were consistently reaffirmed, but it is also quite clear that there were community views on the matter of the propriety or otherwise of keeping cetacea in confined circumstances. Those views were being expressed in the community here and were known to the Zhen Yun Corporation and were also advised to the Zhen Yun Corporation that these people were expressing those views. It would have been improper not to let them know the diversity of opinion existing within the South Australian community on that matter.

Turning now to the issue of union bans and whether or not this matter was known by me, the Opposition has made a number of assertions on this matter this afternoon without actually looking at what I said in the Estimates Committee. The point I made in one of the replies was as follows:

The question of the bans as reported by media conjecture is something that we have not regarded as formal advice to us that a union ban is in place.

Just because I read in the newspaper, see on television, or hear on radio that there are allegedly union bans, does not mean that I am the recipient of a formal notice of a ban. In fact, I do not know that such things as a formal notice apply. The Leader and the Opposition are suggesting that I have been attempting to say that I had no knowledge of any bans. I have just quoted something that was read into the *Hansard* report of the Estimates Committee debate fully a week ago. The Opposition has chosen not to pay attention to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Another point is that Mr Rod Abel advised the department of this matter, and then called for ministerial action. That, too, was answered by me during the Estimates Committee in which it was made clear that the response given by the Director of State Development and Technology to Mr Abel's letter of 16 August—all the substance of the Director's letter—was on the commercial viability of the project. That was the real issue at hand, and had been the real issue at hand for quite some time prior to that.

It needs to be known that the Government was seriously concerned about the financial viability of the proposal and the taxpayers' funds that were considerably at risk. We had identified, with the Tribond Corporation, our concern for some time about that matter and that we could not allow a situation draining off Government funds to continue to put the Government at even greater exposure—an exposure, I remind the House, that with the recommendations of the bipartisan IDC was up to \$9 million. The Government could not allow that exposure to continue unfettered without an attempt to control what was happening in this situation. Indeed, a meeting was held between the Department of State Development and Technology and Mr Rodney Abel on 11 August last year to discuss the seriousness of the financial situation. At that meeting, the department had to advise the Tribond Corporation that we may be forced into a position of putting in a receiver-manager because of our serious concern about the financial viability of the project.

It might be that others may be attempting to talk about other situations as being the real cause of their particular difficulties—be it the state of the buildings or be it some union bans. But, the nub of the crisis was the financial viability question. Coming to the issue of the engineering reports, which I have answered previously in the House, I cannot still believe that someone investing in a major project would not have given it a thorough investigation and an inspection of the actual site. In any event, as I have identified to this House, the principals of the Tribond Corporation in fact undertook a substantive investigation

inspection of the actual site. If they are now trying to say that they were unaware of the state of those facilities, then I suggest that that reflects more on them and the way in which they go about their investigations of an investment nature than on anyone else.

Several other points were made. First, the issue of the firm commitment that the Department of State Development and Technology required, as was stated in some correspondence of the Zhen Yun Corporation. I have already answered that matter in this place and, in answering, I have indicated that there was no capacity for the Department of State Development and Technology to be called upon to give approval or otherwise. In that circumstance, that issue was a clear misunderstanding of the situation by the Zhen Yun Corporation, because there was no legitimate right for the department to say 'Yes' or 'No' to that particular aspect of the proposal.

The Leader is quoting hearsay evidence from some taped conversations on this matter. I think there are some very serious implications there, but let us look at what we actually have. What we have is this taped evidence of conversations between other parties and me—and I am the target of this no-confidence motion. It is interesting to note that when the Deputy Leader read some of the alleged transcripts of these conversations, one of the points he read into *Hansard* was that the Minister did not give a clear indication.

The Opposition says that I blackmailed, coerced, forced and pressured Zhen Yun yet, by reading into *Hansard* the alleged conversation, the Leader says that I am reported to have not given a clear indication. The reality is that, as I have said before, I had telephone conversations with Mr Lawrence Lee on 2 February and, as has been read into *Hansard*, I think by the member for Hanson on an earlier occasion (because he has this particular facsimile message), to which the Premier also referred, we clearly outlined where the onus of decision lay on the matter of any marineland development by Zhen Yun—the onus lay with the Zhen Yun Corporation to bring a proposal to the Government.

That has never been challenged as being a correct record of the conversation that actually took place between me and Mr Lawrence Lee on 2 February. Indeed, in that telephone conversation on 2 February when Mr Lawrence Lee said that they would be coming back with a proposal that did not include a marineland component, it is interesting to note that within hours a six page business plan on that proposal without a marineland was in our hands.

The Leader is suggesting that I picked up the phone, talked to Lawrence Lee and said, 'Look here, you cannot do this. We will not let you do it. I don't care what you say; we will not let you do it. You have to come up with another one.' So, Lawrence Lee says, 'Okay. We will take this on,' and he then has a detailed six page business plan in my hands within hours. Does the Leader suggest that no work was done on that by the Zhen Yun Corporation? What arrant nonsense. That clearly indicates that the answers I have given on the matter of who made the decision are the correct telling of the situation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —and I have no embarrassment at all in affirming what I said in my press releases of 13 February and 3 August this year and in my parliamentary statements of 14 February, 12 April, 5 September, and in the Estimates Committee on 20 September. They all say that I did not pressure, blackmail, cajole or make the decision for Zhen Yun; they all say that Zhen Yun made the decision. I stand by that, and I repeat it again in this place. Several other matters have also been raised by mem-

bers opposite and I draw attention to them. First, it is worthwhile noting—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader says that I have not told Parliament this. I have just given the dates on which I told Parliament that I did not cause Zhen Yun to make this particular decision. Let us come to the matter of the confidentiality clause and the fact that somehow we harassed people into signing these documents. The Deputy Leader, on television last night, I think said these people were 'frog marched' in on a Saturday without legal representation. The facts are that they did have legal representation, and that legal representation was performed very adequately, I am told, on their behalf in going through the clauses in great detail. The particular discussion between the officers of the Department of State Development and Technology and the principals of Tribond Corporation lasted many hours. What is supposed to have taken place in a many holed meeting other than detailed discussion about what should be in such an agreement?

The Leader raised the issue of the letter from the Deputy Director of the Department of State Development and Technology dated 11 August. I wish that his quoting of things were not too partial. He attempted to say that the Deputy Director reinforced a ban on the Abels not saying anything and tried to intimidate the Abels from saying anything. Let us read some of the points of the letter that I think were not drawn adequate attention to. The letter states:

As litigation has been commenced by you [the firm of solicitors] on behalf of some of your clients [the Tribond Corporation] it should be understood that established principles of parliamentary practice do not give the Minister the freedom to disclose all the relevant facts pertaining to this matter and surrounding circumstances. In that context [what the Deputy Director said] it is inappropriate that your clients should be able to comment unilaterally.

In fact, as members would know, I was quite willing to have correspondence with the other parties to the heads of agreement to see if we could release the amount that had been paid to them, and we received their concurrence to that and those figures were willingly made available to this House.

Indeed, other figures will be made available to the Parliament on all the other expenses that have been involved in this case. I was asked for that during the Estimates Committee, and I undertook to provide it by either 29 September or 6 October. I have not been delaying providing that. We have been getting that information together. It will be supplied in the time we have been asked to supply it.

The point I want to make again is that there was no harassing of people to force them to sign the documents. As to the question of whether or not a confidentiality agreement is a normal thing or a common thing to have, the Leader has again said that this is unprecedented. We had the President of the Law Society this morning put the lie to that. Quite clearly, it is not unprecedented. In relation to any of the agreements that the former Liberal Government signed with respect to the Roxby Downs agreement, the Hilton Hotel development, and other developments in this State, are members opposite telling me that there was no standard confidentiality clause in those agreements? Is that what they are saying? No, he is not saying it—the Deputy Leader shakes his head. The Deputy Leader is not saying that because he knows it to be true that the agreement that has appeared in this document is a standard type confidentiality clause.

I now deal with a series of other matters in relation to this. The question has been asked: why has the compensation been paid and why were the creditors paid? First of

all, under the Government guarantee, which I remind members of this place was recommended to the Government by the bipartisan Industries Development Committee of the Parliament—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Which they're trying to wreck.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Which they are well and truly trying to wreck. They seem to have absolutely no respect for the procedures of that committee and the evidence given before it. But that is an issue for another time. The Government was obligated to meet all of the commitments relating to the winding up of activities of Marineland involving creditors. As far as compensation to the Abels is concerned, Zhen Yun indicated that it would only proceed with discussions on the new development, which excluded the dolphinarium, if the Tribond matter was dealt with in a fair and equitable way. In addition to the absence of any alternative formal proposal to redevelop the site (a very important point), the Government felt it had a moral obligation to compensate the Abel family and assume the financial obligations of Tribond under the guarantee.

We then come to the question of the payments and to whom those payments have been made. As I have said, we will be providing detailed information, as asked for in the Estimates Committees and as volunteered by myself to be supplied at the appropriate times as applying to the provision of supplementary Estimates Committee information. I also make the following point. First, all financial matters relating to this issue have been provided to the Auditor-General, and the Auditor-General has already made reports on this matter. There has been no attempt by myself or anyone in my Department of State Development and Technology to keep any of that information from the appropriate authority auditing the moneys of this Government and of this Parliament.

Secondly, I have also offered on a number of occasions a complete briefing for the Leader of the Opposition—an offer that he has refused to accept, because it would spoil a good story. When you can get away with the raising of chimeras which you hope will turn into substance, why should you bother with the facts? I ask members to study the contributions made to the debate in this House this afternoon by the Leader and the Deputy Leader and to go through what they actually said. There was a great deal of insult, a great deal of hyperbole and a great deal of irrelevancy but a substantial shortage on actual fact. The closest that they can come are hearsay conversations between parties—not including the Minister, myself. There was the ongoing repetition of a belief of the Opposition that what I have said is not true. I have given the evidence to this House on many occasions. I repeat the point about the issue of the transcript of the conversation that had taken place between myself and Lawrence Lee on 2 February.

I refer to one other aspect on which matter I have gone to great lengths to answer as much as I possibly can. I have been constrained for a variety of reasons, such as commercial 'in confidence' on the issue in relation to a couple of points. But I want to repeat that I have not broken my part of the heads of agreement, the confidentiality clause. I have not done that. The Leader has made that agreement available to the public. It is now, I guess, in the public record. That is not through any act of mine. So, I have not broken my commitments under that agreement. However, I ask people to read what is actually in that agreement now that it has been made available by the Leader of the Opposition. They will not find the phrases used by the Leader of the Opposition in his question yesterday. He used some of the most dramatic and pejorative phrases in his contribution

yesterday, insinuating that they were coming from the actual heads of agreement. They were not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister's time has expired. If the Leader speaks he closes the debate.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Neither the Premier nor the Minister has refuted the clear evidence put before this Parliament today. Let me just quote some extracts—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Who are the Government calling liars in this place? The Premier dismisses the information that we put before this Parliament. He calls Zhen Yun liars, he calls the Abel family liars, and he calls Mr Oh from the Department of State Development and Technology a liar—because they are the people who have confirmed, through telephone conversations and transcripts, that clearly it was the Government which made the decision that Marineland could not be redeveloped. That is the clear, irrefutable evidence. Let us check the veracity of that. If the Premier wants to dismiss it, we should have an independent investigation. Let Mr Abel, Mr Lee, Mr Chapman and Mr Oh appear before that investigation; let them give evidence, under oath, and then we will find out the truth of the matter.

The public of South Australia are entitled to know the truth, because \$6.1 million of taxpayers' money has gone down the drain because the Government was not prepared to face up to union bans and a bit of union pressure over Marineland. They decided to scuttle the project because of the union bans. The Minister had the absolute audacity to say that he was not aware that any bans were in place. What absolute nonsense.

As to irrefutable evidence, I refer to a conversation between Mr Lee and Mr Abel. I shall quote from the transcript. Let us put these transcripts before an independent committee or investigation. Let such a committee make a judgment as to the veracity of the individuals involved in this matter. We know who has something to cover up, something to hide. What is in it for Zhen Yun or for Mr Abel not to tell the truth? More particularly, what is in it for Mr Oh not to tell the truth? This is the point.

It is the Government that has something to cover up in this matter, and it is going to extraordinary lengths to do so, such as contracts requiring people to keep quiet, when those people want the opportunity to speak out. They asked the Minister back in August to be released from the contract so that they could tell the public of South Australia their side of the story. The Minister has not replied to their letter. He has not yet replied, saying, 'I will not let you tell the people of South Australia your side of the story.' As to the talk about this unprecedented clause, a number of commercial lawyers contacted independently yesterday by the media (not by me or by the Opposition—and this was reported on last night's news services to the public of South Australia) have said that the clause in the contract is unprecedented in the way in which it is silencing the proponents. I now refer to the transcript, because this is the nub of the matter. It is as follows:

LEE: There is obvious a little bit problem on their side. What they call us yesterday may be because I want to be open with you if they want us to consider not to develop the Marineland.

ABEL: They can't do that because there are permits, licences and town planning permits to do that, so they can't actually not do it.

LEE: Yes, but there is the point their department disapprove our takeover.

ABEL: They disapprove the takeover? On what basis?

LEE: They didn't say on what basis. They just say because of the Greenpeace and union bans. They suggest it is not appropriate for us to be involved in the development of Marineland.

ABEL: Not appropriate for you to be involved with the development of Marineland?

LEE: Yes.

That is a direct take from the transcript. Now, whom do we believe—these independent individuals or a Government that has something to hide and a reason to cover up?

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Have an independent commission or inquiry, get the tapes and all the evidence and call these people. We will get the truth out to the public of South Australia. Do it, just do it, and then we will get to the truth of the matter. The public of South Australia is entitled to the truth. The Minister keeps saying, 'I've been open at every forum when I've been asked a question.' Let us look at the very first question that was asked of the Minister in the Estimates Committee. The Minister's reply was, 'There's no line for this; you can't ask this question. The question is not relevant because there's no line.' He tried to duck the very first question in the Estimates Committee.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Here are the excuses thick and fast. The Minister tried not to have to answer the questions we were asking him in the Estimates Committee. However, the Chairman overruled him, and we got on with the business. Let us look at another response of the Minister. When asked if he had received anything in writing from Zhen Yun stating that the project was not viable, the Minister said, 'I do not have any letter on file from Zhen Yun that specifically states, "We will not proceed with Marineland".'

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: They are caught out, so they resort to ridicule to try and put down—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You do not like the evidence that has been put on the table so you try—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The honourable Leader has the call.

Mr OLSEN: There is only one way to get to the bottom of this matter: have an independent investigation, table all the relevant documents, question the people whose discussions we have revealed today, and only in this way will the public of South Australia get to the truth of the matter, to which they are entitled.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Dui-gan, M.J. Evans and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Chapman and Lewis.

Noes—Messrs Keneally and Plunkett.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to enable the introduction of a heavy commercial trailer fee of \$150 without loss of stamp duty revenue. The introduction of the \$150 heavy commercial trailer fee is being sought under a separate amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act.

Trailers are currently exempt from stamp duty on new registration and transfers, except when registered in combination with a prime mover. Separate registration (amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act) provides a complication, in that by excluding the market value of the trailer (which by definition will no longer be registered in combination with a prime mover) a shortfall in stamp duty would occur. As a result, stamp duty will now be levied on all commercial trailers with a tare (unladen) weight exceeding 2.5 tonnes; a commercial trailer being defined as a trailer constructed or adapted solely or mainly for the carriage of goods.

As for the \$150 heavy commercial trailer fee, domestically used trailers will continue to be exempt from stamp duty given the relatively high cut-off point (e.g. standard '6x4' two wheel trailer would have a tare in the order of 250 kilograms) and all caravans and other types of non-commercial trailers will also remain exempt.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 42a of the Act, an interpretation provision enacted in relation to the provisions determining the stamp duty payable on an application to register, or to transfer the registration of, a motor vehicle. Definitions of 'commercial motor vehicle', and 'primary producer' by reference to their respective meanings in the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 are included for ease of reference in schedule 2 to the Act.

Clause 4 amends the item in schedule 2 to the Act that sets out the stamp duty payable on an application to register, onto transfer the registration of, a motor vehicle. The amendment provides that no stamp duty is payable in respect of trailers that have an unladen mass of 2.5 tonnes or less or trailers that are heavier but are not constructed to carry goods. The stamp duty payable on trailers constructed to carry goods of an unladen mass of more than 2.5 tonnes will be equivalent to that payable in respect of commercial motor vehicles.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to enable the introduction of a heavy commercial trailer fee of \$150. The adoption of the \$150 heavy commercial trailer fee was announced on 1 August 1989 as part of a package of proposals relating to heavy vehicles to

make South Australian roads safer, specifically to require heavy vehicles to pay a fair share of the costs of road wear.

The Australian Transport Advisory Council (ATAC), the State and Commonwealth Transport Minister's forum, initially discussed a proposal from the Commonwealth recommending the introduction of a \$400 heavy commercial trailer fee, subsequently agreeing on \$250. The SA Government has agreed on an interim charge of \$150 as a means of lessening the impact on industry. The impact of this charge on the transport industry will be monitored, with an assessment made prior to any consideration of the introduction of the ATAC agreed \$250 fee.

There are good grounds for introducing the heavy commercial trailer charge. Under the current fee structure large operators, such as freight forwarders, who register few prime movers but a large number of trailers bear a proportionately lower registration charge, given that the current scheme directs the charge mainly towards the prime mover. Consequently, independent owner operators who do not own trailers, but tow trailers for freight forwarders, bear the greater bulk (if not all) of the registration fee, a burden many consider inequitable.

The ATAC agreed \$250 minimum fee is seen by many as itself only an interim fee. There are good grounds for suggesting that the bulk of the registration fee should be on the trailer, as it is the loaded trailer which substantially contributes to road wear. Adoption of a national minimum heavy commercial trailer charge should also assist in overcoming the current practice of operators shopping around between States for the cheapest rates.

At \$33, South Australia currently has by far the lowest heavy commercial trailer fee. Queensland, where the fee is currently \$71, will be the only mainland State to have a lower heavy commercial trailer fee than the proposed SA \$150 fee; Queensland has agreed to adopt the \$250 ATAC fee. The Victorian figure is \$175, while New South Wales charges in excess of \$1 000. To introduce the charge in the spirit of the ATAC resolution some consequential amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Stamp Duties Act are required, a number of which will also have the benefit of improving the system of registering commercial articulated (prime mover plus trailer) vehicles in this State.

The units forming an articulated vehicle will be required to be registered separately. Under the current registration system, an owner of an articulated truck must register the prime mover and trailer as a combination, i.e. a prime mover cannot be registered separately. This clearly leads to complications should the owner of a prime mover not possess a semi-trailer! The question of separate registration of prime movers and trailers has been raised from time to time in this State; there is strong justification for its introduction. Other States either have, or are moving to, a system of separate registration, a system also adopted under the Federal Interstate Registration Scheme (FIRS). Separate registration is also a necessary adjunct to the establishment of vehicle standards (e.g. Australian Design Rules) and the ability of authorities to positively identify all trailers.

Section 33a of the Motor Vehicles Act presently enables a trailer to be registered at no fee when towed by a nominated prime mover. This is sometimes referred to as the 'J-trailer rebate'; the 'J' relating to the relevant computer code. This trailer rebate will be abolished. The trailer rebate scheme is open to abuse, given the difficulty of ensuring that the trailer is only used in conjunction with the nominated prime mover(s). Its continuation would also cause the spirit of the ATAC resolution to be circumvented, with many operators able to effectively avoid the \$150 heavy commercial trailer fee.

The majority of trailers registered in South Australia already carry their own individual compulsory third party (CTP) insurance. Under the scheme to be introduced, all trailers will be required to carry individual CTP insurance. Currently some trailers registered in combination with prime movers 'share' the CTP coverage of the prime mover. The potential exists for problems to occur should such trailers be involved in accidents where they are not attached to the nominated prime mover, e.g. 'illegally' attached to another prime mover. With the current CTP trailer fee of \$14, this requirement cannot be considered a burden to industry. The new fee and stamp duty provisions will only apply to commercial trailers with a tare (unladen) weight exceeding 2.5 tonnes; a commercial trailer being defined as a trailer constructed or adapted solely or mainly for the carriage of goods. As a result, domestically used trailers should avoid the new higher charge given the relatively high 'cut-off' point (e.g. standard '6x4' two wheel trailer would have a tare in the order of 250 kilograms) and all caravans and other types of non-commercial trailers will be exempted.

As prime movers have not hereto been registered in their own right, it will be necessary to determine a new fee schedule to apply to prime movers, and given that the direction is towards increasing heavy vehicle charges, the new prime mover fee will be equivalent on average to the fee currently applying to a rig. Operators of rigs (prime mover plus trailer) will therefore be charged an extra \$150 for each trailer owned. It was considered that such operators have been 'subsidised' for many years by paying a very low fee (\$33), zero for rebated trailers. The vast majority of owners of multiple trailers will face total increased charges of much less than \$2 000 p.a. Those operators only owning a prime mover (including many small independents) will generally face no increase in charge. Their relative position will improve and any future increases in trailer charges would result in further improvement in relative position.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the Act, the interpretation provisions. The definition of 'articulated motor vehicle' is deleted. Prime movers will fall within the definition of 'motor vehicle'. The definition of 'trailer' is amended to cause semi-trailers to fall within that definition. The definition of 'commercial motor vehicle' is also amended to ensure that prime movers and semi-trailers constructed to carry goods continue to fall within that definition. Clause 4 repeals section 33a of the Act which provides for the registration of semi-trailers for no fee where several trailers are registered in conjunction with a single prime mover. A separate fee for each trailer will be payable on removal of section 33a.

Clause 5 is an amendment to the penalties imposed for driving an uninsured vehicle consequential to the inclusion of semi-trailers within the term 'trailer'. The lesser penalty currently applicable to trailers will continue to apply except in relation to trailers that are constructed to carry goods and that have an unladen mass of more than 2.5 tonnes. Clause 6 is a transitional provision. Separate registration of a prime mover and semi-trailer will not be required until the current registration of the articulated motor vehicle expires. Clause 7 repeals two sections of a 1978 amending Act that are not in operation but which relate to the subject matter of the measure.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 26 September. Page 891.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): There is very little resemblance in the Estimates Committees that we have in Parliament in 1989 compared with the original concept that was introduced by the Tonkin Government in the early 1980s. When the Estimates Committees were first introduced, there was a genuine attempt by the Government of the day and the members of the Committees to provide as much information as possible to members on both sides. Unfortunately, that is not occurring today. The original concept, using the program performance papers, provided an ongoing indication not only to members of Parliament but to the public at large and to members of the various Government departments of the programs, particularly of capital works, which were in progress in South Australia.

While the program papers still provide that information as such as an ongoing program of works, the fact that there is little opportunity for members of the Committees to receive information from the Government is borne out by looking at the numbers of questions which are able to be asked and the answers given during the time allotted. This has come about in part by some questions being too lengthy in the way that they are presented to the Minister concerned, and, of course, the main problem is the enormous length of some of the answers which are given to comparatively straightforward, simple questions.

The numbers of questions asked in 1989 compared with the first two or three years of the Committees are markedly different. That is a great pity, because the principle behind the Estimates Committees is good. Unfortunately, it is not working today. The average member is able to ask no more than three or four questions during a session relating to a particular department, and that achieves very little when some of the departments have large budgets and thousands of employees. Therefore, to be able to ask only three or four questions relating to a particular department achieves very little indeed. The only option left to Opposition members is to place on notice all the questions to which they need answers. That is the only practical means of achieving those answers.

I should like to refer to the Fisheries Department and regulations which have just come before the House. They were gazetted in June and they relate to the fishery of the Murray River, the lakes and the Coorong. The Government is attempting to restrict the fishing activities, particularly of recreational fishermen and to a slightly lesser degree of professional fishermen, in the belief that restricting the number of fish taken from the Murray River will resolve the problems of declining fish stocks. That is far from the truth. No matter what sort of wildlife we talk about, if the habitat is deteriorating—and that is what is happening with the Murray River—the wildlife population will decline. That goes for fish, water fowl or any other species.

The Government is greatly restricting the activities of recreational fishermen in the belief that that will enhance the fish numbers and solve the problem. I believe that the habitat is the key to the problem. Until such time as the Government, in conjunction with the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, resolves the problems of the ecology and management of the river, native fish numbers will continue to decline, even if fishing within the Murray River is totally restricted. The habitat is all important. At the moment, very little is being done to improve that habitat.

Unfortunately, the introduction of European carp has had devastating consequences for the ecology of the river. We have only to look at the lagoons, backwaters and creeks generally, which used to be full of water grasses, various

weeds and surface floating weeds (to which we used to refer as duckweed), to realise that much of it has completely disappeared. Most of the backwaters and creeks virtually have no sign of vegetation in the water whatsoever.

Numerous attempts have been made by various people and professional fishermen to get access to those backwaters which are just teeming with European carp but they are continually being denied access in the belief by the department that, if it permits access to people to go in and take the European carp, they will take some native species as well. The European carp is having an extremely detrimental effect on the overall ecology and the numbers of carp have increased dramatically over the years.

I believe that there is a potential industry with European carp not only as crayfish bait, but for canning for pet food. There is also another potential industry in smoked European carp. It is a very good product if it is handled correctly. I do not like eating it fresh, but as a smoked product it is highly desirable. I enjoy eating smoked fish of many species, and the smoked fish served in the Parliamentary dining-room is very pleasant. I believe that smoked European carp comes into that same category. There are thousands of tonnes of European carp in the backwaters creating absolute havoc with the ecology of the river, yet the department, which acts for and on behalf of the Government, is denying access to what could be a very lucrative industry. The Government ought to reconsider this matter.

Plenty of proposals have been put forward for various industries based on carp, but the department seems to be petrified that, if it lets anyone in to take the carp, they will take the native species as well. I believe that can be responsibly managed to the benefit of South Australia and the ecology. The ecology, as far as native fish are concerned, is very much dependent on the management of the river system as a whole. That comes back to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the various State departments responsible for water resources and fisheries.

As we all know, native fish are dependent on flood conditions for breeding: we are well aware that, unless the flood plains are under water on a regular basis, the native fish tend not to breed. That has a far greater bearing on the fall in native fish numbers in the Murray-Darling River system than the fishing effort applied to that system. So, the Government has implemented a new set of regulations banning the use of drum nets by amateurs. We only have to go back a few years to when amateurs were required to have a licence to place a drum net in the river. The department believed that that was not serving any useful purpose and there was no need for any restriction at all; we could have open slather and everyone could put a drum net in the river. The department was not concerned who did it and how many drum nets were used. Suddenly, out of the blue, a total ban was placed on drum nets. That to me is not a scientific approach, and the Government will have a great deal of difficulty in convincing members of the public that that is a scientific approach. It is virtually jumping from one position to another without any evidence that those actions will solve the problem.

Of course, the Government will be successful only if the community believes that its actions are logical and make sense. Further, amateurs can now use three drop nets or 10 hoop nets for taking yabbies. The difference between a drop net and a hoop net is very small: a yabby net with one hoop is a hoop net; a yabby net with two hoops is a drop net. Of course, when the net is sitting on the bottom of the river or the backwater, we cannot tell the difference. The yabbies walk in, feed on the bait and walk out, and the

only time the second ring comes into play is when we lift the net from the bottom and it brings up the sides.

Obviously, commonsense would dictate that either 10 hoop nets or 10 drop nets are used, because the potential for catching with hoop nets is just as great as with drop nets. Unfortunately, many people who have yabby nets have already purchased drop nets. The Government is suggesting that they are out. Professionally made yabby nets are not cheap. The average amateur fisherman has quite a bit of money tied up in nets.

I suggested to the Director a few weeks ago that he should look at that situation if he wants the support of the community for regulations regarding the Murray River fishery. He ought to use commonsense in some areas, and then he might gain the support of the recreational fisherman. But I see that the regulations have been gazetted and still allow for only three drop nets as compared with 10 hoop nets. That is a crazy situation, the sort of thing that will not gain community support.

River management has a large bearing on the ecology of a river, particularly in relation to fish breeding, and Lake Bonney at Barmera is part of the river system that requires effective management. We finally gained the agreement of the Minister of Water Resources (when the river flows in the Murray are sufficient to allow it) to drop the level of Lake Bonney prior to the river rising to get as much of the poor quality water out of Lake Bonney as possible, so that with the rising river it can be replaced with good water flowing down from the headquarters of the Murray-Darling system. That was finally accepted in principle.

The extent to which it was done was minimal, and I only hope that the Government, having accepted the principle, will make it part and parcel of overall river management in South Australia. In flushing out Lake Bonney, we flush out not only the lake but also the major backwaters between the various locks. Lake Bonney is situated between lock 4 and lock 3. I suggest that the same management techniques should apply to all sections of the river in South Australia between the various locks. That will get rid of much of the highly saline and stagnant waters held within the backwaters prior to each flush or high river.

That is part and parcel of Murray River management, and it will have a significant bearing on the ecology. It will encourage native fish to breed and that, in itself, will have a far greater impact on the future of fish stocks in the Murray River in South Australia than all the restrictions placed on amateur and professional fishermen. It is generally accepted by both amateur and professional fishermen that a degree of restriction is proper but, in this instance, the Government has gone from one extreme to the other.

This action is not accepted generally by the public at large and, as a result, fisheries inspectors will have an enormous problem in policing these new regulations, because the public will find ways of beating the system if they believe that the restrictions being brought in by the Government are unreasonable and unrealistic. A good example of that is where drum nets were taken out of the river. Drum nets, traditionally, have two metal hoops which hold the net open. The Department of Fisheries uses metal detectors to detect nets in the water. The metal parts of the nets are being removed and being replaced with plastic or wood, so a number of these nets will be put back into the river in a form which will be difficult to detect.

There is only one way in which the department will succeed in what it is trying to do, and that is with the cooperation of the public at large. If the department does not have that cooperation, it can try as much as it likes but

it will not succeed with the restrictions under the regulations currently before this House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): While I was pleased to serve on several Estimates Committees, I want to deal particularly with the Committee that examined the lands allocations. Land valuation was a topical subject before we met and is topical still. I brought to the Minister's attention seven examples, I think, of people who owned their own private house being subjected to massive land valuation increases during the past 12 months. Those increases were as high as 88 per cent: 52 per cent was the lowest example I cited to the Estimates Committee. Those increases included a rise from \$125 000 last year to \$220 000 this year (a \$95 000 increase) for a property at Medindie.

A North Adelaide property increased in land valuation from \$190 000 to \$295 000, a \$105 000 increase in one year. I also highlighted a Gilberton property with a 65 per cent increase of \$95 000 in one year. I traced that property back to the 1983 assessed value of \$47 700, and that valuation progressively increased over the years to \$145 000 in 1988. It then jumped another \$95 000 in the past year. In other words, it took about five years to increase about \$98 000 and then one year to increase by another \$95 000. That is what I tried to highlight to the Minister as being wrong with the whole system under which we are operating.

I was most disappointed with the Minister's response. He tried to give me a lecture on what marketplace and valuation systems were all about. If it had not been for the fact that it was only right and proper not to interject, I would have done so. I did attempt it once, but I was ruled out of order. Amongst other things, the Minister stated:

The valuation system operates on the value of the property in terms of the marketplace. To say that we should set all values at a certain level on day one and just to be fair to everyone, allow valuations to increase only by a certain percentage would mean that we were completely out of step with every other State and the way they undertake their valuations.

A little further down she states:

The whole concept of valuations in a society with a mixed economy is that valuations are tied to what the market will pay.

I was well aware of that and I indicated that to the Minister. I do not like being lectured on matters of which I am fully cognisant, and I am cognisant on this matter.

The Hon. H. Allison: Lectures come free from this Government.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Mount Gambier says, lectures come free from this Government, and we saw an example of that this afternoon. I want to emphasise yet again to the Minister that the massive increase in valuations we have seen in the past 12 months cannot reflect the increase in property values in Adelaide in that time. Again, I cite the Gilberton property, which increased by nearly \$100 000 over five years, and then in one year it increased by \$95 000.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The Minister on the front bench agrees with you, and his colleagues do not.

Mr MEIER: The member for Coles points out that the Minister on the Government front bench highlighted this problem in the media, through the *Advertiser*. He can see through this Government. He exposed what the Government is doing, and what it is trying to do to people, even forcing some pensioners from their homes. The Minister on the Government front bench realises the implications and I give him full credit for standing up to his Cabinet colleagues.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The Minister for Environment and Planning thinks he is wrong.

Mr MEIER: Undoubtedly. The Minister and member for Unley is hiding his head and must have received a fair old lecture from the Cabinet room for going public on this matter. However, it is certainly heartening to the Opposition to have a Government Minister on our side, to have a Government Minister criticising the Government for what it is doing. At long last the Opposition feels as though what it has been saying for a long time is recognised. We know that it is true, but it is now seen as true through the comments of the Government Minister. A few of the Government backbenchers also know this. The member for Bright also was starting to scream about the way the Government was handling the valuation system, and quite rightly so.

I am sure the electors will take notice of the Minister and will see that there is a change of Government, because that is the only way that we can change the valuation system. I was referring to increases that have occurred over the past five years, followed by the massive increases in the past 12 months. Those increases do not reflect market forces. Anyone can appreciate that by reading the figures or following the situation in the media. Adelaide has been dragging behind eastern State property increases, and I believe that land valuations now are unrealistic.

Putting that matter to one side, I also highlighted on more than one occasion where a person had a property assessed at a certain value. One specific example was at Medindie where the property increased from \$125 000 to \$220 000, a 76 per cent increase, amounting to about \$95 000. A Department of Lands officer inspected the property and told the owner, 'You have nothing to complain about. Other properties in the near vicinity have sold for this sort of price. Therefore, your property has been valued at that figure.' As the owner said to me, and doubtless said to the departmental officer, 'Hang on, my house is vastly different from the one that sold for a similar price. Mine is not done up so well. Inside, it is nothing flash. There is nothing much there. It is a relatively poor property compared to the one that has been sold. So, do not value mine in relation to that other property.'

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Where is that property?

Mr MEIER: At Medindie, but I have examples throughout the metropolitan area. The officer looking at the property said, 'I am sorry, I cannot revalue it.' In this case, the appeal is still proceeding and we do not know the result. In another case at North Adelaide the value had been increased from \$190 000 to \$295 000, a \$105 000 increase. The owner rang the valuation department and a young chap answered and said a similar thing, 'A house has sold nearby for \$300 000.' Members should remember that this property was valued at \$225 000. The officer said, 'I am sorry, the valuation is correct.' There was a similar story that the house was not as good on the inside or the outside and the owner asked, 'How come I get landed with a similar valuation?'

The young man said, 'We will not be revaluing it.' The owner contacted a senior valuer and asked for a revaluation. The valuation was subsequently reduced by \$45 000 during the conversation. This example reflects on the system. A normal householder would have said after the first approach that he had tried and failed. This householder did not give up and tried again and managed to get a more senior officer who reduced the valuation by \$45 000—a significant drop. This highlights the fact that if one reduction can occur, then surely it cannot be related to the marketplace in a strict sense. If it is, then the figures are bogus in many cases and they are not reflecting the true values of the areas. The whole system needs to be looked at.

On one occasion the Minister allowed the Valuer-General to comment, as follows:

I remind the honourable member that there are 652 000 properties in South Australia, and each and every one of those properties is valued every year—once again, the only place in the world where this occurs.

That is fine. However, if every property is revalued every year, and these errors occur, the situation could be improved by not valuing all properties every year: maybe half could be valued every year, or maybe a third could be valued every year so that revaluations occur once every three years. In that way, the revalued properties could be appropriately assessed and the large number of objections that presently occur would no longer occur.

I have not referred to the fact that these property valuations directly affect the E&WS water and sewerage rates and the council rates. In one case, the value of a property in the past 12 months increased by \$95 000, and from 1983 the council rates went from \$179 to the present \$698. Those increases are starting to bite. I spoke to some pensioners who told me that they were considering leaving their houses because they found \$698 too much to pay, and one should remember that they receive a \$150 discount.

I put to the Minister that I believed the Government did not care less about the ordinary pensioner. In fact, that is reinforced in tonight *News* where we see the headline, 'The man Hawke swore at'. This pensioner, who was seeking information from the Prime Minister, was called a 'silly old bugger' by him. That article shows Bob Hawke as he really is: the facade has been seen through. The pensioners of this State and country are sick and tired of this Government.

To top it off, the Prime Minister tried to intimidate the ABC television crew into not showing that segment. Thank goodness justice prevailed, and that confrontation was shown on television. The truth is coming to the fore and we are seeing behind the facade of this Government. Unfortunately, this Government has no substance, no methodology and no knowledge of where it is going—as our balance of payments figures and high interest rates indicate. It is rather tragic. Recently an accountant told me it would be best to sell one's property in Australia and go overseas for at least the next four to five years, because Australia is not looking good; and I believe that that person has voted both Labor and Liberal over the years.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Where would you go? Argentina?

Mr MEIER: No, it was suggested to go to Britain, but the only problem is whether or not one would be allowed to settle there. The valuation system has to be changed. I can cite many examples in my electorate where council rates have increased in the vicinity of 60 per cent to 80 per cent. Part of the reason is this Government's bringing in partial abolition of minimum rates, although it wanted to abolish them totally but the Democrats would not allow it. As members will remember, the Opposition was totally opposed to the abolition of the minimum rate, and that stand increased land values for many people.

The current valuation system, which was highlighted during the Estimates Committees, has to be re-evaluated. It worries me that the Valuer-General also determines the value of freehold shacks. I can cite examples of South Australian shack owners being very disturbed by the values of their freehold shacks. I took up one case with the Minister who initially was not interested in it—he said it was a closed book. However, that case has been reopened and shack sites will be revalued—and that is a waste of taxpayers' money. Why can it not be done right in the first place? I know that many shack owners are worried about the unrealistic values of freehold shacks in many areas of the State.

During the Estimates Committees I highlighted the problem of pastoral rents. Again, the Minister lectured me about the fact that pastoral rents are slightly different from land valuations. I am fully aware of that. What she failed to see was that the Valuer-General also determines pastoral rents, and we have seen the shemozzle that occurred with property valuations in the metropolitan area. How difficult it will be for pastoralists, who live many hundreds of kilometres from the metropolitan area, to obtain justice. It is easy for those in the metropolitan area to ring or visit the Department of Lands personally; but for pastoralists it is very difficult.

The Department of Lands can look at properties in the metropolitan area within a matter of minutes, whereas it has to go specially to the pastoral lands to look over a property, and that would take a couple of days; and if they have many properties to value it will be a real problem. Therefore, the assurances we received during debate on the Pastoral Bill mean nothing because this problem will surely occur.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I will take one or two minutes to respond to some of the points that were made by the member for Goyder in his recounting of stories of the revaluation exercises of a number of people. Those people who went to the member for Goyder to try to have properties revalued would have been better going to their local member. About 45 to 50 people have seen me about having their properties revalued; and that is being carried out in a fair and equitable way. Some people are having their valuations confirmed; others are having them altered one way or another.

The problem in the minds of many people in the community, and obviously in the mind of the member of Goyder, is caused by their confusing two things: the value of the property; and the charges that are applied to that property as a consequence of the valuation. Those two separate exercises should take place separately, and I have argued that to the Government on a number of occasions, as I have argued that there ought to be a review of the process by which both those exercises are conducted.

A valuation will always be necessary, it has to be undertaken by Government. I think it should be undertaken as a separate exercise whereby each property holder is notified of the value of the property and has an opportunity to appeal, thereby removing any argument or dispute about taxes and charges that will relate to the property as a result of that valuation. That matter, as well as a number of other matters that I have raised with the Minister of Water Resources, is currently under review. I hope that that review will result in a more satisfactory system than the one that exists at the moment.

The second part of the exercise obviously relates to the charges that are laid by local and State Government against the valuation of those properties. I think that that taxing or charging exercise should take place separately. People who have brought their concerns to my attention as their local member, as to some of the areas raised by the member for Goyder, have obtained the satisfaction that I believe they deserve from the Valuer-General.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In speaking to the Estimates Committee reports, I must confess that I did not expect to be covering the subject of land valuations, but as a result of what the member for Adelaide has just said I am bound to criticise the Government and the gaggle of Ministers who are publicly disagreeing with each other on this subject and the manner in which land valuations are being dealt with by the Government.

The Hon. H. Allison: They can't all be wrong.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Indeed, not every one of them can be wrong. Is it the Minister of Recreation and Sport who is right in his stringent criticisms of the procedures? Is it the Minister for Environment and Planning who is right in her vigorous defence of the procedures? Is it the member for Adelaide who is right in saying that he can help his constituents? Is the member for Goyder right in his saying that his constituents are not being given a fair hearing? Indeed, is it the member for Bragg who is right when he says that (and I have no doubt at all that he is correct in saying this) his constituents can get their valuations modified and attended to simply by a phone call to the Glenside office of the Land Valuation Department?

Is it my office which, after writing letters to the Valuer-General calling for revaluation, gets knocked back? Any system that permits such totally inequitable and inconsistent treatment of constituents cannot be right. It is not possible that the way the system is being administered at the moment is right, because too many people are being treated too differently, too often, for anyone to have confidence in that system. Every member on this side of the House can point daily to examples of inconsistencies. What sort of a system is it that permits a constituent to get a revaluation on the basis of a phone call only?

The Hon. H. Allison: It shows that they must have been desk valuations in the first place.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Precisely. How could those valuations have been properly carried out if they are able to be modified simply on the basis of a phone call not to the Valuer-General or to a senior officer of the department but to a desk clerk in a local office? That is what has happened on more than one occasion. The member for Bragg can testify to that. The Minister of Recreation and Sport, in what must be one of the most desperate efforts of all time to hold his and the Government's flagging popularity in a marginal seat, has actually come out as a member of Cabinet—which is supposed to express solidarity—and claimed that the system is rotten. His colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning defends the system and says that it is fine.

If ever a Government is on shaky ground it is where it stands on the question of land valuation. The member for Adelaide and all his colleagues well know the truth of what the member for Goyder said, namely, that the capital value is profound in its flow-on effects into the budget of every householder, because it is to that value that other rates and charges are linked. The member for Adelaide's defending a system that is patently causing inequity, injustice and terrible deprivation in many households is in my opinion a very extraordinary thing for a member holding a marginal seat to do. I would say that the whole system needs to be looked at. The Minister of Recreation and Sport, in a desperate effort to shore up his popularity in his seat, has recognised that and in an almost unprecedented move he has criticised his own Government. I would say that members on the other side of the House are on shaky ground indeed.

Speaking of shaky ground, I shall now pursue the question of the Estimates Committees. I sat on several Committees, involving the Premier, the Minister of State Development and Technology, the Minister of Tourism and the Minister for the Arts. In each of those cases information was given to the Committees which clearly demonstrates that the Government has lost its way, that it is faltering, that it is in an economic morass and desperately trying to survive by means of following opinion polls and passing the buck.

The first Committee on which I sat concerned the lines pertaining to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. One of the most interesting things to come out of that Committee, and subsequently reinforced and confirmed by the release of John Cornwall's book *Just for the Record*, was the fact that the Government is hoping for a survey led recovery. The Premier admitted in his Committee that the Government had spent \$99 000 on environmental surveys which covered broad questions of public policy and political popularity. The Premier was very cagey when it came to questions about the extent of the circulation of the answers of those surveys.

He refused to deny that the results of those surveys had gone beyond the Ministers to Cabinet or to himself, or indeed to the Secretary of the ALP. He refused to deny that, and that to me is borne out by John Cornwall's statements in his book *Just for the Record* that to the time of publication of that book, no-one had ever established what happened to the results of the Party political surveys for which the South Australian taxpayer pays in respect of any issue whatsoever that is tricky for the Government, whether it relates to the question of drug use, of development, of education, or of environmental matters. So, we have an indictment of the Government out of the Premier's own mouth in terms of the budget Estimates Committee for that department.

As for the Department of State Development and Technology lines, matters pertaining to this were canvassed in some detail in the motion of no confidence in the Minister of State Development and Technology that was before the House this afternoon. By no means in this afternoon's no confidence motion did all the material condemning the Government that was put on the record during the Estimates Committee come out. If ever a Minister was ducking and weaving and looking uncomfortable it was the Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of State Development and Technology. The Leader of the Opposition reaffirmed that the first question that the Opposition asked on Marineland was met by a ducking from the Minister, who claimed that there was no line under which the question could be asked.

As to a budget line in the Department of State Development and Technology, one was hardly necessary: there was so much condemnation from the Auditor-General that was sufficient basis for questioning in the first instance. However, the Minister went on, having tried to avoid the question in the first place, to say:

It must be understood that the Special Projects Unit of the Department of Premier and Cabinet is handling the progress of development.

One is tempted to ask: who is robbing this bank? The Minister then later said that the lease agreement between Zhen Yun and the West Beach Trust was not directly under his ministerial responsibility but rather under the responsibility of the Minister of Local Government. This was further buck passing in an effort to avoid questioning. It was also a further revelation as to why that hapless Minister is the one who has been given the responsibility by the Government to defend what is obviously a total Government decision not to proceed with the project. When we have a Minister of the personal integrity of the Minister of State Development and Technology placed in the position where he is forced to cover for his Government and make denials of what is patently the truth we realise that there is something very important indeed to cover up. In this instance, I have no doubt whatsoever that it is the Premier's reputation. It was that statement put on the *Hansard* record at Question Time today by Mr Oh, an officer of the Department of State Development and Technology, that nothing could be done until the Premier made up his mind—

An honourable member: That's right.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is to protect the Premier that the Minister of State Development and Technology has had to stand in front of this House time and time again and deny that he knew anything about union bans, deny that he put any pressure on Zhen Yun, in fact, make many denials in order to save his boss's skin. Again, that bears out what the Hon. John Cornwall said more than once in his book that, if there was any bad news or rough stuff to be dealt with, the Premier was a hundred miles away and the Ministers were put up front. We saw an example of that today.

Mr D.S. Baker: And we will see an example tomorrow. He will be at Paskeville.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is convenient for the Premier that he is able to go to Paskeville tomorrow. I suppose he thinks that the no confidence motion has been dealt with and he can relatively easily go off without too much criticism. Maybe his Ministers will be wishing that the Premier were here tomorrow.

Further, in relation to Marineland and the Minister's comments in the Estimates Committee that examined the lines of State Development and Technology, the Deputy Premier had claimed in a letter dated 17 April this year to a constituent that the dolphins not remaining at West Beach had 'nothing to do with lack of Government support'. He further stated in that letter:

The people—

that is, Zhen Yun—

who are now interested in building a motel on the site, initially showed interest in some sort of Marineland but have now backed off because of the costs involved.

That is not what the Zhen Yun principals said to Mr Abel in the recorded conversations that the Leader read to the House today. Not in the slightest did they back off because of the costs involved; they backed off because the Government asked them to back off. The Deputy Premier is adept at making the casual, disowning comment that is so relaxed in its nature that it is supposed to inspire confidence in those who hear it. He stated further in that letter:

You will thus see that the decision to relocate the animals to another place really has nothing to do with the unions, very little to do with the State Government but a lot to do with finances.

No-one who heard today's debate and who listened to what has been said by the principals of Tribond, the principals of Zhen Yun and officers of the Government's own Department of State Development and Technology would believe that this decision has nothing to do with the Government and nothing to do with the unions. It is beyond credulity. Further, the member for Victoria asked the Minister of State Development and Technology whether he believed that he had a responsibility, when there was a guarantee of taxpayers' funds, to ensure that those projects were not affected by union bans and were allowed to proceed? What was the Minister's answer? He said:

I do not believe that question is relevant at this time.

The Opposition believes it is relevant: the Opposition believes that there is \$6 million worth of relevance in that question, but the Minister of State Development and Technology did not seem to agree with that. Anyone who reads the questions asked and answers given at that Estimates Committee hearing will be reinforced in the view that the Minister has a great deal to hide; that he was extremely uncomfortable; that he was doing his level best to defend the Government as a whole with very little conviction, and that he has now been exposed by the record produced at Question Time today to have not told the truth to Parliament.

I also attended the Estimates Committees that examined the Tourism and Arts allocations. At the outset of each Committee, both Ministers took up a substantial portion of the Committee's time with very long perorations of information which is readily available on the public record. The Minister of Tourism normally soaks up anything from a quarter to a fifth or a sixth of the Committee's time in a long winded statement. Members opposite will know that a Minister who is truly confident and in complete command of his or her portfolio does not do that: it is the timid Ministers who find it hard to cope and do not want to be exposed to scrutiny who make the long perorations, and it is very interesting that that involved the Minister of Tourism. The Minister for the Arts actually took up all but one quarter—

Mr Duigan: You ran out of questions.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Ran out of questions—what rubbish! The member for Adelaide is well aware there were many questions left unasked at the close of both those Estimates Committees. The Minister for the Arts took up all but one quarter of the two hours allowed for the Department for the Arts budget in a peroration that was redundant, almost irrelevant. The information she gave the Committee was information either which we could have read in the budget papers or which had already been produced. It was filibustering at its worst and it denied the Committee the chance to scrutinise her administration, which has been subject to considerable criticism, of her portfolio.

In the Estimates Committee on the Tourism lines, the Minister of Tourism refused to meet what has been a strongly expressed wish of the tourism industry for the Government to give a lead by making a financial commitment to recovery programs to assist the industry to pull out of the frightful trough resulting from the pilots strike. Twice I asked the Minister of Tourism whether she would be willing to give that lead which the industry has sought (and I know that it has been sought) by making a commitment. If one State were to make such a commitment, other States might follow and so might the Federal Government. But no: the Minister of Tourism said she had fixed a marketing budget in the context of a stable, predictable environment over the next 12 months at least for the tourism industry.

Between the fixing of that budget and the Estimates Committee hearing, that environment had been turned completely upside down. This State is losing approximately \$2 million per week as a result of the pilots strike, but what did the Minister say? She said, 'We might reallocate our existing resources or there might be a rejigging of our planned marketing activity in particular markets.'

Mrs Appleby: What did you want her to say?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: She did not say, 'We will give extra.' She just said, 'We may switch around what we had already committed long before the pilots strike ever occurred.' That is by no means good enough. Later in the Committee hearing, the Minister was obviously severely embarrassed when one of her officers told the truth. He said that he was not aware of any discussions or considerations that led to the decision by Zhen Yun not to proceed with the Marineland part of the development. However, he went on to say—and this was really embarrassing to the Minister:

Our advice to Zhen Yun was that the marketplace was not ready for an international style hotel in that location, and that was not the standard it should aim for. We recommended strongly that it undertake a market feasibility study to identify both the scale and type of development.

If ever a Minister was caught flat-footed and red-handed, the Hon. Barbara Wiese was. But what did she do? The next day she simply torpedoed her officer and said that was

not the truth. Who are we most likely to believe—a respected officer who had no axe to grind or a Minister who was trying to make a political cover-up?

The Minister for the Arts failed to give any satisfactory responses to questions about the financing of the Ruhe collection. She said that the Leader of the Opposition had that in hand or the Prime Minister had that in hand, but she was not willing to make any commitment or even make vigorous representations to acquire a collection which is of world standard and which we are likely to lose if she does not act with speed. The Minister is not acting with speed and as a result we are likely to lose that collection.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I should like to take up some of the comments made by the member for Coles about land valuations. I understand that the member for Adelaide also made comments about land valuations and the way in which they may be being adjusted. I can give the House numerous examples of people who, either by phone or having gone in to the land valuation office in Glenside, have had their valuations changed not a bit, but significantly, by clerks who have made no attempt whatsoever to have the property properly valued. My criticism of the system is not that people are able to have valuations reduced but the way in which it is done. People are billed by the State Government through the E&WS Department and by local government on the same basis. However, it seems incredible that one can have a figure set as if it is correct and then question it and have significant changes made in a totally non-professional way.

I do not mind whether valuations are changed, even significantly, because our role is to send people in and at least put a question. However, the way in which it is done is questionable. I support the comments made by the member for Goyder in calling for significant change. As the member for Coles pointed out, one Cabinet Minister (the member for Unley) has also asked for the system to be considered because he, like many Opposition members, has recognised that the whole system requires significant change.

I should like to talk briefly about the recreation and sport portfolio and, later, transport. I am fascinated by the way in which the Government continually runs out similar projects for what I can only assume is mass media presentation. The one that was highlighted significantly in the budget was the ill-fated velodrome at the sports park. In 1986, as part of a \$55 million development at Gepps Cross, the velodrome was announced.

In February 1987, there was a further announcement with a \$4.5 million tag. In April 1988 a number one priority project was announced by the Premier. It was upgraded to get better media coverage. The Premier confirmed that in the corresponding budget period we could expect significant development to occur in terms of the velodrome, this time at sports park. On 26 August 1988—the day before my birthday—the Premier said that \$1.9 million was to be spent in that year. That was a significant and important announcement on 26 August. We heard that announcement four times in three years.

On 23 September 1988 a \$6.5 million program for the velodrome was announced. We were told that it was set to go ahead, but this time it was downgraded because the Minister of Recreation and Sport announced the \$6.5 million. We had jumped a couple of million dollars in less than 12 months, but it was downgraded—and still nothing happened. As part of that downgrading, we noted that stage one was to start in 1990 and that it would involve a \$5 million development. Stage two, which involved a roof,

would be a \$1.5 million development. That was 23 September 1988.

In January 1989 another press release came out saying, 'We have a bureaucratic red tape problem; we are having difficulty with the program going ahead.' It was going ahead in 1986, in 1987 and in 1988, upgraded by the Premier. Now, all of a sudden, a bit of bureaucratic red tape gets in the way and it is to be held up.

In February 1989 there was an announcement that detailed costing would go before the Public Works Committee. I thought that I would ask whether that matter had gone before the Public Works Committee. I understand that to date it has not. What happened? That was in February 1989 and nothing has happened in the last six months. I have been advised that it has still not happened.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: As I said, I have been advised.

Mr Tyler: By whom?

Mr INGERSON: I have been accurately advised. So the velodrome proposal is still not before the Public Works Committee. It was fascinating during the Estimates Committee to discover that this program, which was announced in September 1988 as costing \$6.5 million, is now to cost \$18 million. We have a program which has gone from \$6.5 million in 1988 to a possible cost of \$18 million. It is incredible that we should have this change in this short period of time.

I note that in the 1988-89 budget \$1.9 million was allocated for the development of the velodrome, and this year \$300 000 has been allocated for a feasibility study. The development was announced in 1986 and it has now been announced seven times in some form or another; now a feasibility study is referred to in the Estimates documents and reinforced and agreed during the Estimates Committee hearings. There is a farcical set-up whereby an international Olympic sport does not have a facility even though this development was announced in 1986. As I am not politically cynical, I have to believe that it is purely and simply bad management by the Government in not being able to manage its funds, nor being able to get the Federal Government to put up funding to get this project off the ground. As the Minister said during the Estimates Committee, whilst these funds are committed to the budget line, they can be moved around. I suspect that this money has been moved around to such an extent that we are not likely to see this velodrome start for some years, although we may hear some extravagant promise during an election campaign. That is a tragedy.

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

Mr INGERSON: After five years of promises, \$500 000 is to be spent on planning and design in connection with the baseball facility, yet the baseball administrators have not heard too much about it. We have \$1.5 million to be spent on a soccer stadium at Hindmarsh, yet the Hindmarsh council, the owner of the land on which the soccer stadium is to be built, has not had any discussions about the plans with the Department of Recreation and Sport.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr INGERSON: I wonder whether the soccer stadium is another stunt, as we approach the next election. I should have thought that, since the Hindmarsh council was the land owner and landlord, it might be the first to be advised but, as of yesterday, the Mayor of Hindmarsh had had no consultation with the Government. It seems to me that that

is the way in which the Department of Recreation and Sport runs its affairs.

I wish to deal also with a couple of issues relating to transport. Something I find quite staggering is that the Government put out a labour productivity review for consultants to be briefed, only to find that the people who monitored the conditions of this brief were the State Transport Authority. It is amazing that, when looking at an organisation and its labour practices, one does not go to an independent group such as the Department of Transport which has—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to keep the conversation level down. It is very hard to hear the speaker. I ask members to show respect for the speaker. The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: I find it amazing that the Government would look into the problems of labour productivity in the STA but use the STA itself as the judge as to whether the study's terms of reference were being adhered to. When we have within the Department of Transport some very professional planners who could adequately look at this study review and monitor it, and make sure that the STA was being run properly—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Come on, you dill! I know you are asleep most times, but the department has not been abolished at all. The Policy Planning Division—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: The Policy Planning Division is still there and has been there ever since the Hon. Michael Wilson was Minister of Transport. The only thing that has been abolished is the Division of Road Safety—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It has not been abolished. The Minister explained it to everyone in the Committee, and you were not there. Like most things that you do in this House, you're either dead asleep or—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair and not to address members as 'you'.

Mr INGERSON: I made those comments about the STA during the Estimates Committee. It is unbelievable that we should spend about \$100 000 on this sort of review yet not have an outside monitoring body. Again, under the Department of Transport line, the announcement was made of the interchange at Tonsley and the Minister clearly and categorically said that, whilst it was a very important project, it was highly unlikely that the public would recognise its value because it would have to transfer from a bus system to a train system.

It is amazing that, a couple of days later, the whole program is laid out in the local paper as one of the panaceas for transport in the south, yet the Minister himself clearly stated during the Estimates Committee that he does not think it will really work. I wonder, again, whether this is not another transport joke from the south simply showing that more money has been spent on setting up an interesting study. It is an interesting study, with a very glossy report, and it will cost \$20 million if it goes ahead but, to use the Minister's own words, he does not believe it will work.

Mr Tyler: What do you think should happen?

Mr INGERSON: You just wait and see. You will find out all those things in the next three or four weeks or whenever you call the election. One of the other issues that came up during the Estimates Committees was the *Island Seaway*. We discussed with the Minister of Marine the costings of this vessel and eventually found that, with the

modifications made which have been finished this week, we now have a vessel costing \$21.2 million, initially estimated to cost some \$12 million.

Another interesting fact we discovered was that \$3.3 million worth of capitalised interest is just floating around, as it were, in the Department of Marine and Harbors. The officers of the department clearly said that it did not belong to any particular lines in the department. It will be interesting to see what happens when the Treasury actually tells us who is responsible for this money. Irrespective of who is responsible, it shows that the actual financing costs of the *Island Seaway* have not been added to this figure of \$21.2 million. So, including its financing cost, the vessel has now cost some \$24.5 million instead of the \$12 million reported to this Parliament.

Today the Minister of Marine announced that the vessel would be going to Port Lincoln in the near future, and I hope that that is the case. If, having now spent about \$25 million on a vessel which was to go to Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island, we can finally get it there, albeit at double the original cost, South Australian taxpayers may be satisfied to see how their funds have been spent in achieving this object.

The other matter to which I wish briefly to refer concerns overruns with the Motor Registration Division computer. From questioning the Minister in the Estimates Committee, it became clear that a further \$800 000 would have to be spent on the division's computer, even though in the end we might not have a system as modern as we could have had. Originally, it was to cost \$4 million, but the final cost will be more than \$11 million, without achieving the degree of performance that we should have been able to expect, despite having spent double the amount originally budgeted.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): From the outset, I must say that I was intrigued by the Opposition's tactics in the Estimate Committees, particularly when I was not in the Chair and was a member of the Committees. The Opposition's tactics involved anything for a cheap point and then there were the dorothy dixer questions. I call a spade a spade, and I do not care who knows it. Every political Party has dorothy dixer questions for its members: there is no doubt about that, and any members worth their salt should contact the Minister's office and the Minister's advisers before the Estimates Committee and say, 'I intend to ask a number of questions in the Estimates Committee.' I have done that in Opposition and in Government.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I thank the member for Fisher for his vote of confidence. I make no apologies for contacting a Minister's office and advising that I intend to raise particular matters. If the Opposition is unaware, let me indicate that the reason for the Estimates Committees is to solicit information from the Minister and advisers, and that is what I have done ever since I came into Parliament. I have tried to obtain information from the Minister, and I believe the best opportunity available for members to do that in Parliament is through the Estimates Committees. Certainly, when I was not in the Chair but functioning as a Committee member during the first week I obtained much information in the Estimates Committees which I will disseminate throughout my electorate and through western suburbs newspapers.

Dorothy dixer questions are an integral part of the system: I do not deny that, nor should any other member, yet we

saw the blatant hypocrisy of members opposite who attacked the Government and Ministers during the Estimates Committees and made claims about dorothy dixer questions. Opposition members sat with lists of questions that had been typed out on the second floor. They were too damned lazy to do their own research, yet they read these prepared questions off like parrots. It was absolute rubbish. On a number of occasions, they did not even understand what they were reading: that is how good they were.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I note the stupidity of the member for Mitcham, who has the temerity to sit in this House. Members on both sides know that dorothy dixer questions are a function of parliamentary life, and we know why. All members have tactical intentions in this Parliament and want to solicit information. I have been a member in Opposition and I know what it is like to raise questions. On one occasion I put some questions on the Notice Paper that upset the then Premier—350 questions in one hit. He did not have a sense of humour at all but referred to the time and expense involved, and all that garbage. What price democracy! Nevertheless, that information went out to the community.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I ask any of my Government Ministers questions. I write to them and their staff. I can assure the member for Mitcham that he will be pleasantly surprised to know that as the member for Albert Park I am not reluctant to contact my own Ministers and advise them on how I feel on issues. If the member for Mitcham does not understand that, he has much to learn. It became clear what the Opposition's intentions were; its tactics were patently clear to anyone with half a wit. Come election time and all the Opposition will raise will be alleged aspects of waste in Government departments. Rarely did Opposition members raise issues about their own electorates. One member in this House complimented me by saying, 'Kevin, your forte is looking after your electorate.' The member for Coles may laugh, but I took that remark as a compliment; indeed, I believe strongly in looking after my electorate. That is what representing the people who put me in this place is all about—never forgetting whence I came or who put me here. Some Albert Park electors are not necessarily Labor supporters but they elected me to this place. I love the job I do, and I want to do the best I can for the people in my electorate.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: You're doing a good job.

Mr HAMILTON: I thank my colleague for his strong support. I believe strongly in what I do. I remember one of my ministerial colleagues saying not so long ago, 'Kevin, your responsibility as a member in this place and as a member of the Government is to write to Ministers and ask questions in State Parliament. If the Minister does not like it, that is his problem.' The Minister and Cabinet have to make decisions and, as long as I am in this place, I intend to keep up that practise and look after my constituents.

I come back to the point that it is important for any member worth their salt to look after their constituency first of all. Therefore, one of my disappointments in the Estimates Committees involved what took place last Thursday night, and I understand that when you were in the Chair, Mr Deputy Speaker, you encountered a similar problem. One thing I object to most strongly is any suggestion that I am a liar or that I try to manipulate a situation. I must say that I forewarned some Estimates Committee members opposite during the tea break of the problems that we might encounter, and those problems did manifest themselves. I have never been one to bow to threats: that is the worst thing one can do not do to a Hamilton, I can tell the

House. The worst thing one can do is try to put pressure on me. I do not want a job where people want to put pressure on me and bully me around. That makes the hair stand up on the back of my neck.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am a big boy, as the member for Mitcham and his colleagues know only too well. I will not be messed around with by fools like him. Therefore, in terms of the budget lines, I ask that Cabinet and people like you, Mr Deputy Speaker, look at Standing Orders and the problem involved on this occasion so that the position can be spelt out clearly before the next Estimates Committees. Indeed, I believe that when the Bannon Government is returned, this matter will be looked at.

I do not like unpleasantness; I like a nice easy life. However, when issues arise they have to be addressed. On Thursday night it would have been easy for me to have not shown common sense. Sessional orders are provided by the Parliament and, after the adjournment, it was agreed to pursue this matter along policy lines. I would be dishonest if I did not say that, in my opinion, the rules were bent by me—and that is a reflection on me as the Acting Chairman of that Committee.

Mr S.J. Baker: I hope you apologise.

Mr HAMILTON: I do not apologise. In my opinion, the Opposition acted that way because it wanted to raise this issue during the election campaign. It wanted a ruling from the Acting Chairman, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition moved to dissent from my ruling—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, not at all. The Deputy Leader wanted Parliament to be brought back at 9.30 the next morning—and to do what? The stupidity of the whole thing is that the Deputy Leader did not understand the point. I ruled that the member for Hartley's question was out of order—

Mr Tyler: A Government member.

Mr HAMILTON: I ruled that a Government member's question was out of order. That was the impartiality I displayed in the Chair. God only knows what the Deputy Leader had been up to prior to dinner—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: What is that supposed to mean?

Mr HAMILTON: I do not know what he was up to or where he was. If the honourable member would not interrupt and would let me finish, I was about to say that he came in late. The member for Coles can infer what I was going to say; she is too quick to impute to me something that I was not going to say. I did not know what he was up to because he came in late, and the Chair facilitated the changeover of members of the Committee for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He then moved dissent from my ruling—

Mr S.J. Baker: That is fair enough.

Mr HAMILTON: Against a Government member? That is absolute nonsense. He was there to create a mischief. He wanted to bring Parliament back the next day and waste thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money. That was the stunt. I have been in this place long enough to understand the tactics he employed. If he had succeeded, what then would have happened, in my view, is that the issue and the sessional orders would have been lost in all the hullabaloo and publicity on radio, television and in the newspaper. I see my colleagues nodding their heads in agreement. The Opposition talks about honesty in this place. The Deputy Leader was blatantly dishonest. He wanted to pull a stunt to gain cheap headlines. Well, that did not work; and I

thank a number of colleagues for their guidance and assistance in that matter. I believe that the Chair displayed—

Mr S.J. Baker: You backed off.

Mr HAMILTON: There you go. That is the crass stupidity of the member for Mitcham. He would have the mentality of an ant. He is the type of person on the other side of the House, and interjections like that demonstrate that that is where he will stay. He really is a fool of a man; he laughs at himself. If he gets some satisfaction out of that that is up to him. The next time a matter like this arises I hope that it is properly addressed.

I now turn to a number of matters affecting my electorate. When I was a Committee member during the Estimates Committees I mentioned the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The only time members opposite, and that includes the member for Coles, go to the western suburbs is at election time. I remember when the member for Coles and the member for Bragg—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Let me finish. Don't be so rude. I did not interrupt you. We rarely see the member for Coles or members of the Opposition in the western suburbs—but they venture there at election time. I know that in 1982, when the member for Coles supported the then Liberal candidate for Albert Park, she did not fare too well in the western suburbs. That is why they do not venture there very often but, when they do, they are done like a dinner.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Leader in the Upper House criticise Labor Party members in the western suburbs, but they would not have a clue about what happens in the western suburbs. They thought they could get some cheap headlines. However, that did not go over very well amongst those people in the QEH and the western suburbs, and members opposite are fooling themselves if they think it did. During the Estimates Committees I wanted information about what the Government had done. If members opposite had read the *Hansard* they would find that I mentioned letters of appreciation. Not only are letters of appreciation delivered to me but also to my colleagues in the western suburbs who look after the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is a terrific hospital. Members wanted to make it a political football but they failed abysmally.

People in the western suburbs are not stupid. Many of us come from working class stock and may not have had the opportunities for education that some of the silver tails opposite have had. The Labor MPs who represent the western suburbs are not fools, neither are the people who live in the electorates. I am delighted by what this Government has achieved there, particularly in the past seven years it has been in office.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Were any of those letters made public?

Mr HAMILTON: Actually, I did not want to put them on public display because they were addressed to me personally; but they are there for any member of the House to peruse.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: There is, and I thank my colleague for that. During the Estimates Committee that concerned education I addressed the future of the West Lakes High School. Mr Deputy Speaker, you know Mr Randall, and the local paper outlines that he is jumping up and down about the Kidman Park High School and the West Lakes High School. I did not know that the West Lakes High School was in the Henley Beach electorate—and he probably does not know, either.

I turn my attention to the review of the decline of secondary schools in the western suburbs. When this review

was underway I remember discussing this issue with two school councils. I said that this Government will be damned if it does make a decision about the future of high schools in the western suburbs and damned if it does not. The Government will be damned if it makes a quick decision because that would be called a 'snow' job; but if it consults the community and that consultation process lasts until the new year then it will be accused of putting off the decision until after the State election and not being prepared to make a stand. Lo and behold, the local *Weekly Times* contains an article which mentions the former member for Henley Beach—and I do not believe he will ever grace this place again, given the tremendous amount of work that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, do in the Henley Beach electorate and knowing how hard you doorknock and letterbox. I have no doubt that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, will retain that seat. But, it is there in black and white for everyone to see. One can pick the tactics of members opposite. They are too lazy to get off their butts most of the time and get out there in the electorates and ask people what they want; or get on the telephone and ask about the particular issues.

From my experience in the western suburbs over the past 10 years I am aware of the laziness of Liberal candidates. This is during the time that I have had the good fortune to represent the electors of Albert Park. Typically, there is much carping criticism about various things, but as to any constructive proposals put forward by the Liberals in relation to the western suburbs, I cannot think of one. No doubt I will be reminded if there are any. I believe that the budget Estimates Committees provide an excellent forum for backbenchers to obtain information. I have no particular bitch about the work of the Estimates Committees over the years that I have been here. I think that they have worked very successfully. There have been a few minor hiccups, but the Ministers and their officers have assisted me tremendously. I place on record my appreciation to the Ministers and the people assisting them, and also in particular I thank the Clerks of the House for their assistance.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Thank goodness that is over. It was a sort of half hour fill-in, delivered in a very whimsical fashion.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Folksy.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, folksy, as my colleague the member for Coles says. None of his contribution seems to get anywhere near the truth. If the truth be known, the Estimates Committee chaired by the member for Albert Park got tied up on a very important issue, namely, whether the Woods and Forests Department operations should be examined in the Committee. Comments that were made and his ruling were fairly critical in this regard. So, I would not feel too proud of my efforts had I been in the Chair of that Committee.

I want to go briefly through the things that I found out as a result of the Estimates Committees. A number of notable items came forward as a result of questioning. I find the process generally very worthwhile. It provides an opportunity to ask questions that are not normally answered in the ordinary course of events. First, we found that a draft AIDS policy for the Public Service had been prepared and circulated for comment to CEOs, with an emphasis on non-discrimination. There could perhaps be some other areas of emphasis with such a policy. Next, we found out that the Dunstan consultancy cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$26 750, for 53.5 days of endeavour.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Not bad work if you can get it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Indeed; it is not bad work if you can get it. We are not sure whether the taxpayers have got \$26 750 worth of value out of that exercise. The Government will only release the report at a time of its own convenience. I suggest that within a matter of weeks or months it will probably be put through the shredder.

We know that a promise has been made in regard to a number of Australian traineeships within the public sector and that 200 traineeships will be provided for in the current budget. But there will be no guarantees of employment for those trainees. We note that early retirement packages were accepted by 127 people in 1988-89 and cost the taxpayer \$3.4 million. We note that the new Austpay system, a very expensive system, is still not fully functional, actually nowhere near fully functional. We would like to see the Government have the capacity to keep all records of service, including sick leave, on the Austpay system, but we find that that system is still not capable of doing that. This system was designed to provide an administrative tool to the Government in this regard. It is quite scandalous. We noted that there was funding of \$66 000 for the Migrant Workers Centre. Of course, that centre happens to be at Trades Hall.

We noted that sick leave has been reduced from 6.6 days to 5.8 days in the Department of Labour—a very commendable effort, but still well above what we would expect in relation to that work force. Probably the eighth item on my list interests me most: the Government intends to support a full flow-on of national minimum wage determinations, despite lower levels of over award payments in South Australia. The Minister said that we will give a rubber stamp to the national decision. We are going to support the proposition in the State Industrial Commission.

The commission will be asked to accept, as is, the national determination. I asked the Minister whether indeed it was appropriate to mention to the commission that the over-award payments, extra payments, made to employees in South Australia were considerably less than the national average. The Minister did not think that was worthwhile. Either he has not read the national determination on the minimum wage issue or he has chosen to ignore it. One of the most salient features of that determination was that, because of the number of additional payments being made in the system above the minimum, the Industrial Relations Commission found it quite fit and proper to raise the minimum standards to embrace some of those additional payments—in fact, sort of simplify the system. That was one of the reasons why the minimum award system was being raised. However, in relation to one of the most important criteria the Minister refused to have that matter canvassed before the commission. Indeed, employers will become relatively worse off in South Australia than will be the case elsewhere, given the cost disadvantages that we suffer because of transport distances.

The Minister introduced an element of bravery when he said that, following the election, he would introduce legislation for extended shop trading hours and that this would be a key issue after the election. One wonders why indeed the Minister does not have the guts and determination to introduce this before the election. If he believes that the vast majority of people in the community want extended trading hours and that the only people who are going to get hurt are small business people, why does he not introduce the measure before the election? Why doesn't he test the water once again?

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: Why do you oppose it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is because the people will not stand for another circus like we had last time, when the Govern-

ment went to the commission with a pay package, which was going to lift considerably the remuneration for shop assistants, as the price to be paid for extended shop trading hours. That was the only way by which we could extend the shop trading hours here in South Australia. Of course, there are the issues of penalty rates, just how much shopping time Adelaide needs, and indeed whether tenants should be forced by landlords of shopping centres to open for 60 or 70 hours a week for the same amount of take.

Another item of interest was that the Minister was awaiting a report before determining possible reforms to the handling of unfair dismissal claims, which are continuing to increase and clogging the commission. Members would well remember the opposition that was put up to the change to section 31 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I spent some time explaining to the Minister that he would make the system unworkable by taking the proceedings for unfair dismissals out of the court and into the commission. We did suggest that if there was an element of unfairness in the court proceedings that could be relatively easily fixed up. However, the Minister proceeded on his happy, merry way and said, 'We are going to give everybody a fair chance and we are going to throw it over to the commission.'

In the process, a large number of people have been to the commission with unfair dismissal cases which would never have seen the light of day in the courts, because the claims have been utterly scurrilous. I have referred in Parliament to cases involving people who have committed theft or who have been involved in practices that have been detrimental to a business, or people who have continually failed to turn up on time or to keep the prescribed hours. We have seen these people coming before the commission and claiming unfair dismissal, although they have been engaged in what would be classed as very doubtful employment practice.

So, the Minister said, 'We will let you rape the employer; we will let you have a lend of the employer; we will let you have a chance to get some money out of the employers who are living off your back, living off your labours.' We found that the number of people who get a free ride out of the system are all rushing into the Industrial Commission claiming they have been unfairly dismissed. What happens is that the people who have a legitimate right to question their dismissal have been disadvantaged, because the time taken for hearing their cases has escalated quite considerably. The number of cases has increased from about 300 in the first year to well over 800 last year. As I said, many—in fact most—of them are probably scurrilous.

I was fascinated to learn that the Minister is still pursuing the registration of workplaces despite the fact that this Parliament gave him authority to get the details of workplaces from WorkCover. We gave him the right in this Parliament last session to go to WorkCover and say, 'Give me a list of these registered places of employment and then we do not have to go around and hassle employers any more.' However, this year there has been an increase in staff and \$200 000 has been spent in the pursuit of unregistered workplaces. If that is not waste, what is? Quite simply, the WorkCover register is probably 95 per cent on the mark. Thus, it is quite feasible and proper that those details should be taken directly from that register, that the amount required for the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act could then be taken as a levy on the WorkCover to save all this paperwork, activity and the Inspectorate.

Another item of interest was that only about one-third of the safety representatives received training in one of the five approved courses. Whilst the Opposition had many reservations about the Occupational Health, Safety and

Welfare Act, we did say it was important that people who were to be the safety representatives should have the proper training. Again, the Government has been lax in its responsibility. It has approved only five courses. Other courses would be quite useful, meaningful and appropriate, yet the Minister and the commission have been very slow in allowing these facilities to come to fruition. There has been a fight between the employers and the unions as to whether accredited employer training courses should be allowed to train unionists. As far as I am concerned, if the course is up to scratch, if it is designed to do what we all want done, it should be approved. We would not have only one-third of safety representatives actually receiving some element of formal training.

One fascinating item to come from the Estimates Committee was the intervention of the State Government in the paternity case being mounted by the ACTU in the Federal commission. It is absolutely fascinating that the State Government should intervene in a paternity case involving the ACTU. I would have thought under normal circumstances that it would have had nothing to do with such a matter in the Federal arena. However, for some reason best known to itself, the Government has decided to support the case. It is an interesting one because it allows for paternity leave. We know that the only people who currently receive paternity leave in South Australia are public servants, and that is the way it has been for a number of years. Yet the Minister in South Australia is saying that this is such a worthwhile case he will take the extraordinary step of intervening on behalf of South Australia and, I suppose, by definition, the rest of Australia, to have paternity leave written into awards.

I know where the idea comes from. I have been to Sweden and studied the manifesto. I estimated it was only a matter of time before paternity leave came to the fore, but I would not have expected this Government to take the extraordinary step of intervening. It does not intervene in disputes; it does not intervene when the Building Workers Union and the BLF are causing chaos on building sites; it does not intervene when South Australia's future is at risk, but it takes the opportunity to intervene to get paternity leave for South Australia and the rest of Australia. It is absolutely extraordinary! Somewhere down the track the employer has to pay for this privilege. He must pay for the privilege of holding a position open for one year while the male of the species changes nappies, but that is not the end of it.

If one looks at the Swedish system, the next step after paternity leave is recognised is that at some stage it will be paid for by the employer—not the Government but the employer. That is the next step in the process. In principle, this Labor Government wants to get paternity leave recognised as a condition of service in the system so it can go on its merry way to make employers pay the price. I thought Australia was in enough strife at the moment to not even consider such incredible schemes.

Despite the much vaunted Occupational Health Safety and Welfare Act, the number of deaths in construction and manufacturing increased from seven in 1987-88 to 14 in 1988-89. When the Minister paraded this new Act before the Parliament—and members will recall that I spent some time on that debate—I warned the Minister that it could not be done with legislation or a sledge hammer, but it could only be done by assisting people to understand their responsibilities. But what did he do? He said, 'We have this wonderful new Act that will solve all our problems. If an employer is in any way associated with an accident in the work place in which someone is injured or killed, he will pay the full price.'

We can now see the impact of that legislation. We find out that the number of deaths doubled in South Australia, so where is the initiative of the Government to make people more responsible and accountable, and make them understand what are the responsibilities and needs of employees? I said at the time that the sledge hammer approach might do the Government's heart some good, and being a Labor Government it is good employer bashing, but if we want to achieve reform, that reform has to take place at the workplace. Many employers who have operated the same way for 20, 30, 40 or 50 years will need assistance. Assistance is not provided by cutting out the areas where inspectors have previously gone along and assisted those employers to get up to the mark and replace that system with people who are there to find fault and then prosecute.

It is interesting to note that stress claims in the Public Service are escalating. More importantly, the cost of the stress claim in the Public Service is over \$11 000 per person. May I humbly suggest that someone is having a lend of the Government? When one considers the whole range of accidents associated with falls and the like, it comes down to about \$500 per accident, so we have a monumental problem on our hands. The number of people with very serious stress claims average \$11 000 per claim—half a year's pay—and they are on the increase. Some areas are reducing, but the net bill is increasing. So, what action has the Government taken on its own legislation? What action has it taken to reduce the stress or to investigate stress in the Public Service? As I suggested, a number of people are taking a lend of the Government.

The Government has failed to provide actuarial assessments of long-term workers compensation liabilities, despite the requirements of the Act. The Act provides not that the Government is exempt but that exempt employers must provide actuarial assessments each year to determine long-term liabilities. That exercise has not been done by the Government. We heard a vague statement by the Minister about a computer problem. A computer is not necessary if an actuary can take a sample of the records. The Government has done nothing about it. If possible, the Government should be prosecuted for negligence—for failure to observe its own legislation. Why has it happened? Has it been negligence or has it been deliberate? Does the Government want revealed that the long-term liabilities of the public sector may be about \$500 million or \$1 000 million? That is the question that I keep asking myself, because nowhere have we seen the answers.

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It gives me no pleasure to have to raise again the question of the pollution of the Patawalonga. Whilst I have raised this matter on many occasions this year, I will continue to raise it until the Government does something about it. I have received a letter from the Glenelg Sailing Club which has expressed concern at the condition of the lake. The letter is addressed to me, and it states:

Dear Sir,
Re: Pollution of Patawalonga and beach in front of Glenelg Sailing Club

The members of the Glenelg Sailing Club are very concerned about the pollution of the Patawalonga and of the beach in front of our club. Of particular concern is the effect that this pollution is having on our junior membership.

For many years the Glenelg Sailing Club has had a successful junior program which has made extensive use of the Patawalonga. Here our junior members have been able to learn basic sailing skills before venturing out to sea. We are now unable to use the Patawalonga because of high levels of pollution. This is causing many problems with our junior sailing and we fear that it will have a detrimental effect on our junior membership.

We held a Juniors Promotion Day on 30 July. Unfortunately, the beach in front of our club on this day was covered in rubbish of all descriptions, including syringes. It was very embarrassing and a great disappointment to have to ask our young visitors to tread through this rubbish so that they could go for a sail.

Sailing is a sport which is wonderful for the development of young people. The Glenelg Sailing Club is proud to have made sailing available to young people from all sections of the community, and we will endeavour to continue to do so. A clean Patawalonga and a clean beach would be a big help to us.

I am sure that you will be sympathetic to our concerns regarding the pollution of the Patawalonga and of the beach in front of our club and perhaps you could raise our concern with the Minister of Water Resources and Environment and Planning, the Hon. Ms Lenehan, M.P.

That is signed, 'M. Rogers, Commodore', and it is dated.

This question of the Government's attitude towards the pollution which floats down the Sturt Creek, the Keswick Creek and what they call the airport drain has reached a point of absolute frustration. In 1987, an interdepartmental committee was set up called the Patawalonga Trash Abatement Committee. From memory, it involved the Department of Environment and Planning, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department (because of its connection with the Sturt Creek), the Department of Local Government, the Glenelg council and a group called The Friends of the Patawalonga. That committee has done an enormous amount of work in making local authorities and Government authorities acutely aware of the value of the Patawalonga.

When the present Minister for Environment and Planning took over, pressure was brought to bear on her, after the other committee had been meeting for nearly two years, to see what she would do about it. Her response was to disband the Patawalonga Trash Abatement Committee and form a task force to look into the problem. To that committee she added the South Australian Health Commission, but other than that it is still the same committee. It was the Patawalonga Trash Abatement Committee before and it is now a task force. The only difference is that this task force has been given two years to report. The Government has been able to buy itself considerable time to allow either a developer at West Beach or the Patawalonga ferry proposal developer to pick up the problem and do something about it. The Government has not done a thing.

The former committee was able to put in a very small floating boom which extended only a few metres out into the lake. To some extent, it picked up a few barrow-loads of rubbish. It was tokenism. At the time we applauded and said that it was a good idea, and it was nice to see something being done but, as far as solving the problem was concerned, it has had no impact whatsoever.

The Opposition is keen to see a proper concrete and steel trash rack erected. It has already made commitments in the local media. In fact, I announced it and am on public record as being totally supportive of it, as I would be totally supportive of the Labor Government if it could do something after all these years.

We should not be receiving letters from the Glenelg Sailing Club saying that it is having to cancel sport in front of the club because of rubbish and syringes on the beach. We should not have other sporting bodies which traditionally have used the lake over many years being banned from it because the Government, being a Government of inaction, has done nothing about the Patawalonga.

Eight or nine councils drain into this lake and it receives the stormwater from probably half the metropolitan area. If we drew a line from Henley Beach Road up to the city and through to the foothills, and took that line south to the rim of the foothills, we would see the area that drains into the Patawalonga. I know from the Engineering and Water Supply Department that it is a problem. It is that department's main stormwater drain. Be that as it may, a Government must eventually start filtering that water as it comes through.

It is interesting that the first committee Ms Lenehan disbanded, although it attempted to look at the surface water issue, at no stage addressed the question of water quality below the surface. I gather from members of that committee that they had no intention of addressing that matter. We hope that the new committee will do something about it, but not much has been achieved thus far. I assure the Government that we in Glenelg consider this an absolute environmental priority.

It is an environmental disaster at the moment: it is not appreciated by any resident of Glenelg that the Government has been inactive on this matter, and I strenuously urge the Government to take a serious look at its allocation of funding so that in the immediate future something can be done about this problem.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): The Opposition's attempt to smear and besmirch the character, reputation and integrity of two fine South Australian sportsmen deserves to be condemned. I condemn it and everyone on this side of the House condemns it, as do most good thinking people in the community. None of us should have been surprised by the attempt to besmirch and smear the names of Craig and Nunan, because the Opposition has done it on a number of occasions. It has done it to the Attorney-General, to the Minister of Correctional Services, to the Minister of Tourism, to the Minister of State Development and Technology, to the Chief Executive Officer of the State Bank and to the Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare, so it is not surprising that it would do it to two fine South Australian sportsmen.

Members opposite are involved in the politics of sleaze and innuendo, impugning the integrity of competent South Australians, politicians, people in public office and sportsmen. They are unsubstantiated allegations which are tarnishing the reputation of these people who are making a positive contribution. The votes and records of this House

will show forever the words 'allegations against Nunan and Craig'.

They are the words that will appear forever in this House in the votes and proceedings in the papers that are kept in this House. They will not be removed after 12 months, like the reprimand that has been delivered to Nunan and Craig by the Director-General of Recreation and Sport. That will be expunged after 12 months, but the allegations raised by the Opposition which have impugned the records of these people will stay on the records of this House forever—and that is a disgrace.

I want to put on record tonight some more positive contributions that these two people have made to sport and to the positive efforts of young South Australians. It was noted by Geoff Jones in an article in the *News* headed 'Leave these heroes alone'. He said:

I've said it before and I'll say it again . . . we're a weird mob of knockers. But not as weird as some of our politicians who have chosen to score a few lousy points at the expense of two outstanding and dedicated South Australian sportsmen. I'm talking about Mike Nunan and Neil Craig and the hammering they are getting from the Opposition because one of them chose to use a felt pen to write down the South Australian Sports Institute's telephone number on a brochure.

If anyone's entitled to give them a serve I am because they walked out on Sturt. I'm only joking because they are a credit to football and sport in general. But I'm certainly not joking about this continuing storm in a teacup being perpetuated by the Opposition, primarily by Jennifer Cashmore, the shadow economics spokeswoman. She has her knickers in a twist because she reckons Mike, the institute's Director and Neil, its exercise physiologist, have used the institute to promote a private sporting equipment company they have set up.

We're not talking about yuppie shoes and T-shirts or barbells—we're talking about specialised scientific equipment only required by a small band of highly qualified sports technicians. Mike and Neil sell heart rate monitors and all business stationary carries a post office box number. No printed literature identifies the two with the institute.

It's pretty technical stuff used by coaches to test their athletes and sometimes, in the early stages when they are learning how to use it, they need to call either Neil or Mike on the spur of the moment. And goodness gracious me, those naughty little boys have admitted that, sometimes, for the coaches' convenience, they have crossed out their business telephone number and written the institute's in with a felt pen. This really is front page stuff. What a scandal!

Jennifer, why don't you stand up in the House and sing the praises of these two outstanding young men who have the House of Representatives standing committee on finance and public administration publicly recognising our institute is the nation's accepted model for sport development?

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the honourable member is abusing the privilege of the House. There is no way that *Hansard* can keep up with this!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr DUIGAN: The article continues:

Why don't you tell the House some overseas sports experts who have visited the institute rate it the best in the Western world? The East German cycling chief recently dubbed Neil . . .

Members interjecting:

Mr DUIGAN: And I acknowledged it. Further:

. . . the best exercise physiologist in the world, citing some of his techniques as brilliant. In particular, one related to a testing procedure that not only monitors the way in which physiological changes occur, but also how this information can be used to prescribe training levels.

When intelligent and dedicated people get castigated in this manner, no wonder we get a brain drain in this country. Another intrigue in this mind-boggling debate is why the Opposition's sports spokesman, Graham Ingerson, hasn't carried the can—and I emphasise the word can. God help us if this is all the Opposition can find to get its knickers in a twist!

That is a positive story about the way in which the Opposition has disgracefully attacked and impugned the reputations of these two fine sportsmen. It looks at the positive contributions they are making. I have seen the half-hearted

nonsense that the member for Coles tried to use to justify her contribution to the debate in a letter in the *Advertiser* of 9 September. She said:

This is a matter of public importance. Of course I am entitled to raise it. It doesn't matter that they are sports heroes; I am entitled to raise it. I am entitled to impugn their reputations.

That is a nonsense. If the honourable member were seriously concerned about the issues being raised about public administration, she could well have written to the Minister of Recreation and Sport or to the Director-General. There is no need to come in here and carry on with all this nonsense. Two of the factors have been dismissed out of hand by the Crown Solicitor; for the other, there was a reprimand. Yet on the records of this House, both in *Hansard* and in the papers tabled, forever, there will be a reference to 'allegations against'. There is not one word from members opposite about justifying the honourable member's attack.

I will not have the opportunity to read into *Hansard* another positive article written by Ashley Porter which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 8 September and which was entitled 'Nunan and Craig—mere pawns in a political game'. What I would like to do is take a number of quotes from that article for the public record, so that there is some response in this House to the nonsense that members opposite went on with for a month. They did not give up: they went on with it for a month. I want that on the record.

Ashley Porter in the article of 8 September said:

Nunan, as SASI's Director, and Craig, who is also respected and acclaimed nationally for his expertise in the field of sports physiology, haven't sold secrets to the Soviet leader, Mr Gorbachev. And they haven't thieved or lied. But their integrity and the SASI credibility have been put at risk by insignificant allegations raised in Parliament by the Opposition's economic spokeswoman, Ms Jennifer Cashmore.

That is what is at stake. Members opposite have done this with plenty of other public figures, plenty of other people carrying out public duties: they have done it with these people and it is a disgrace. Ashley Porter did not say it once in his article—he said it more than once. The article quotes Geof Motley as follows:

This whole action (the allegations in Parliament) is shameful and because of this the reputations of not only Mike and Neil but SASI and everyone associated with it have been tarnished. The allegations are small in significance and I find it shameful that a political Party has taken this direction.

That is what the sports commentators are saying about members opposite. The contribution that the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) has made over many years has been extraordinarily substantial. It was established in 1972 with a board that has continued pretty well in the same form until 1987, when it was changed. Mike Nunan was appointed Director when the Liberal Government first established the SASI. In 1987 he not only maintained his position as Executive Director but was also made a staff member of the board, and in that same year SASI received total responsibility for sport and its development in South Australia.

Further, 35 of the 36 people who represented South Australia at the Seoul Olympics were people who held SASI scholarships. That reflects the contribution of SASI and those people—Craig and Nunan—and all the other people who have been associated with the development of sport in this State. What does the Opposition do? Opposition members raise questions about the integrity of the Executive Director and the procedures that have been followed by the board, the relationship between the board and the staff, the contribution that those two people have been making, and there have been no apologies.

Two of the allegations made were determined by the Crown Solicitor to have no substance whatever. The documents were tabled by the Minister of Recreation and Sport in Parliament in respect of allegations against Nunan and Craig. Do Opposition members get up and say, 'I am sorry, I was wrong'? There has been no apology—nothing. One person gets a reprimand, which is going to be expunged from his record in 12 months. What about the Opposition's allegations? They will be on the public record for the rest of time, yet there is no apology from the Opposition—nothing at all. These people deserve better from the Opposition, because they have done a fine job, as this article amply illustrates.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): That is one of the silliest speeches that I have ever heard in my time here. It is the greatest lot of codswallop of all time. What a lot of nonsense and garbage! People can steal, plunder and do what they like to the State and that is all right with this Labor Government. Come on, use a bit of commonsense.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I would suggest that the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee ought to have a look at that organisation, because people were reprimanded: cheque signing rights were taken away. The Government of the day did not do that without reason. I do not care who works for the Government: 99.9 per cent of Government employees are honest, sincere and hard working public servants, but every now and then someone does something that is not quite right. If someone manipulates the system or violates the Act, then they should be reprimanded and be dealt with.

This goes on all the time, and to stand up and make stupid remarks as the member for Adelaide did is unreal. Of course, this is the last speech that he will make in this House, and then we will not have to worry about him. The member for Coles is on record of accepting the sporting attributes of those two people but, as far as I am concerned, I barrack for Glenelg and I reckon Mike Nunan is the worst football coach whom I have ever seen. So what! The fact that people who went through the South Australian Sport Institute and excelled at the Commonwealth, Olympic or whatever games is a tribute to the athletes themselves and their hard work, dedication and devotion. The fact that the sports are being provided with facilities by the State and Commonwealth Governments is part of what should be provided for these young people. We are not doing anywhere near enough and we should be doing much more.

Let me now turn to an issue concerning the South Australian Sports Promotion, Cultural and Health Advancement Trust (Foundation South Australia). I recently put questions on the Notice Paper and sought information about who received the various allocations from this organisation. I received probably one of the worst replies that I have ever seen—again, the typical arrogance of some organisations and persons who administer various statutory organisations in this State.

These people have to be told that they are accountable to Parliament and the people of South Australia. They should be told that we expect answers to such questions. Certainly, I will continue to pursue this organisation until we get adequate answers. At page 375 of the Auditor-General's Report we are told that the income for the financial year, or since the beginning of the trust, which was established on 1 July 1988, was \$5.8 million: \$5.5 million coming from tobacco licence fees which were collected at the rate

of 10.7 per cent of tobacco merchants' licence fees, and interest earned was \$343 000, which is not enough.

I would like to know on what basis that income was received. Was it monthly or quarterly, because \$343 000 in interest does not appear to be satisfactory. Sponsorships paid out amounted to \$1.603 million; health programs amounted to \$322 000 and the Foundation South Australia promotion amounted to \$214 000, with administration expenditure of \$358 000. This amounted to total expenditure of almost \$2.5 million. The year's surplus was \$3.353 million.

When one looks at the balance sheet, one sees that cash on hand at Treasury is \$3.29 million, debtors amount to \$52 000 and inventory is \$82 000, with non-current assets totalling \$100 000 and total assets \$3.524 million. Liabilities amount to \$171 000. These figures indicate to the Opposition that something is not right, because the tobacco industry advised us that in 1988 it paid \$2.3 million in sponsorship in South Australia out of an Australian total of \$19.6 million. Let me acknowledge that the foundation spent \$218 000 on its health program, \$40 000 on anti-smoking and \$49 000 on injury prevention. Sport received \$1.205 million and recreation received a mere \$40 000, yet art and culture received \$358 000. I now refer to the tobacco replacement aspect, the total being \$775 000, yet the industry advises that it was paying about \$2.3 million. What is this organisation up to?

Has it taken over all tobacco sponsorship, or is it being extremely selective in what it is doing? Sport received only \$520 000 in terms of tobacco replacement and art and culture received \$255 000, to make up the \$775 000. New initiatives in respect of sport cost \$685 000 and \$103 000 for art and culture. I suspect that some of the large professional organisations receive support from this fund while the small deserving organisations do not get their fair share. Certainly, the biggest problem with this fund is that moneys are not being allocated for capital expenditure, yet there is sufficient room in the fund to do that.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I know the big organisations such as horse racing and whatever are important, but the fund has not paid out the amount the tobacco industry claims that it was paying out. I refer to the arrogance of this organisation in

not providing answers to questions on the Notice Paper. It would not hurt it to do so. It would not cost it anything to say what it has done, to whom it has given grants and to say how many applications it received for so many million dollars, and so on.

Certainly, to wipe it off by not answering the questions simply raises questions. What has the foundation to hide? What is it committed to in failing to support the system? They are failing the system by being unwilling to accept the opportunity to provide capital grants to small clubs and organisations which meet community needs. Members know as well as I do that many sporting clubs—tennis clubs and walking, croquet or bowls clubs—could do with sums between \$2 000 and \$8 000 to buy lighting or the like and provide greater opportunities for people to involve their early evening leisure hours in participating in their favourite sport.

I think Foundation South Australia is a failure. It is time that it is asked to do the job it is expected to do. It is time that those who contribute have a greater say in that organisation. I am not prepared to stand by and allow Foundation South Australia to dictate to the consumers and taxpayers of this State without its being accountable to Parliament in the way we expect. More than anything else, what annoyed me was the reply that I was welcome to come in, have a talk and go through the files. I do not have the time to be drinking cups of tea with those in the organisation when an answer could be provided on an A4 sheet of paper.

These people have a lot to learn. If they expect this vote to continue on the State's accounts it is about time they cooperated with Parliament. It should accept the fact that the current Government—and I hope the Opposition when in government—strongly supports open government in this State, and that full information and details that are sought by any member of Parliament should be provided. Certainly, those who contribute to this organisation, the South Australian taxpayers, will support the bodies that are deserving of support for the reasons that this organisation was established.

Motion carried.

At 8.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 28 September at 11 a.m.