HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 February 1990

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That—

(1) a Joint Select Committee be appointed to consider and report on—

(i) the fairness and appropriateness of the existing electoral system providing for representation in the House of Assembly through single member electorates;

(ii) other electoral systems for popularly elected legislatures with universal franchise including multi-member electorates;

(iii) whether or not criteria for defining electoral boundaries are necessary and if they are regarded as necessary, to determine whether or not the criteria the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission presently is to have regard to when making a redistribution of electoral boundaries for the House of Assembly result in a fair electoral system and what changes, if any, should be proposed to those criteria to ensure electoral fairness is achieved; and

(iv) to make recommendations on the most appropriate form of electoral system for the House of Assembly and its implementation;

(2) the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members of whom two shall form a quorum of House of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Committee;

(3) the Joint Select Committee be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament;

(4) the Legislative Council be requested to suspend Standing Order No. 396 of the Legislative Council to enable strangers to be admitted when the Joint Select Committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating;

and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

It is appropriate that this should be the first private member's motion to be moved in this forty-seventh Parliament because the issues canvassed in it must be of equal concern to all members in this place. We are all here to represent the people of South Australia and, ultimately, it is our decision—that is, the collective decision of all members of this Parliament—as to how the wishes of the people are transferred into representation in the Parliament and as to who governs South Australia. Hence, my proposal for a joint select committee. Ultimately, members of another place must also vote on any measure for change. Their involvement in a joint committee can help to ensure that they are as informed as we must be in the event that the committee proceeds.

This issue of electoral reform caused high controversy in our State throughout the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s—and the issue remains. I do not intend either in this debate or through the committee to revive the problems that we had in the past and nor would I ever question the motives of the key players who debated this matter previously. I do not believe that that would be productive and it would not be in the best interests of anyone to rehash old ground.

However, I ask the House to do one thing, namely, to take cognisance of the experience and facts now available which arose out of the redistribution of some 15 years ago, when we had the last significant change to the Act. Those changes were reflected in the 1976 redistribution. Since that time there have been five State elections. The Labor Party has governed after four of them, even though in two of them the Liberal Party won a clear majority of the two-Party preferred vote. Let me illustrate the point further. In 1979, the Liberal Party won 55 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. This was the largest vote for the winning Party in any election in South Australia since compulsory voting was introduced in 1944. However, this vote returned the Liberal Party only a bare majority, that is, 25 seats.

In 1982, the Labor Party won the same number of seats with 50.9 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. In 1985, Labor, including the Independent Labor member, won 29 seats with 53 per cent of the vote. Last year, the Liberal Party came within 1 per cent of Labor's 1985 vote and yet won seven fewer seats. The two-Party preferred Liberal vote in 1989 was 52 per cent, yet Labor won the same number of seats as the Liberal Party and ultimately retained Government with only 48 per cent of the vote. I know the Premier continues to dispute these figures, but they are now being accepted by everyone who closely analyses the 1989 election result. It is interesting to note that the Electoral Commissioner will ratify these results shortly and they will then be on the public record.

I contrast these outcomes with the Queensland electoral system, which has been subject to many attacks and many attacks in this House. The reality is that in Queensland, no Party failing to obtain a majority of the two-Party preferred vote has governed in that State over the past 30 years. I repeat that: no Party that has failed to obtain greater than 50 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote has governed in Queensland in the past 30 years. However, it continues to happen in South Australia and it happened last year. It also happened in 1975 and, again, Labor was the beneficiary. It happened during the 1950s and 1960s as well. On those occasions, the advantage was to the non-Labor side of politics, although that advantage was never as great as that established for Labor after the 1976 redistribution. Those who fought for the present electoral system in South Australia by condemning the previous system must now recognise that there is still a way to go before we can all agree that we have the fairest possible system.

I have mentioned the Queensland situation. In that State, under the current electoral system, there is an advantage of about 1.5 per cent to the coalition. This is slightly less than the 3.7 per cent advantage to Labor currently applying in South Australia—demonstrated by the 1989 election result. In Victoria, there is an advantage of 1.5 per cent to the ALP. In New South Wales and Western Australia, the advantage to Labor is 3.5 per cent, and in the Commonwealth it is about 1.7 per cent. These measures of unfairness have been established by independent analysis of the electoral systems.

The 3.7 per cent advantage to Labor in South Australia is the effect of the redistribution that came into force before the 1985 election. It was even greater for the 1982 election, as the recently retired Commonwealth Electoral Commissioner, Dr Colin Hughes, explained in a paper to the Third Federalism Project Conference in February 1983. I quote at some length from this paper because it is directly relevant to the matter before the House. Dr Hughes stated:

> Under a Westminster-model parliamentary system, the object of an election is to win at least a bare majority of seats in the legislature—50 per cent plus one of the seats—in order to form the Government and secure the perquisites and opportunities of office. The best measure of fairness will be the relative ease (expressed as the necessary minimal proportion of the total vote each would require) with which each of the major Parties could attain that object. In practice, it is most unlikely that the election will be so narrowly balanced, with the winning Party having only

that barest of majorities. It will be necessary to adjust the share of the total vote figures to meet at that point.

To illustrate with a very recent, and close, election: the winning ALP obtained 50.9 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote at the 1982 South Australian State election, and the losing Liberal 49.1 per cent. Counting the Independent Labor and National Country Party MHR's as ALP and Liberal respectively, they obtained 25 and 22 seats. Twenty-four seats would have been the bare majority required to govern. On the results of the 1982 election, the ALP could have won 24 seats despite a loss of up to 3.6 per cent of its actual two-Party preferred vote; thus we can say the proportion of the total two-Party preferred vote the ALP required to win was 47.3 per cent (50.9 per cent minus 3.6 per cent). The Liberals would have required an additional 3.7 per cent to have won the necessary twenty-fourth seat, so their required share would have been 52.8 per cent (49.1 per cent plus 3.7 per cent). The difference between those two figures is 5.5 per cent (52.8 per cent minus 47.3 per cent) and that will be the measure of fairness, favouring on this occasion the ALP.

I emphasise the independence of those comments and the eminence of their author. They came from Dr Colin Hughes, who was, at the time, with the Department of Political Science at the ANU and is the former Commonwealth Electoral Commissioner.

The reasons for the continuing advantage to the ALP in the South Australian electoral system are to be found in the criteria for re-distribution entrenched in the Constitution, and the distribution of the potential vote of the two major Parties. An analysis of the 1989 election results demonstrates the particular concentration of the non-Labor vote. Six seats produced two-Party preferred votes of over 70 per cent for the successful candidate: they were Flinders, Victoria, Mount Gambier, Custance, Murray-Mallee and Bragg. None was won by Labor. No Labor seats had the same number of what psephologists call 'locked-in interest votes'. The concentration of majorities in a single member system of representation significantly increases the potential for a Party to be able to govern with less than a majority of the overall State vote. The demographic situation in South Australia means that this factor in this State is a considerable advantage to Labor. The criteria under which the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission must work, requiring it to leave existing boundaries undisturbed as far as is practicable, compounds this advantage for Labor.

The commission is hamstrung in being able to significantly change boundaries. Nor can it take into account previous election results in assessing the consequences for the future. The ultimate result of the existing criteria is an extended advantage to Labor at the expense of the Liberal Party. I believe now there can be no dispute about that. I have no argument whatsoever with equality of representation, which is what the existing criteria, in part, seek to ensure. But they are silent on the ability to also guarantee government for the majority preferred Party for which the electors vote. This distinction must be recognised. Equality of representation—equal numbers, within a set tolerance, in each electorate—does not guarantee fairness in the overall election result. I quote again Dr Colin Hughes as one authority for saying this. In the same paper from which I quoted earlier, he has referred to the failure to distinguish between equality and fairness as follows:

Too often these two aspects of representation are muddled. Even when they are not, there is frequently an assumption that their measures will be positively correlated, so that a set of boundaries which increases 'equality' of electors (that is, equality of the enrolments of Electoral Districts) must also increase 'fairness' in converting Party votes into Party seats in the legislature, or that a set of boundaries which is low on 'equality' must be seriously 'unfair' to one Party or another, an interpretation which is particularly likely when one Party obtains a substantially higher proportion of the total vote than its rival.

The Parliament must consider how we can establish a system which guarantees both equality of representation and fairness of outcome. It is inevitable that there will be a redistribution before the next election. Constitutionally, it is not due before the election after next. But the introduction of four-year terms, and population growth in some areas and decline in others, means that many electorates will be above or below the 10 per cent tolerance if we leave the next redistribution until it is constitutionally due.

At the 1989 election, 12 electorates were above or below the tolerance. The new member for Fisher has to represent 10 500 more electors than the member for Elizabeth. They are our largest and smallest seats in terms of elector numbers. Clearly, this disparity must be dealt with by this Parliament. The Government has a number of options. It can increase or reduce the number of members of the House, and this would trigger an immediate redistribution without a referendum. It could propose simply to bring forward the timing of the next redistribution, and this would require a referendum. I make it clear that the Liberal Party would not support either course.

Mr Ferguson: Shame!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Do you think the present system is fair? The honourable member will have a chance to reply to this, and we will see who wants fairness and reality in this House. I should have thought that the member for Henley Beach had enough to do trying to fix up his council's problems without interjecting in this debate.

Each of those—the referendum or the reduction in the number of seats, as I have said—would only compound the unfairness of the present system. A redistribution held at any time under the present criteria is likely to further benefit the Labor Party, and not address the question of fairness. We have made that assessment after a detailed consideration of the commission's options. This would also apply to a redistribution under the present criteria for a smaller or larger House of Assembly. Each course of action would not address one of the fundamental obstacles to a fairer system raised by the present criteria. Accordingly, the Liberal Party believes all members of the House should take the opportunity to consider, in full, all the options available.

I suggest that the joint select committee that I have proposed will encourage the first full and objective open debate of the electoral system in our State's history. Previous debates have been characterised by misrepresentation and misunderstanding. It will allow us to strip away some of the myths surrounding this issue, which I believe have been prevalent for many years. It will show a full consideration of all options. The criteria for redistribution and single and multi-member representation are to be canvassed under the terms of reference. The joint committee will allow all parties, all groups and all individuals in the community with an interest in this vital issue to put forward their views, knowing they will be fully considered by the whole Parliament.

I emphasise this opportunity to those academics in South Australia and in other States who are often vocal about electoral systems. This Parliament should welcome a forum in which their views can be canvassed. I am not seeking a political advantage for the Liberal Party with this committee. I am seeking only an opportunity to establish the fairest possible system in which no Party is advantaged or disadvantaged. I refer to an *Advertiser* editorial on this issue on 3 January this year. It stated:

Fair electoral distribution is such a fundamental right it must not be blurred by any hint of sleight of hand, any stain of political opportunism.

I fully endorse those comments. It would amount to sleight of hand and opportunism if the Government responded to the current electoral circumstances by simply advancing the timing of the next redistribution and doing nothing more.

I indicate here and now that the Liberal Party would oppose a referendum question put to the people seeking to achieve only this result. I hope this does not happen. I believe that we need to be mature enough to debate this matter fully and objectively, without confrontation. As an alternative, we propose this joint committee in the first instance. It will allow the Parliament to canvass all views, assemble all the facts and assess all the options in the hope that the result will be that, finally, South Australia does have an electoral system which is fair by any measure. This means an electoral system which guarantees equality of representation and fairness of outcome—one vote one value in the full sense of that well worn but often misunderstood term.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

That this House notes with dismay the progressive failure by Ministers to adhere to Westminster traditions of ministerial responsibility to Parliament, the increase in the power of the Executive and the Public Service and the consequent decline in the power of Parliament and thus in the democratic rights of the people and calls on the Premier, the ministry and the Parliament to uphold all those customs and traditions which strengthen the role of Parliament and the rights of citizens.

In noting the progressive failure by Ministers of this Administration to adhere to the traditions of the Westminster system, it is essential that we first identify what those traditions and customs are. They have been written about, at length, by constitutional writers and political commentators, but they are perhaps best summed up briefly by Walter Bagehot in his celebrated writings on the English Constitution published in 1867. In those writings, he says:

The Minister of the day will have to give an account in Parliament of all branches of administration, to say why they act when they do, and why they do not when they don't.

Under this Government, this tradition has become a fiction, and it is only a fiction under the Bannon Government. Traditions, if identified broadly, fall into about six categories: first, the Minister will answer questions put to him or her in Parliament in a straightforward, honest and accurate fashion; secondly, a defence by Ministers of Cabinet decisions (and that is a tradition that has fallen into disrepute, as I will demonstrate, under the Bannon Government); thirdly, the tradition of advocacy for Government policies (again, that tradition has fallen into disrepute under the Bannon Government); fourthly, the tradition of stepping aside while a Minister is under investigation is one that is time-honoured (and it has fallen into disrepute, and, indeed, into disuse under the Bannon Government); fifthly, the tradition that a Minister will resign if he or she has misled the Parliament (that has been totally abandoned by the Bannon Government); and, sixthly, the tradition that a Minister will resign if he or she loses the confidence of the House (and that has fallen into disrepute and disuse under the Bannon Government).

First, I turn to the tradition which is central to parliamentary democracy under the Westminster system of a Minister's answering questions and thus being accountable to Parliament. A glance through the parliamentary debates over the past four or five years will show that countless questions by the Opposition have been met with straight-out denial or with an evasion of responsibility by Ministers of this Government. Probably one of the most memorable examples is the performance of the former hapless Minister of Forests (Hon. Roy Abbott) who came into this House day after pathetic day with information provided by his public servants in anticipation of a question from the Opposition.

Mr Ferguson: He was the most honest politician here.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As the member for Henley Beach points out—and I interpolate 'according to his own lights'—Mr Abbott claimed to be the most honest politician in the Parliament. It was quite clear that the Minister of Forests under that Administration was incapable of providing answers to the questions. One of the most wretched sights that this House has witnessed was Mr Abbott simply reading what was in front of him regardless of whether it was relevant to the question that had been asked. It made a mockery of the notion of ministerial responsibility.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He had the wrong bit of paper sometimes.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Indeed he did. It also made a mockery of the fact that the Leader of the Government is ultimately responsible for the conduct of his or her Ministers. The Premier, as Leader of that Government, permitted this situation to persist to what must have been the acute embarrassment of the more enlightened members of the Caucus. It certainly persisted to the point where the Parliament was diminished as a result.

One of the ploys much used by this Government to evade the responsibility to answer questions is the new cover-all excuse of commercial confidentiality. So many times we have been told that answers to questions cannot be given because they are commercially confidential. I will not go into the relevant and important aspect of Government involvement in business which gives some kind of plausibility to this question in the Government's eyes; that is another issue which should be debated separately. However, it is worth pointing out that South Australians do not know who owns our power stations, what the leasing arrangements are and why they were entered into in the first place because, according to the Government, this information is a matter of commercial confidentiality.

This matter is of fundamental public importance. It is a question of State ownership of infrastructure. It is a question that South Australians are entitled to have answered; but it has been dodged time and time again under the cloak of commercial confidentiality. Apparently, South Australians are not entitled to know the total indebtedness of the State Bank in respect of high risk loans which it has entered into recently because, according to the Premier, these matters are commercially confidential. It is a fact—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: In other words, the facts are embarrassing to the Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The facts are embarrassing to the Government. The phrase 'commercial confidentiality' is another way of saying that the answer would be too embarrassing. The fact of the matter is that the people of South Australia, through the Government, are guarantors for every dollar lent or borrowed by the State Bank of South Australia. This circumstance alone would normally make disclosure to the guarantor mandatory, but under this Government, because it might be held accountable for events which I have no doubt will, in time, be demonstrated to be irresponsible—to put it kindly—in terms of lending policy and because it might embarrass the Government, we are told that these matters are commercially confidential. The matters that this Parliament should have disclosed to it in the interest of the people whom it represents are cloaked in secrecy because of a convenient excuse which the Government has found and which it uses time

and time again. The whole question of the ASER project has never been answered satisfactorily, simply because—

Mr Ingerson: And the Casino.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: And the Casino, as the member for Bragg points out, simply because, presuming that answers would be embarrassing, the Ministers of the day have said, 'We cannot give you that information, because it is commercially confidential.' How can it be that land made available by the Government in the name of the State and owned by the State can be subject to dealings about which the people of the State apparently have no right to know? My colleagues and I believe that that is wrong. I also believe that it is quite unnecessary. I have the sincere doubt that, if all the Government files, Cabinet files included, were open to anyone who wanted to examine them, and if the media and community were allowed access to them, the Government would be one whit worse off, and I think that the people would be a lot better off. However, with freedom of information legislation (which the Government has been dragged screaming to the barrier to bring in), we may have access to a little more. But, the Ministers are evading their responsibilities to give answers to Parliament.

The other issue of defence of Cabinet and Government decisions by Ministers—a tradition which goes back to the whole notion of ministerial responsibility and which is fundamental to it—has been substantially abandoned by this Government. I refer particularly to the now common practice of Ministers hiding behind 'spokespersons'. It is extraordinary how often Ministers are not available when a controversial issue comes up and any answer that is sought by the media or, indeed, by the Parliament, is provided by a departmental head.

I would like to provide some examples of that. Members will recall the occasion last year when Dr Boston, the Director-General of Education, had a hectic time defending the Government's curriculum guarantee package. The Minister, Mr Crafter, lay very low. Dr McPhail, the Director-General of Environment and Planning, was placed in the unenviable position of defending, on ABC radio, the Government's decision on Wilpena against Opposition arguments to the contrary. In those circumstances, the role of the Opposition becomes untenable. It is simply not right for a member of the Opposition to attack the Government and, in doing so, being forced into a position of attacking and contradicting a public servant. That makes the roles of the public servant and the Opposition untenable and, to that extent, it makes the role of the Parliament untenable. It therefore places the people in a position of powerlessness where they are very much compromised as a result of the uneven balance between a politician and a public servant simply through default of a Minister.

The health service is another area where the Minister has hidden, and continues to hide, behind his public servants. Last year Dr McCoy, Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, was left to answer a lot of questions about the crisis in hospitals that would have been much better answered by the Minister. I could point to many other examples of this failure by Ministers to account publicly for their activities. However, in the interests of time, I will restrict those examples, but I point out to the House that the advocacy for Government policies, which should be undertaken by Ministers, is another area that is now becoming the province of public servants, thus enhancing the power of the Executive and the Public Service and diminishing the power of Parliament.

When I was Minister of Health I had the privilege of receiving from the then Government's special adviser on health matters, Sir Charles Bright, a series of letters on constitutional matters. In January 1980 Sir Charles wrote to me and stated:

> The most important duty of a Minister, in my opinion, is to inspire and lead by positive action and by ensuring that the departmental officers know what they ought to be doing and why.

Today the inspiration comes less and less from the Minister and more and more from the corporate departmental plan. Corporate departmental plans were simply not heard of in the period prior to the Bannon Government. Governments had policies: they were developed and enunciated by politicians on behalf of the Parties and people they represented and put into practice by the Public Service. It now seems that under this Government the Public Service develops the policy. The corporate plan is a document which, as its name suggests, emulates private business plans which set out company goals and strategies to achieve those goals. Such plans are increasingly being adopted by departments in default of ministerial leadership, direction and specific Government policy. The responsibility for development of those plans rests not with the Minister but with the departmental head.

Another pernicious development under this Government is the development of so-called performance agreements which are a contract between a Minister and a department. They are designed to diminish the direct responsibility of Ministers for administering departments by blurring the distinction between Government objectives and industrial goals.

The question of stepping aside while the Minister is under investigation is one of the more important traditions of Parliament and one which has been blatantly ignored by this Government. When it was announced that the National Crime Authority was investigating the Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, to ascertain whether he had been compromised by having an association with a brothel keeper, in my opinion the Minister should have stepped aside. That opinion in no way presumes any outcome, guilt or indeed innocence on the part of the Minister. It is simply a fundamental way of demonstrating that justice is being done and being seen to be done.

Mr Lewis: It is convention.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is convention based on an ethical approach to government. It is based on the notion that if things are not right at the top they cannot be right anywhere. It is based on the notion that Government has a responsibility to set an example and on the notion that if Ministers, on behalf of the Government, fail to set that example, we cannot expect an ethical approach and a high standard of integrity throughout the community. We cannot expect it in the Public Service, the professions, business, commerce or in community dealings. Integrity starts at the top. This is a subject about which I feel most strongly. There can be no presumption whatsoever of guilt on the part of any politician simply by the notion of stepping aside. Even Mr Neville Wran—that very hard political dealer—stepped aside when he was under investigation as Premier of New South Wales.

Mr Lewis: To his credit.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Much to his credit. Mr Sinclair, then Leader of the National Party, stepped aside from his position as a Cabinet Minister when his personal affairs were under investigation.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And Mick Young.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, as the member for Light rightly points out, even Mr Mick Young, the former member for Port Adelaide and Minister in the Hawke Government, stepped aside when he was under investigation. The fact that the present Attorney-General, for whom I have a high personal regard, has not stepped aside in my

opinion has diminished the moral power of the Bannon Government.

The next point is the resignation of a Minister if he or she loses the confidence of Parliament. That tradition has been completely jettisoned by the Bannon Government. When John Cornwall lost the confidence of the Legislative Council in a vote 12 to 9 against him in November 1987, he simply carried on as if nothing had happened. That action, which is probably now forgotten by the public, dealt a savage blow to the whole concept of ministerial responsibility. It was defended on specious grounds by a Premier who should have known better, it was tolerated by a compliant Labor Caucus, and it was allowed to pass relatively unremarked by the media but, in my opinion, that action was a watershed that should not be forgotten by anyone who is concerned about the rights of Parliament.

Much more could be said on this subject but, recognising the rights of my colleagues today to pursue other matters, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STURT CREEK

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House deplores any suggestion that the Government further degrade one of this State's natural waterways, the Sturt Creek, by turning it into an O-Bahn carriageway and that it applauds the efforts of the Marion council to develop the creek's environs as a linear park.

I am prompted to move this motion because of an article by Rex Jory that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 20 September 1989. It began:

The State Government is examining the possibility of building a $100 million O-Bahn carriageway south of the city to Darlington.

I will not quote the article fully because I am sure that all members have read it and it is freely available in the Parliamentary Library. Mr Blevins, while acknowledging that the matter was under consideration, said:

I certainly do not write off the project. It is well worth further study.

That is what prompts this motion because I, for one, and I believe many other members on both sides of this House hope, on some very serious grounds, that it was not worth further study. They may be described as historical, environmental and tourism grounds and I will deal fairly briefly with each.

Members on the Government benches are very proud of their record with the Aboriginal people of South Australia and we must give them some credit for the work that they have done with Aborigines in areas of the State. However, it is a fact that Sturt Creek is very important to the Kaurna tribe of the Adelaide Plains. It was, according to Christabel Mattingley, who has studied this matter and with whom I spoke as recently as this morning, a principal area for them and there is a principal place of dreaming on that creek. I do not pretend to be an expert on Aboriginal law and there are others in this place and outside who, I am sure, the Government could consult on this matter.

However, I would like to read one point into the record which illustrates what I am saying. At one stage in the Aboriginal dreaming an Aboriginal boy was killed near the Sturt River, at the place which is now known as Marion, for committing a crime which could only be expiated in Aboriginal law by his death. His uncle, Tjilbruke, who will be known to most members as the mythical creator of all waters, gathered up the boy's body and, from the Brighton beach—where according to custom it was being smoked and dried—he then carried it off to its final resting place. At every stopping point along the way from Marino to Carrickalinga Head, Tjilbruke's tears of sorrow gushed forth springs of everlasting water. That was the Aboriginal legend associated with the springs that are found all over the Fleurieu Peninsula.

As European descendants, we may well consider that to be a lament for the passing of a docile tribe. Thanks in part to our actions, it is only a remnant of what it was and no longer inhabits its tribal land. I trust that that lament will not become more poignant by Government action that further denigrates the important heritage of these people. I invite members opposite to come with me this afternoon to Sturt Creek to see the bee trees and canoe trees of these people. For the reasons of Aboriginal heritage and culture, I believe that Sturt Creek is valuable in its own right.

Moreover, it was one of the first rivers found on the Adelaide Plains, having been discovered in 1831 by Captain Collett Barker, who named it for his friend, Sturt, as part of the expedition in which Barker lost his life. It was important to the early settlers because its flood plains became prime agricultural land on which the early vineyards were established. The importance of the river to white, European history is recorded graphically in the coat of arms of the city of Marion. Over the azure waves, which represent the colours of the Sturt Creek, is a rose, which formed part of the personal crest of Captain Sturt. The tatting around the crest is blue and white, also in acknowledgment of the colours of Sturt Creek.

As one of the natural waterways of the Adelaide Plains, it is an important part of the history of South Australia. I appeal to the Government not to denigrate it further. I accept that Ministers opposite are concerned for the heritage, culture and traditions of this State, especially our environs. I also accept that they are environmentally concerned. I was dismayed to read that there could be any suggestion of degrading one of the few, precious natural waterways which is unobstructed in its passage from the hills to the sea. It should be preserved. I do not oppose a rapid transit system to the south: members who represent southern metropolitan electorates regard that as a priority. During the election campaign the Liberal Party put forward a viable and economically responsible alternative.

It is not a matter of putting an O-Bahn down the Sturt Creek or nothing at all. It is a matter of siting a rapid transit system, whether it be an O-Bahn, a light rail system or continuing the heavy rail system, in the best place. That is the purpose of this motion—wherever the transport system is sited, for the sake of our credibility and for future generations it should not be placed down the Sturt Creek. The Minister for Environment and Planning claims every day in this place that she is concerned about the environment. Sturt Creek is an important part of our environment, not so much as it is today but as it was. Today the creek is part of the south-west drainage system and people on both sides of this Chamber may be responsible for that. In the long term, some of the drainage system could be modified and reclaimed to make the creek more like it was.

I do not pretend to suggest to the Government that it could achieve that in the course of one or even two Parliaments but, as with the Torrens linear park, I would hope to see this Parliament adopt it as a long term project for the future heritage of South Australians. Members can see what the Sturt Creek was like when we read:

The river was once a permanent stream fed by springs and prodigal in breeding fish and yabbies. Its banks were the natural habitat of possums, ducks, lizards, snakes, birds and insects: kangaroos and emus and also wallabies, moved freely among the river gums and grassy woodlands of the plains.

The Sturt Creek area was notable as open woodland country, for its river red gums and its larger eucalypts, peppermint gums, sheoaks and acacias. It was a significant part of the Adelaide environment, which we have degraded temporarily but which I hope one day we can restore to the eminence it had in the time of our early settlers. Because other members wish to speak this morning and as I do not wish to unduly take up the time of the House, I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LONSDALE ROAD

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House notes the concern of local residents about the danger caused by the permissible speed limit of 100 km/h on Lonsdale Road, Hallett Cove, and calls on the Government to take action in the interest of safety, including reduction of the speed limit to 80 km/h and construction of an underpass in accordance with the original road plan to allow school children and other pedestrians safe access from one side of the road to the other.

The issues on which I move this motion are not new. They have lain unresolved over years, being subjected to endless procrastination, buck-passing and inaction. They have been given cursory examination by the present Minister of Transport and his predecessor, and given some lip-service by the previous member for Bright.

Lonsdale Road was opened in 1980 as a four lane arterial road stretching from Majors Road to Sherriffs Road. The section of road between Aroona Road and Gretel Crescent, Hallett Cove, has a 100 km/h speed limit, with 80 km/h speed limits applying to the sections of road at either end of the 100 km/h zone.

This 100 km/h stretch of road is bordered by Hallett Cove, on its western side, and by Trott Park and Sheidow Park on its eastern side. A Catholic primary school, the St Martin De Porres School, borders the road in Sheidow Park, as does a Mobil service station, Hungry Jacks food outlet and retail premises for garden supply and landscape supply businesses. On the other side of the road are a Shell service station, a tavern, council library, three churches and some 50 specialty shops and offices.

The Hallett Cove R10 school, which provides education to approximately 1 000 students, is located one street back from Lonsdale Road. Residents commute from both sides of the road to use the services provided on the other side. Children residing in the member for Fisher's electorate at Trott Park and Sheidow Park cross the 100 km/h road to attend the Hallett Cove school, while children residing in my electorate cross the same section of the road to attend the St Martin De Porres School. Similarly, Trott Park and Sheidow Park residents must cross the 100 km/h road to attend church, do their shopping, visit the tavern or library, or have their car repaired, and residents of Hallett Cove do likewise to buy garden or landscape supplies and, if they so desire, to enjoy a hamburger at Hungry Jack's.

The designers of the original road plan envisaged the need for pedestrians to travel from one side of the busy road to the other and, accordingly, they incorporated a pedestrian underpass in the design to facilitate safe access. However, at the time the road was constructed, the shops and facilities I have detailed did not exist and the population of the area was much smaller. The Government of the day, in its wisdom, decided to defer the building of the underpass until the population grew and the schools and facilities were built.

An honourable member: Did they give that guarantee?

Mr MATTHEW: Yes, they certainly did give that guarantee but, regrettably, that guarantee was not met. The schools and facilities have been built and there are now some 5 000 houses in the suburbs bordering the 100 km/h road, but still there is no underpass. The previous Minister of Transport finally examined the situation after a rash of correspondence and representations from groups such as the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association; the Karrara Residents' Association; the Lonsdale Highway Underpass Action Group; the Hallett Cove (R10) School Council; the St Martin de Porres School; the City of Marion; and the Education Department.

The Minister's first response was to offer in November 1986 to cover one-third of the cost of the underpass, provided the Education Department and the City of Marion also contributed one-third. As one would reasonably expect, both the City of Marion and the Education Department declined such an absurd proposition. After all, the underpass was supposed to have been constructed with Highways Department funds as part of the original road plan. After further representations, including a petition carrying in excess of 2 000 signatures, the previous Minister of Transport took the cheapest way out: a quick-fix solution involving the erection of traffic lights including a pedestrian crossing, with the speed limit remaining at 100 km/h.

I ask members to picture in their minds a gently sloping 100 km/h highway with pedestrian lights installed so as to be obscured to south-bound traffic until it is almost upon the lights—traffic travelling at speeds of 100 km/h or more. Would members in this House allow their children or grandchildren to cross such a road? Indeed, would the Minister of Transport allow his children to do so? Picture the same road on a wet day as water flows in sheets down the slope of the road. Drivers approaching the pedestrian crossing at 100 km/h do not notice that the lights have turned red until they are almost on top of them. I would not like to be the pedestrian on the crossing at that time.

I acknowledge that the underpass was not an inexpensive option. I am reliably informed that in August 1988 the cost of the underpass would have been in excess of $300 000 and that its final cost would be dependent upon a number of design issues such as dimension of ramps and access requirements. But do we need to see the blood of young children on that road before moneys will be spent to provide a safe underpass for pedestrians?

I urge the Minister of Transport, as a matter of priority, to listen to the groups involved, such as the City of Marion and the school bodies and resident groups that I previously mentioned and, as a matter of urgency, to direct his department to re-examine the underpass proposal. A quick fix is not good enough. The original road plan allowed for an underpass and the Government deferred it. It is now time to act.

My motion is in two parts, and I have spent most of my speaking time addressing the second part of the motion, concerning the construction of the underpass. The first part of the motion requires little expenditure and could be relatively quickly implemented. Most of the same groups of people I have previously mentioned have been actively lobbying for the speed limit of 100 km/h on the section of Lonsdale Road involved to be reduced to 80 km/h. In a letter dated 21 December 1988 to the previous member for Bright, the Minister of Transport wrote:

The current speed limit on Lonsdale Road (100 km/h) is considered to be appropriate in view of the prevailing road and land use conditions. As previously advised, a speed survey conducted by the Highways Department confirmed that driver observance of the existing speed limit is good, and changing the speed limit will not be expected to have any effect upon actual vehicle speeds.

The previous member for Bright certainly was not convinced by the Highways Department surveys. Indeed, in a public outburst he was quoted in the local media as saying:

> Clearly, no parent of right mind would allow a child on a bicycle to attempt to cross Lonsdale Road at present when vehicle speeds often exceed 120 km/h.

The previous member and I have been known to disagree in many instances, but on this matter, quite clearly, he was right. In 1988 there were 11 injuries and 33 incidents of property damage resulting from vehicle accidents on Lonsdale Road. In the first nine months of 1989, since the installation of the traffic lights, there were 11 injuries and 38 incidents of property damage, which exceeded the figures for the previous year. Figures for the last three months are not yet available, but I am aware that there was a death on the road on 2 October 1989, which death occurred a matter of metres away from the traffic lights.

I enjoy the travelling time saved by being able to travel at 100 km/h as much as any motorist who uses Lonsdale Road, but the safety of all users—pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists and motorists—must be considered together. I have often observed the difficulty experienced by the drivers of the 681 STA bus trying to cross Lonsdale Road in peak hour traffic that is travelling at high speeds. The lowering of the allowable speed to 80 km/h would help alleviate the difficulties of the bus drivers as well as providing a safer road for all users. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Public Finance and Audit Act. Read a first time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill represents an important principle, namely, that the Auditor-General shall be declared an officer of the Parliament and be recommended for appointment to the Governor by the Parliament. Section 24 of the Public Finance and Audit Act provides that the Auditor-General be appointed by the Governor. The Act, however, is silent as to who shall recommend the appointment to the Governor, but the convention is that the Premier (in his role as Treasurer) performs this task.

Section 24 also provides that the Auditor-General be not subject to the direction of any person, and that is an extremely important provision. There is a conflict: on the one hand, the Auditor-General shall be free from any political interference, yet be selected by the head of a political Party. Further, section 26 provides that the ultimate responsibility for dismissal of the Auditor-General lies with the Parliament by resolution of both Houses.

The Opposition believes first, that the Auditor-General should be completely free of political interference; secondly, that this can only be achieved by the selection of a suitable candidate by both Houses of Parliament; and thirdly, that to ensure that there is no bias exhibited by the Parliament there shall be equal representation of Government and Opposition representatives on the selection panel, with both Houses equally represented. A panel of eight has been suggested.

There is a very strong precedent in the wording of our own Act, which says that there shall be a separation of Government and the Auditor-General, because this person must be above any form of political interference. In this day and age it is inappropriate that the Auditor-General should be appointed by recommendation of the Government. He or she should be appointed as a result of recommendations from Parliament.

It is interesting to note that in the British Parliament the Auditor-General (or the equivalent thereof) is appointed by a public address from the House of Commons and, under British law, the Auditor-General is deemed to be an officer of the House of Commons.

The distinction we should draw in this situation is that the House of Commons and the House of Lords do not have responsibilities identical to the Houses of Parliament in South Australia. In this State the Legislative Council has powers approximately equal to those of the House of Assembly—which are not enjoyed by the House of Lords. In Britain the Auditor-General is responsible to only one part of the Parliament, namely, the House of Commons, while in South Australia the Auditor-General is responsible to both Houses.

Interestingly—and I think it is quite timely to mention this—this matter is currently being addressed at the Federal level. Recommendations are afoot, and they are contained in a March 1989 document entitled 'The Joint Committee of Public Accounts, The Auditor General: Ally of the People and Parliament, Reform of the Australian Audit Office, Canberra.'

I do not intend to read all the recommendations in that report, but perhaps the most important one relates to this principle that the Auditor-General be separated from Government. The major recommendations on this subject are as follows:

> The report's major recommendations of relevance to South Australia are:
> - the Audit Act 1901 be repealed and replaced by a Financial Administration Act and an Audit Act;
> - similar to the post-1983 arrangements in the United Kingdom a parliamentary committee be established to advise the Auditor-General on Parliament's audit priorities and to consider the Audit Offices finances—membership of nine to include Speaker/President (alternating), Minister for Finance, Public Accounts Committee chairperson, two Government committee chairperons who use AAO reports (1 Reps, 1 Senate), 3 Opposition members, 1 minority Party member (or Opposition);
> - future audit legislation state unequivocally that the Auditor-General is an officer of the Parliament (in the United Kingdom he is an officer of the House of Commons);
> - the Auditor-General be appointed by the Governor-General in Council. Nominations to fill future vacancies for Auditor-General be made by the Prime Minister after consulation with an advisory panel . . .

So, the precedent for change to take place in this Parliament is already there, and the Liberal Party considers that it is opportune to do so. Members would be well aware that we have a very fine Auditor-General in Tom Sheridan, who has undertaken his tasks with a fearlessness and an objectivity, which I believe is respected on both sides of this House. There is an opportunity now to put in place what I believe is a fundamental principle: that the Auditor-General should be completely free of any form of political interference or any element of mateship involved in the appointment thereof.

In researching this matter, I looked to the United States—which is probably a very poor role model—and at the committee system that operates in the Senate of the United States. Reviewing that literature made me realise that Australia would have difficulties if it ever became a republic and adopted the American system for appointments.

Members would be aware that in the United States most of the appointments to high positions in the Public Service, the military and the foreign affairs areas are made by the President, or his nominee, and then scrutinised by the Sen-

ate. The report to which I referred states that, over the five year term of the last Reagan administration, over 160 000 appointments were dealt with by the Senate. One of the great criticisms in the literature was that the task had become impossible, that the committees simply could not handle the vast number of appointments that had to be made. This has led to a lack of scrutiny. When a problem arose due to the selection of an inappropriate person the rules were tightened and the delays increased.

They now have a system that is quite moribund. When appointments are made, appointees take up their position until the Senate has managed to review the nomination. This is a very lengthy process that can take some months. I was not very interested in seeing how bad the American system was; I was interested in the way the Senate committees operate. They are, if you like, bipartisan and are formed by the Senate's own resolution. They comprise of representatives from both sides of the political spectrum. They vary in size according to the importance of the appointment; for example, one of the largest committees is the foreign affairs committee, which has a membership of 17, as does the judiciary committee.

The members of these committees are responsible for reviewing the legitimacy or otherwise of the nomination put to them by the President. The very minor appointments are normally considered in bulk by lower order committees, which have a much smaller membership. I was fascinated to read how many appointments had ultimately been rejected because, if the committee deems an appointment to be inappropriate, then the appointment must be considered by the whole of the Senate. It is then a vote of the Senate that determines the fate of that appointment. A large number of appointments have been considered but, probably more importantly, 10 times as many people have had their nominations for appointment withdrawn by the President or his delegate before they suffered the fate of defeat on the floor of the Senate.

It is an interesting system, but it does not have direct relevance to the proposition I am putting today, except to contrast, and perhaps give some added impetus, to the idea that the Parliament is quite capable of making its own decisions. The American Senate has to make 160 000 decisions in a four-year period, whereas we have to make one decision. I do not believe that it is beyond the wit or the will of the Parliament. If this principle is agreed to, members will also realise that we should consider other positions that fall within the same ambit, namely, appointments that should be above and beyond Party politics. The appointment of the Ombudsman readily comes to mind as an appointment that should be recommended to the Govenor by the Parliament. Appointments to the Police Complaints Authority also come to mind. The appointment of the Electoral Commissioner could also be deserving of this procedure.

I support this principle because it is all too easy, when a Government is under severe stress—which this Government is at the moment—to appoint to a position such as the Auditor-General, a person who does not have the strongest will to ensure that the Public Service is accountable. It is a fact of life. I am not saying that the Premier of this State would do that, but there is always the inclination, when the numbers are so even and when the debates become so fierce in this House—given that the Government is held by one independent seat—to say, 'I don't want any more strife than I have now. I would prefer to have someone who is quite competent, but not someone who will rock the boat or take the Government to task day after day.' I am not accusing the Bannon Government of doing that; I am saying that we may run into these risks irrespective of which Party is in power. There is always the inclination to take the easy way out.

The role of the Auditor-General is changing. The Federal report which I previously mentioned indicates that there will be a greater emphasis on efficiency audits. The job of the Auditor-General is no longer just checking to see that the accounts have been authorised and that they have been paid, and that there is no fraud or inaccuracy in the account keeping. Auditor-Generals are now faced with the responsibility of ensuring that the money is spent in the most efficient manner. I know that our Auditor-General has made comments in the last three publications in particular reflecting on the way that the money in the Public Service is spent. He has drawn parallels with the way current operations are carried out and suggests alternatives which will lead to significant savings of taxpayers' funds. So, the complexity of the task is increased and the need for vigilance is increased. I believe that the proposition before us must be agreed to by this Parliament. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the Auditor-General is to be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of a committee to be known as the 'Auditor-General Appointments Committee'.

Clause 3 establishes the committee which is to consist of eight members of Parliament, four from the House of Assembly and four from the Legislative Council. Two from each House will be Government nominees and two will be nominees of the Opposition. The committee will be appointed at the commencement of each new Parliament and members will hold office until that next appointment and are eligible for re-appointment (unless no longer a member of Parliament). Deputies may be appointed in the same manner. A member's office becomes vacant if he or she ceases to be a member of Parliament otherwise than upon dissolution or expiry of the Parliament or his or her term of office. No provision is made for a quorum, therefore all members (or their deputies) must be present at each meeting of the committee. A majority decision is a decision of the committee. The members of the committee will choose one of their number to preside at meetings.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

VOLUNTEERS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House—

(a) expresses its total support for all the volunteers who serve our community in so many valuable ways;

(b) recognises and endorses the continuing role of volunteers in the St John Ambulance, the Country Fire Service and in non-Government organisations, the churches and other community groups; and

(c) calls upon the Government to ensure that it will not introduce legislation or any administrative measure which effectively discourages such volunteers from continuing to make their valuable contribution to our community.

This motion, more than any other, highlights one of those problems which, over the course of this Parliament, will

clearly distinguish the philosophical differences between members on this side of the House and members opposite. It touches upon the legitimate functions of Government. Since last century, or perhaps even earlier, there has been a tidal movement of Government, not only in this Chamber but in Chambers around Australia and the world, regardless of the complexion of Government in those places, to adopt a philosophy which requires the protection of people from the womb to the tomb.

While I believe that the rule of law can extend from even before people are conceived until well after they are buried—and it should extend over that period—such rule of law is one of the functions of Government but it is not the total function of Government. I believe that Governments have extended the concept of enacting legislation in respect of their social function until it has become an almost foetal approach to people through the whole of their life.

Government has become all nurturing and all pervasive. It looks after people and does not allow them to think for themselves. I, and other members on this side of the House, see that sort of approach as dangerous. I point out to members opposite that within the womb a foetus can indeed develop. It is nurtured and protected, but finally there comes a point at which the foetus must be born. For the development of our senses and of us as individuals, it is essential that there is an external world which impinges upon us. For that reason, the human being must be born and live. I would argue with this logic that Government can be too nurturing and too cosy and that that is the track down which many current Governments have gone.

The individual, in the basic unit in which he lives and which is important to him—the family—is a social being. It is the individual and his family which I believe is the basic stepping stone in human development. It has not been Governments or the people as a whole that have made the quantum leaps for humanity. Those quantum leaps have been led throughout our entire recorded history not by the Government, not by society as a collective, but by prominent individuals. That, I believe, is at the basis of this motion.

We should look at aspects of Government in which we are now totally involved and committed—education, hospitals and health—most of which were started by individuals or by small sectors of society and were nurtured by them for centuries before the collective will of the people in the form of Government took them on.

There are those on this side of the House who would argue that some functions which are today seen as the legitimate concern of Government are more effectively and compassionately handled when they were undertaken by individuals. In this Chamber we must represent the greatest good of all the people. In doing so, in representing the good of all the people, we cannot always represent the greatest good of some of the people. The thing about smaller units in society is that they can help sometimes where Government cannot, because, in trying to be fair to all, an action may often be unfair to some. That is where individual organisations can and do play a most valuable part.

So we come to the substance of the motion. Prior to the last election, we saw a movement with the volunteers in the St John Ambulance, which many on this side of the House deplored. They deplored it not only in terms of St John Ambulance and its volunteers as such (though I and, I am sure, many of them view those St John Ambulance volunteers as critical and important to the effective functioning of St John in South Australia), but also in terms of the wider question of volunteers in our society. If St John is to become an entirely professional organisation, what then of the Country Fire Services, Meals on Wheels and other organisations that rely entirely on volunteers? I believe that, as long as they do so, they will be run more effectively and economically than the Government has demonstrated it can do with its own institutions and structures. If we do not stop there, what of the Scouts, the Guides, the Southern Self Help Services organisation and the multitude of other organisations which seek to help individuals in our society?

The other day I visited Southern Self Help Services. I am told that it is one of the few organisations that the Department for Community Welfare uses for work orders imposed by the courts.

I believe—and I stand to be corrected—that structured organisations find it difficult to use people who are subject to work orders because of problems with their union membership in those organisations. So, it is left to a few people in our society to support that court order for community work to be done. I believe that members opposite and this Government in particular are strongly in favour, in some cases, of work being done in the community for the expiation of a crime committed against that community. I support that concept, but it is difficult for such an action to occur if there is no-one to supervise the work orders. I may be wrong but, if there are only voluntary organisations to support those work orders, surely there is an argument that such volunteer organisations should be nurtured.

Southern Self Help Services is one that comes to mind. It receives limited funding from this Government, although it seeks to help those whom this Government champions. Southern Self Help Services uses its resources to help people by cutting lawns, building fences and repairing houses for those who cannot afford to do it themselves. For its efforts, I understand that Southern Self Help Services receives $5 000 per annum from the State Government, and I believe that the Government believes it is generous in providing that amount. So, we could go on.

This morning, I was one of the few members in this Chamber who had the privilege of hearing the Hon. Kym Mayes launch the Gumnut Guides. I am sure that a number of members were invited but, because of their heavy duties, they were unable to attend. Nevertheless, I counted it a privilege to hear what the Minister said. He totally supported the Girl Guides Association. I hope that he will continue his rhetoric in this House and that my information that funding for the Girl Guides has been cut by the Government is totally erroneous. However, I am sure that the Minister will correct me if it is. If Ministers are to go to functions that are run by community based organisations, and support those organisations, I hope that those same members opposite will support this motion.

The church organisations also have perhaps been squeezed out of the social welfare area over the past 20 years. The orphanages that were often run by many of the churches have, in fact, been closed down. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STONYFELL-GREENHILL QUARRIES

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

That this House, while acknowledging the dependence of both the public and private sectors on quarry products from the Stonyfell-Greenhill sites—

(a) notes with concern the progressive erosion of the western flank of the Hills face linking the Stonyfell and Greenhill quarries;

(b) commends the efforts made so far to rehabilitate the north-east benches of the quarry; and

(c) urges close cooperation between the Government and the quarry companies to preserve the maximum area of the Hills face and to minimise the visibility of quarry operations from the Adelaide plains.

This motion continues a debate which has raged for decades in Adelaide and South Australia. The problem of doing away with the quarries on the hills face is insoluble. The problem rests on a battle between aesthetics, preservation of the landscape and resources, and economics. Arguments have been advanced in respect of both the preservation of amenity and landscape and the necessity to continue quarrying in order to supply the metropolitan area with quality stone and aggregate at prices which can be afforded by both the Government and private sectors. In acknowledging the dependence of both the public and private sectors on quarry products from the Stonyfell and Greenhill sites, which are but two of the sites ranging from Smithfield to Sellicks across the hills face zone, it is important to put on the record just how dependent we are on these products.

At the outset, I state that I have a special interest in these quarries because they happen to be located within my electorate. Many of my constituents live adjacent to the quarries and still more are familiar with the landscape changes caused by quarrying operations. These changes can be seen as they go about their daily rounds and, indeed, as I travel to and from my office each day. Of course, the impact of the quarries extends way beyond the immediate area surrounding them; virtually wherever one goes on the Adelaide plains—and, indeed, out into the gulf—one is keenly aware of the visual impact of the quarries. I understand that some fishermen were disturbed by the prospect of rehabilitation of the quarries because they serve as a convenient landmark to determine the route to shore.

Some people actually see aesthetic advantages in the quarries and like the look of rough hewn stone rather than that of natural vegetation and the natural shape of the hillside. However, many more people in the metropolitan area are deeply concerned about the increasing erosion of the hills face, which is visible from virtually all suburbs and all angles. In fact, the angles at which the quarries intrude upon the landscape are extraordinary. I was travelling east along North Terrace this morning and I noted that just before the intersection of North Terrace and Hackney Road, if one looks to the south-east, one can see clearly the Greenhill and Stonyfell quarries and their terraces. If one were familar with the topography of the quarries or, alternatively, if one had binoculars, one would see a jagged escarpment, which is known by the quarry companies as 'the slot', which links the Greenhill and Stonyfell quarries. From a view west of the quarry face this escarpment serves as a screen to disguise the depth and height of the quarry behind it.

Members may be interested to know that within a few months—possibly within a few weeks—blasting of that effective screen (the slot), which is on the western face of the quarry, will commence, and the one thing that effectively screens the Stonyfell and Greenhill quarries from open gaze from the plains will come down, I predict that the sound of the dynamite, or whatever explosives are used, to bring it down will be quiet compared to the roar of rage that will go up from the citizens of Adelaide when they see the quarries fully exposed.

In all the circumstances, the question is: what can we do about this problem? To determine what can be done, and to acknowledge what is being done, I will give the House some facts. In recent years, the total of the products produced by the quarries in the metropolitan area has averaged approximately 4.5 million tonnes per year. Of this amount, Stonyfell and Greenhill supply approximately 700 000 tonnes per year, or 15 per cent of the total. The relative quantity each year from Stonyfell and Greenhill varies according to customer demand and the progressive state of overall development of the site.

I add that last year, when I again inspected the quarries (having inspected them from time to time over the years), I was told that the slot, as it is called, would have been quarried had the normal demands for quarry products been maintained in South Australia. It is perhaps a commentary on the state of development in South Australia that that normal level had not been maintained.

The total usable resources within the development are confirmed to exceed 40 million tonnes, which would meet the current levels of demand for, say, the next 50 or 60 years. So, in acknowledging that at the moment we are dependent upon the quarry products, we must also acknowledge that they are not infinite. One day that resource will run out and South Australia will have to find another source to supply our needs, so it is not as though we are dealing with a renewable resource, because we are not.

In addition to the Stonyfell-Greenhill quarry, quarry products are supplied to the Adelaide market from 12 other metropolitan quarries from Smithfield in the north to Sellicks Beach in the south. If we were looking at alternative sources of supply, the nearest available quality resource would be found on the Upper Yorke Peninsula and on the Fleurieu Peninsula in the Myponga-Rapid Bay area. There are many other deposits throughout South Australia, most of which are limited in size and, in many cases, they are limited in quality. But to what use are these quarry products put?

The main products include concrete aggregates, asphalt aggregates, rail ballast, various crushed sands, a wide range of road base materials encompassing various qualities and specifications, back filling, coastal protection products as well as many other special products for specific applications. The main products are in constant demand, but the individual variations simply reflect changes in overall construction and development patterns. The aggregates represent 35 per cent of demand; crushed sands, 10 per cent; crushed rocks, 20 per cent; filling products, 25 per cent; and, ballast, marine and miscellaneous products, 10 per cent.

So, what would we do if somehow or other the Government and the private sector decided that the disadvantage of the visual destruction wrought upon the hills face as a result of the quarries outweighed the disadvantage of cost that would be incurred if we had to get quarry products from elsewhere? How would we assess that cost benefit? We would have to look at a very diverse and complex range of costs and benefits. There is no doubt that, if we had to quarry elsewhere, the cost of quarry products would increase significantly.

I noted from library files that, when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, the Hon. Hugh Hudson said that, if quarrying had to be undertaken elsewhere, the cost to Government in terms of roads alone would be, if I recall correctly, about $60 million to $70 million a year. That is a very substantial amount to add to the Highways Department budget.

Another factor which may not have been considered in the 1970s to be as important as it is considered today is energy use in the transport of quarry products. It is unusual in any society to have such ready access to aggregate and stone products that can be transported so relatively cheaply with relatively low fuel and energy use as we enjoy in Adelaide. The fact that trucks can continue daily to supply the construction industry virtually immediately (or at least within a matter of hours) with its needs and at a distance

of only a few kilometres one might describe as an enormous economic asset that South Australia and Adelaide enjoys.

Another consideration that would have to be taken into account is what one does with a disused quarry. Many people may be quick to answer, 'Look at the restored quarry in Victoria, British Columbia' which has been transformed into a beautiful garden. However, the Stonyfell and Greenhill quarries are vast and potentially extremely dangerous. It would be incredibly costly to adapt them to another land use, namely, housing, although I imagine that such a challenge would excite some engineers, architects and construction companies. Access would be difficult and, left in their present state, would certainly be dangerous.

I mention some of these facts simply to highlight the complexity and diversity of issues related to the concern about the impact on landscapes of quarrying. The General Manager of Quarry Industries, Mr Graham Martin, in a letter of July last year stated:

> If operations were stopped at any present location considerable problems and costs would arise from the very nature of the quarries. No suitable after-use suggests itself for sites such as those you have seen and visual appearance would not be changed without major works being undertaken.

I will come briefly to the question of visual appearance. When I became aware of what I thought were subtle but nevertheless intentionally profound changes to the quarries when driving around them each day, I asked for an inspection. I had had one, two or three years previously when the then Managing Director of Quarry Industries, Mr Bernie Leverington, took considerable and well justified pride in showing me the success of the rehabilitation works on the north-eastern terraces of the quarries. That work was undertaken as a result of the development plan agreed upon by the quarry company and the State Government in the 1970s. Before I come to outline the nature of the development plan, it is worth putting on the record the history of mining in the quarries so that we can appreciate the legal situation and rights of the quarry owners.

Mining commenced at the Stonyfell site as little as one year after settlement of the State in 1837. It commenced at the Greenhill site in 1943. The operations have been continuous since then and it is currently operated by Quarry Industries, owned by Boral Limited, as private mines Nos 1, 6 and 7. Upon the introduction of the Mining Act in 1971, which divested all landowners of ownership of minerals, all mining operators were given a three-year period in which to apply for a private mine. In 1972 Quarry Industries applied for and was granted a right to mine on private mines Nos 1, 6 and 7. It is important to remember the concept of the hills face zone, which is not a zone of amenity or aesthetics but simply a zone established in 1971 to determine the limits of infrastructure that a Government would provide—water, sewerage and electricity.

Many people today think the hills face zone is a zone of amenity and established for aesthetic purposes; it is not. I might add that, in my opinion, because it is not it should be reassessed in the light of today's views of amenity and of conservation. A grossly artificial set of boundaries is, in my opinion, very much distorting our view of the way in which the Mount Lofty Ranges should be used.

Private mines were issued pursuant to section 19 of the Mining Act and were exempted from the provisions of the Mining Act. The mining rights of a private mine (in this case the quarries) are continuous, subject to section 19 of the Mining Act, until the deposit of minerals is exhausted or the owner applies for the private mine to be annulled. That, in fact, means legally the position is that the Stonyfell and Greenhill quarries will continue to operate if the present level of demand is maintained for 50 or 60 years. If, for some reason, the present level of demand were greatly accelerated, then the reduction in the time of operation would be accordingly increased and we might be facing the requirement to look for other sources of quarry products before 50 years.

In the 1970s, members will recall that there was enormous public concern about the visual impact of the quarries. I recollect that, at that time, I was working as a promotion consultant and one of my clients was the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. I remember the then president making a very strong statement about the visual impact of the quarries and urging South Australians to consider their priorities and work out what could be done. His point and that of another leading architect, Mr John Chappel, and the point of the then Governor of South Australia, Sir Mark Oliphant, was that we were destroying our heritage; that we were gouging the hills face in a way that future generations would not forgive us for; and that we simply must do something about it. It was as a result of public outcry at the time that the development plan was drawn up by the then Department of Mines, working in conjunction with the owners of the quarry.

The general principles of the developmental program were to provide for an economically viable mining method which would minimise the visual impact of the operations and provide for appropriate and effective rehabilitation of worked out areas. The concept developed and required the linking of the two quarries with an initial slot cut behind the western edge of the Hills so that quarrying benches in the Stonyfell quarry could work in a north-south direction. The reorientation of the benches has reduced the visibility of the current working faces when viewed from the city. Coincidently with the cutting of the slot, the north-east faces of the Stonyfell quarry were rehabilitated in 1979-80 and planted with a variety of grasses and native plants.

If any member wants to consider the miracles of nature and the hardihood of vegetation, I invite him or her to take up what I am sure is a standing invitation of Quarry Industries and inspect the north-east faces of the quarry. Through a method of spraying a bituminous-like substance onto the raw rock face—

The Hon. H. Allison: Batter spray.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Batter spray—and the subsequent spraying of seeds or seedlings onto that material, trees grow to a quite substantial size. I estimate that trees more than 12ft high are growing out of raw rock face. As they grow, they provide the natural vegetation softening which reduces the visual impact of the quarry. Given another 100 years, South Australians on the Adelaide Plains might not even know that the quarries were there, unless they look at what would otherwise have been the natural shape of the Hills.

The Hon. H. Allison: The Snowy Mountains Authority regenerated its entire operation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The member for Mount Gambier points out that the Snowy Mountains Authority regenerated virtually its entire operations simultaneously. In any event, the quarry ventures at Stonyfell and Greenhill have continued to be worked down through the deposit of good quality stone and they have been shielded by the lip of the western edge. However, as I say, it is only a matter of weeks, perhaps months, before the western edge is to be lowered. It is the western flank that contains the high quality rock, which is essential for Quarry Industries to meet required product standards. According to Quarry Industries, to prevent mining of the western edge would place the Government in a position in which it could be liable to litigation for the considerable financial loss that

Quarry Industries would sustain because of the sterilisation of the resource. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL POLICE AIDES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should immediately increase the number of police aides to increase the scheme throughout South Australia where there have been requests for the appointment of Aboriginal police aides and that the existing police aides be used to supplement police officers outside the Pitjantjatjara lands.

One of the success stories of recent times in the administration of justice by the South Australian Police Force has been the establishment of the Aboriginal police aides scheme in the Pitjantjatjara lands. Those aides have administered the law in an effective and practical way and they have done a great deal to improve the relationship between the Police Department and those Aboriginal communities.

The scheme has operated for a considerable time. Its success has been recognised by anyone with a knowledge of the area, and a number of other communities experiencing difficulties with delinquents and other Aboriginal people, because of the prevailing social and economic conditions, believe that there is an urgent need to extend the scheme. I am of the view that the scheme has been so successful that the necessary funds should be appropriated by the Government to provide aides at Ceduna, Yalata, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, in the Riverland and in various other parts of the State.

Large minority groups feel that their point of view is being considered if some of their own people administer the law, and such programs have been successful. In Ceduna, for example, most members of the large Aboriginal community are unemployed, and where there are large groups of unemployed people there is social unrest. That has been recognised throughout the world.

One can look at the problems that led to the Brixton riots in the United Kingdom. The last thing that any of us want to see is social conflict. The situation has now been created where, if we are not careful, we will see social conflict in places like Ceduna, where many young people aimlessly go around the community, particularly in the evenings. Because they have nothing better to do, they are getting into mischief, throwing stones and vandalising motor cars. That is not something unique to Ceduna. Solving of problems is where further difficulties arise. In many of these communities we have people who have been sent to ensure that Aboriginal communities and other underprivileged people have access to legal facilities. I believe strongly that every citizen has the right to legal representation but, hen that legal representation is used in such a manner as to cause racial conflict and disharmony within the community, when it prevents the people who have the responsibility for administering the law from going about their business in a proper way, the necessary action must be taken.

I say to the House—and I am pleased that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is present in the House—that, unless the skills of existing experienced police aides from the North-West are utilised in places such as Ceduna, I am concerned about the end result. No community will tolerate people not having the right to defend their property, but that is what is happening. If delinquents (of any colour, or from any group) are deliberately setting out to vandalise and terrorise the community, people in such communities, either individually or in groups, will react. Indeed, that has happened.

The Government should act quickly because I am concerned about what is taking place. The only way to solve the problems at Ceduna and elsewhere is to introduce Aboriginal police aides, because their methods of handling and dealing with such matters are in line with the methods Aboriginal communities used to administer their affairs before European settlement. We can attempt to hide the problem under the carpet and hope that it will go away, but it will not go away; it will get worse because, as I have said, in Ceduna people are throwing stones and breaking into motor cars. I gave the example last week of the glazier who had replaced 936 windows in the past 12 months, 43 windows having been broken in one night at the school. That is a clear example of what is taking place.

There was another example of a person who was forced to fire a shotgun in the air to protect his son who had been the victim of attackers. This young man had had his motor car vandalised on two occasions, resulting in extensive damage. On the occasion in question he was merely walking from the sailing club back to his home with a couple of friends when he was accosted by a large group of larrikins. His girlfriend ran home to tell his father what was happening.

The father took one look and saw that it was physically beyond his ability to intervene, so he fired his shotgun in the air—the only course of action he saw as being open to him. However, the father went close to being charged with discharging a firearm in a public place. That in itself would have been a disgraceful situation if it had come about. Also, the House is aware of a person now before the courts charged with assault following an incident in which vandals threw stones at his house and his caravan. These are the same people who have been throwing stones on the roofs of houses occupied by widows, as well as knocking on their windows while the Police Department is not available to assist because of the difficulty of being everywhere at the one time in such instances.

This is what is happening and my motion is designed to bring to the attention of the Government and the House the urgent need to extend the excellent police aide scheme. The Government gets involved in many schemes that are not successful, but this is a successful scheme. Certainly, the police officers who have organised and administered the scheme deserve full credit from the Government and the House. They are special people who have done an outstanding job. The present scheme operates well and I believe that everyone in South Australia can be proud of it. Certainly, when we have a good scheme going we should expand it and ensure that it can help people elsewhere throughout the State. There is little or no point in putting people in gaol—that does not help anyone. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive the Speaker and honourable members for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting this Address.

[*Sitting suspended from 2.3 to 2.35 p.m.*]

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by the House on 21 February, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the first session of the Forty-seventh Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

PETITION: CITRUS BOARD

A petition signed by 192 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain and enhance the role of the Citrus Board was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1988-89.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: KATNOOK GAS RESERVES

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am delighted to inform the House that, following testing of the Katnook 3 gas well near Penola, the Department of Mines and Energy has confirmed that there are sufficient gas reserves in the Katnook area to make a natural gas supply viable in the South-East of the State. The department has provided its findings to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. I am hopeful that this will lead to the rapid conclusion of a gas sales agreement between the joint venture partners in Petroleum Exploration Licence 32 and the Pipelines Authority, and a related agreement with Sagasco, which has played a significant part in negotiations to this point. Sagasco will be responsible for selling gas to the various consumers in the region.

PASA has, in fact, begun work surveying the pipeline routes required and on preparing the necessary tender documents. It will shortly start work on the construction of the trunk pipelines necessary to transport the gas to Mount Gambier and other domestic, commercial and industrial markets in the region and expects to have these completed early next year.

Confirmation that the Katnook field can support a viable local project is also important for the encouragement it will provide to all of the explorers currently operating in the South Australian section of the Otway Basin, both onshore and offshore. The area currently has six onshore licences and two offshore permits and exploration activity is at record levels. Two seismic surveys are under way and a third is due to start in March. These will define targets for future wells.

In addition, further exploration acreage will become available shortly when 25 per cent of PEL 32 is compulsorily relinquished at the time of the first licence renewal. The Katnook discoveries provide some degree of confidence that further exploration in the region may yield sufficient gas reserves not only to supply significantly greater markets than are currently planned in the South-East, but possibly to supply part of the future Adelaide market. Finally, I would like to congratulate the Katnook joint venturers for their discoveries to date and wish them well in their future exploration programs.

QUESTION TIME

FEDERAL ECONOMIC PACKAGE

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Was the Premier consulted before the Federal Treasurer announced his wage/tax/superannuation deal yesterday? As the Government is the State's largest employer, what would be the impact of the deal on next year's budget? Would State taxes and charges have to rise, or would the deal be paid for through higher inflation and interest rates, as occurred after the 1987 Federal election?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I was not consulted, nor would I expect to be. This was a statement on Federal economic policies and that policy is propounded by the Federal Government. In terms of the wages aspect of that agreement, it would seem to me that a very reasonable compromise has been reached based on the economic predictions that have been made. Of course, I am aware that the Leader of the Opposition and members on the other side would oppose that policy, just as they have opposed every single increase in wages in the past 10 years. This is the group which, on occasions, goes around saying how much it is concerned about the plight of families in the community and which attempts to relate in some way to the wage earner. We have the Leader of the Opposition telling us what a very fair and generous employer he was and yet his Party—

Mr D.S. Baker: I still am.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 'I still am,' he says. I am delighted to know that. However, despite that, as I said, his Party—both at the State and Federal level—has opposed every single case before the commission. We certainly believe that any employer, whether in the public sector or in the private sector, has a responsibility to pay a decent wage to their employees.

Because of the actions of the Federal Government and the accord with the trade union movement, the wages outcome of the past few years has meant that, in some respects, wages have not gone up as fast as has inflation. There have had to be tax concessions and other ways and means of ensuring that the wage earner gets a better return. That wages outcome has been beneficial for our economy and the accord has been absolutely vital through the difficult years of economic restructuring. The economic statement, in all its components—and it is a package in which each segment relates to others—certainly shows the way into the 1990s.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Labour advise the House whether shop trading hours will be extended during the Adelaide Festival?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I can—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker; you have some competition from people opposite.

The SPEAKER: Let me worry about that. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I can advise the House that shopping hours have been extended for the middle Saturday of the Adelaide Festival. That is, 10 March, for the central shopping district only. All shops in the square mile of Adelaide, except for those predominately selling red meat, will be able to remain open until 5 p.m. on that day. This decision was made because of the large number of tourists and local residents who will be in the city during the Festival; it will add to the spirit of the occasion.

Once again the extension has to occur by proclamation. In a week when the Liberals have again displayed their hypocritical attitude to Saturday afternoon trading. The Opposition Leader was on talk-back radio on Monday saying that the extension of shopping hours on a Saturday is inevitable and the convenience was vitally important for the family. That issue is totally unrelated to the issue of shopping hours. Yet members opposite again seem to have made their support for Saturday afternoon shopping conditional on some action regarding land tax and wages. Those issues are totally unrelated to the matter of shopping hours—a fact that industry groups have publicly acknowledged.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Meanwhile, those people who enjoy shopping on Saturday afternoons during the Festival are sure to ask themselves why they cannot have that freedom on all Saturday afternoons. I believe that visitors from interstate would be amazed to learn that in South Australia the alleged Party of free enterprise opposes deregulation in this area. That is completely out of step—

The Hon. H. Allison: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. This would appear to be ministerial comment rather than the simple 'Yes' or 'No' which was required to the answer.

The SPEAKER: The rules are clear in relation to replies. Where there is repetition and extending of the question, that is certainly an offence under the Standing Orders. However, whether or not it is a ministerial statement or an answer to a question is not covered, and while the Minister is answering the question and not repeating he has the floor. The Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is completely out of step with the Liberals' policy elsewhere in Australia.

Members interjecting:

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

DEPARTMENT OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier order an independent investigation into the operations of the Department of Corporate Affairs, the receivers and managers and other State intrumentalities involved in a deal to allow a criminal to take over a business under the control of the receivers and managers? A company by the name of Timadon Pty Ltd has been invited by Arthur Anderson & Co., receivers, to operate the Plympton Park Supercentre.

The principal behind Timadon is Donald Brownlie Fleming, who was declared bankrupt on 20 March 1989 owing $9.679 million and who has a long history of involvement in bottom of the harbor and company asset-stripping schemes.

Mr Fleming arranged for two elderly people to become the registered proprietors of Timadon as well as another company, Greatness In You Pty Ltd, which extracts money from the South Australian public for motivational courses.

Mr Fleming also set up three 'straw' companies as subsidiaries to Timadon to create a fictional asset base for Timadon. These companies are G.S. Trading Pty Ltd, Kalmara Pty Ltd and Richland Pty Ltd. The elderly couple who were brought in from Western Australia for this deal were housed in West Lakes, and until recently faced an eviction order for $1 500 rent outstanding.

An office was set up in Sturt Street but then abandoned, with mortgage lease payments outstanding. Another company involved with the group, namely, Ergo Australasia Pty Ltd, established in Lonsdale, was evicted for failure to pay the rent. Arthur Anderson & Co. has accepted an offer by Timadon to buy the supercentre, settlement being on 30 June 1990. The receivers and managers have already allowed the occupation of the supercentre by the aforementioned companies before the proposed purchasers have been approved by the Licensing Court and have allowed four motel units of the supercentre to be set up as offices to operate the evicted businesses.

Mr Fleming has also set up a company by the name of Vector International, which sells itself as a motivational organisation, claiming that its courses will lead to success in business. Vector operates out of the supercentre, conducts its courses at the State Bank training centre and promotes itself with the assistance and involvement of a Director of SGIC (also a Director of Vector). My informant has explained, and I will use his words, 'Vector operates nothing less than shonky "get rich quick" schemes, using brainwashing techniques. They plan to target young people within the next three months.'

The same Mr Fleming owed the State Bank $455 000 when he was bankrupted. A lawyer alerted the Corporate Affairs Commission to these matters, but the commission failed to act or take any interest. I have been asked to raise this question in order that an independent authority may determine why the *bona fides* of the buyer of the supercentre were not checked, whether breaches of the Licensing Act, Planning Act and Companies Code have occurred, why there was no investigation when details of malpractice were offered and whether there is some element of corruption or cover-up involved.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member asked the original question and is now extending the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly not aware of any of the matters that have been raised by the honourable member. I was interested in part of his explanation where he said that a lawyer had put these matters to the Corporate Affairs Commission and it showed no interest in following them up or took no action. That really surprises me.

The most appropriate way in which the Government can deal with allegations of this kind is to refer them to the properly constituted authority, which is the Corporate Affairs Commission. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Corporate Affairs and ask him for a report on, first, whether the alleged facts are true; secondly, whether there has been a breach; and, thirdly, if so, why the Corporate Affairs Commission was not interested in representations made through a lawyer, as has been suggested by the honourable member.

RED LIGHT CAMERAS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the introduction of red light cameras at intersections has either reduced or increased the number of accidents, especially, rear end accidents, at intersections? Prior to the introduction of red light cameras I made inquiries of an officer of the Ministry of Transport in Victoria and subsequently received a copy of the report compiled following the introduction of red light cameras in Victoria. That report showed an increase in whiplash compensation claims in Victoria possibly because of an increase in rear end accidents following the introduction of red light cameras.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question, but it is too early to give a definitive answer on any benefit to the community from the introduction of red light cameras. The preliminary analysis indicates that fewer right-angle accidents have occurred since the introduction of red light cameras but that, as in Victoria, the number of rear end collisions has increased slightly. Although much more damage is apparently done in right angle accidents than in rear end accidents, it is still argued that there is a net benefit to the community.

I understand that in Victoria the initial increase in the number of rear end collisions has now decreased remarkably, so that people appear to have learned to be more cautious at traffic lights if for no other reason than that they may be caught going through the lights. In addition, those in following vehicles are realising that cars ahead may be stopping more often than they did in the past. Of course, that is the whole idea of installing red light cameras.

So, it appears that after a reasonable period the rate of increase in rear-end collisions diminishes and the decrease in right angle accidents is maintained. I invite any member who wishes to see the red light camera in operation to visit Holden Hill. It is a remarkable thing to see, and the police officers who decide who ought to be prosecuted, what is marginal and what is clearly not an offence do their job well and sensitively. I warn all members that once they have seen the results of the red light camera operation they will never think of going through a red light again, because the photography is marvellous and there is no way to beat it—no way at all. It is interesting to see, and I encourage all members to inspect the operation.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Following the Minister for Environment and Planning's joint announcement with the Premier on 28 August last year, almost six months ago, that the Government would initiate a feasibility study, which was anticipated to be completed within five months as the first step in a joint venture for a scaled down development at Mount Lofty, can she tell the House: first, whether that study has been completed, what is now proposed for a development on the Mount Lofty summit and what are the differences between the new proposal and the original one; and, secondly, how much the feasibility study has cost the Government and what financial contribution the Government intends to make to the joint venturers' development?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this project, which I think will be of major significance to the tourism industry and to the provision of a number of interpretive services for South Australians. Obviously, I do not have the answers to the detailed questions, but I can advise the House of the present situation.

There have been two sessions of consultation organised through Government agencies. In fact, my own department has been directly involved, as have officers from other departments, including those of the Premier and the Minister of Tourism. There have been two of these consultations with a number of people in the community who have given up two or three hours of their time. I certainly attended one of those meetings and opened it, and my colleague the Minister of Tourism attended the other. This has proved to be very successful, and it has been very well received by those people who took part in what could only be described as a brain storming exercise—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If I could finish my answer. It involved people in the community who are obviously people with vision, ideas and something to contribute. In other words, the Government is putting into practice its policies of community consultation, and it is involving particularly the business, tourism and conservation sections of the community and bringing them together to share ideas about what might be the most effective form of some of the specific aspects of the Mount Lofty proposal. I will be delighted to provide in detail the answers to the remainder of the question for the honourable member.

TORRENS VALLEY LINEAR PARK

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning obtain a report on the time frame for completion of the Torrens Valley linear park development?

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: You worry about your questions. I understand that this financial year the linear park development is being concentrated on the western suburbs and that during the following financial year it is hoped that the linear park development committee will be attending to the area between OG Road and Silkes Road in my electorate. I understand that the E&WS Department has purchased an area between Hill Street and Church Street. In addition, I understand that the final phase of the Torrens Valley linear park development is the area east of Silkes Road.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. He has been interested and involved in this issue for some time, as have many other members including some Opposition members. The River Torrens linear park and flood mitigation scheme has had ongoing commitment and a large contribution from the E&WS Department. It is correct to say that the order of priority of construction of the outstanding work is for the whole of the western suburbs to be completed, we believe, this year.

Mr Becker: Hooray!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted that this has met with such a pleasing response. The inner eastern suburbs east of OG Road at Klemzig will be completed next, and the design of the inner-eastern suburbs is proceeding in anticipation of the funding commitment at which we will be looking this year, involving a sum in the vicinity of $3 million. We are proceeding on program. The next section to be completed will be the outer eastern suburbs east of

Silkes Road at Paradise, followed by the final completion at Athelstone/Highbury through to the Gorge area.

At the completion of this exciting and environmentally interesting program, which will provide a range of recreation facilities as well as improving the environment for communities all the way along the Torrens, it will have involved some 30 kilometres. I am told that it will probably be the longest river linear park of its kind in Australia when completed and I certainly believe it has the support—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am about to get to that—what a shame the honourable member could not be a little more gracious. Everyone who has been involved in this project will be as delighted as I will be as Minister at its completion. There is still some way to go. Anyone who has visited the completed sections of the linear park could not help but be impressed by the quality of the rehabilitation. I remind the member for Hartley that, in addition to the beautification of the banks of the River Torrens, the program also involves a flood mitigation scheme, which is of great importance in itself.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has asked one question. If he wants to ask another one, he must put his name on the list.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Labour say whether SGIC is seeking more than $10 million from WorkCover in settlement for outstanding fees and capital incurred by SGIC for operating WorkCover until the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Corporation was established just under a year ago? If so, when does the Minister expect this matter to be settled and what impact will there be on WorkCover's financial position?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Because the question was very detailed, I will provide a more considered response for the honourable member at another time.

EXHIBITION HALL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House whether the Exhibition Hall was completed on time and within budget? I have watched with considerable interest the progress of the Exhibition Hall over the past few months, and noted especially the speed with which it has been erected. A constituent who took advantage of visiting the hall last weekend told me that the design of the building is a credit to all concerned.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted that the member for Napier has drawn this matter to the attention of the public and that of the House. The Exhibition Hall was completed on time and within its budget of $15.3 million.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore that inane interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. All remarks must be directed through the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member's interjection displays his lack of knowledge of the industry, which he always exhibits in this place. The project was very successful. The participants—Woodhead Australia, the designers; Sacon, which managed the project on behalf of the State Government; and Baulderstone Hornibrook, the construction company—can all be pleased with the results. The comments of the honourable member's constituent have been reinforced by other comments that I have heard from constituents, the community and from overseas and interstate visitors. Some of their comments have been recorded in the media.

The hall is unique and it will become a focus both nationally and internationally for exhibitions in South Australia. It opened with 'Exhibition 2000—South Australia on Show', from 16 to 19 February, and a large number of people took the opportunity to go through the facility. The Exhibition Hall is a steel framed building clad with pre-cast concrete panels. It provides 3 000 square metres of exhibition space with 170 individual exhibition booths. It is built over a carpark, which has capacity for 320 vehicles, and a mezzanine office area of 800 square metres is located on the eastern end of the hall. The exhibition space is free of pillars, which will allow for large exhibitions to be displayed.

On radio I heard an international visitor indicate that it would cater for virtually any kind of function involving the manufacturing industry, the automotive industry or service industries. It is a credit to all those involved and I acknowledge the role of the previous Minister and Sacon's expertise. The community and members opposite often criticise project managers and, in this case, as with the hockey facility, the hall is a credit to them. My congratulations go to all involved—Woodhead, Baulderstone and Sacon.

SCHOOL LITERATURE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is to the Minister of Education. What guidelines does the Government apply to editorial content of literature which is freely circulated to students in State schools, and will he ask the Education Department to review the content of the publication *Teenage News* to determine whether it conforms with any guidelines which may apply? A high school principal has drawn my attention to the content of a free publication called *Teenage News* which I am advised is available to students at most public high schools in South Australia. The principal has taken exception to several articles in the February/March issue of the newspaper, and in particular to the content of its 'Blackboard' column on page 15, where students can leave messages. These messages include several of a covert and overt sexual nature.

It would appear that the State Government has decided to give this publication financial support, as a number of the agencies or organisations it funds, including The Second Story, the Office of Road Safety, the STA and the Aids Council of South Australia, have advertised in the latest issue. The Aids Council advertisement recommends erotic massage, mutual masturbation and oral sex. The principal who contacted me says this material poses the question of whether the Minister of Education and his department approve of such subject matters being available to students as young as 12.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is interesting that, as I understand it, the principal has not contacted me, nor have officers of the Education Department reported to me on this matter. There are well established guidelines for the distribution of literature in our schools and I would be pleased to provide the honourable member with that detailed information. I am sure that the guidelines are well known to the principal of the school to which the honourable member refers. Perhaps the honourable member would like to provide me with a copy of the literature and some information as to how it

came to the school. There is no way in which the Education Department can prohibit mail that is forwarded directly to the school; that then becomes a matter for school-based decision making, about the distribution of that literature and what should happen to it if it is seen as unsuitable. So, if the honourable member can provide me with any of that information, I would be pleased to have the matter fully investigated.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Murray-Mallee have a question? I call the member for Stuart.

AQUICULTURE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology inform the House what is happening regarding the joint venture between Agridev and ETSA at the Port Augusta power station and what development, if any, has occurred to date? The proposed project involves aquiculture/horticulture using, amongst other things, excess heat generated by the power station, which warms the seawater which then can be used in the project to provide a controlled growing environment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Stuart for her question, which is indeed about an important project in aquaculture that has been developed in the Port Augusta area. My ministerial colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, can give details as to the exact arrangements between ETSA and Agridev. It is an exciting project, which ultimately wil see some 100 hectares of ETSA's land at the northern power station being used for various forms of horticulture development and aquaculture.

At this stage, I can advise that the Chairman of Agridev Australasia recently addressed a meeting of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association to talk about the concept being developed there, and I can also advise that the company has appointed a firm of construction engineers to undertake the project management function of the Port Augusta project. It is anticipated that work will start on the erection of greenhouses at the power station in March, with completion due by early July.

The first stage of the construction will see greenhouses over a 1.75 hectare site, which is larger than originally expected for the first stage of the Port Augusta development, principally because the Portland development (which is also being undertaken by Agridev) has not been proceeding as quickly as the company had hoped. There have been some planning approval problems in Victoria which have not been experienced in South Australia, and I think it is a credit to all parties that planning methods and other methods have worked more efficiently here in South Australia. It has meant that more work is being done on the Port Augusta project at this stage than had originally been planned. Ultimately, when the project is completed, it will be a horticultural production area and an aquiculture production area. The initial production will be vegetable and brine shrimp. The brine shrimp will be used for fodder food for the aquiculture industry. Indeed, it is proposed that it will be complementary to the Portland project where barramundi will be bred and fed on the brine shrimp fodder that come from Agridev's Augusta site.

It is a very exciting project and I was pleased to inspect the site last year. I am looking forward to going back again later this year when the first set of greenhouses will be up, and perhaps even tasting some of the vegetables that come from the facility.

SAMCOR JOINT VENTURES

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Will the Minister of Agriculture tell the House how many joint ventures the South Australian Meat Corporation (Samcor) has entered into, what is the nature of those joint ventures and whether or not each of them has been financially successful since 1983? Some members will recall that in 1980 there was major restructuring of the Samcor operation. In the subsequent years of 1980-81, 1981-82 and 1982-83 substantial trading profits were achieved by that statutory authority. In 1984 when the new Minister—now a member of this House—took over from my successor (Hon. Brian Chatterton) he was unable to achieve a profit in his first year and, in fact, in 1985 sold off the somewhat financially embarrassing arm of the operation at Port Lincoln.

In 1986 a marginal profit was made, again following the sale of substantial land and building assets, and similarly in 1987. However, throughout that interim period the committed direction of the board was to enter into joint ventures. Whilst the annual reports have noted the involvement of the board in that direction, as indeed has the most current report tabled in this House last Thursday week, there are no details in those reports as to how many of those joint venture exercises there have been or how well they have succeeded.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised by Samcor that there have not been any joint ventures. Some discussions have taken place with a view to forming joint ventures, but none has actually reached the joint venture stage—so, the answer is 'No'. With respect to other matters relating to Samcor referred to by the honourable member, it is worth noting that the profits in recent years were clear trading profits and not profits artificially boosted by financial mechanisms, as I believe the honourable member was implying.

The other point that is probably worth noting at this juncture is that, currently, a triennial review of Samcor is under way. I expect to receive that report either late in March or early in April. That will look at the directions for Samcor into the 1990s.

KARINA G

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Marine advise the House of the fate of the *Karina G*, which is aground close to the Western Australian border? I understand that an earlier order to remove the vessel issued by the Minister was due to expire yesterday and that neither the vessel nor its fuel has been removed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question and he is correct; the vessel is still there. After discussions with the vessel's insurers, a strong case was put to my department that the original deadline for removal of the boat and its contents could not be met. When the original notice was issued I had before me some intent to remove the fuel only and no idea as to when that would happen. I now have a firm commitment that both the oil and the vessel will be removed. Given that, I revoked the earlier order yesterday and issued a new order extending the time under which the oil and vessel can be removed. The fuel and oil must be removed as soon as possible and, in any event, by Friday 20 March.

An extension is possible if the Director of Marine Safety at the Department of Marine and Harbors is satisfied it is necessary because of weather conditions or technical problems. The vessel itself must be removed by 21 April 1990 in a manner to be approved and a place to be approved by the departmental Director. Just as importantly this new

order stresses that action must be taken to ensure there is no pollution or oil spillage during the removal operations. Any work ashore with oil removal can be undertaken only after consultation with regard to the concerns of the National Parks and Wildlife office. Members may recall that the vessel is adjacent to a national park. Officers of my department will meet with representatives of the vessel's insurers next week to discuss details of their proposals. I understand that options under consideration may involve the use of helicopters to ferry out the fuel and oil.

ST VINCENT GULF FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr MEIER (Goyder): What action is the Minister of Fisheries taking to protect the fishing industry in the upper St Vincent Gulf region from bans on fishing imposed by the Port Wakefield proof and experimental range? The Minister would be aware that the professional and recreational fishing sectors in this State are prevented from fishing in St Vincent Gulf in a kite shaped area from an approximate line north of Webb Beach due to test firing of ammunition from the Port Wakefield proof range.

The value of production from this area is almost $1 million per annum and South Australia stands to lose this production if a satisfactory agreement with the Commonwealth is not worked out forthwith. Many recreational fishermen have also expressed their concern to me at the increasingly prohibited use of the area. With 700 commercial scale fishermen operating in the State, these bans are squeezing the commercial and recreational sectors into a smaller area and the Green Paper on the marine scale fishery, which should have been released last year, will almost certainly need major amendments when it is eventually released.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. SAFIC recently brought this matter to my attention again and it was the subject of correspondence between the Federal Minister of Defence, and me in September or October last year. The fact that we have not had a response from the Federal Minister has been highlighted as a result of SAFIC bringing the matter to my attention again. That matter is currently being pursued and I will certainly keep the honourable member advised of progress in the matter as it is being followed through in the next few days.

With respect to the marine scale fishery Green Paper, which the honourable member said should have been released late last year, certainly, I identified that we were sending it back to various Government departments for further work to be done on the matter with a view to its release, we had hoped, late last year. The final responses from the various Government departments were not received until January this year. They have been incorporated in a new draft, which is currently being worked on and which will, I hope, be released in the near future.

MOTOR VEHICLE TYRE DISPOSAL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning investigate the manner in which used motor vehicle tyres are stored and/or disposed of in South Australia? Further, will the Minister advise what actions have been taken or will be taken to protect the South Australian public from the effects of toxic fumes in the event of fires in similar storage areas?

Yesterday, I received a telephone call from a constituent pointing out an article in yesterday's *News* concerning a fire in Toronto and I have been asked what action this Government has or will be taking to protect South Australian people from a similar occurrence. Finally, can the Minister advise whether any similar fire has occurred in South Australia in the past and what actions have then been taken?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. He paid me the courtesy of letting me know late yesterday afternoon that he would be asking me a similar question. Therefore, I took the opportunity of contacting the Waste Management Commission to find out whether we have had any similar situations in South Australia and whether we have the potential not just for the kind of disastrous situation which occurred in Toronto. As I understand it, there are similar fears about some of the enormous tyre dumps which exist in Western Australia. Again, the honourable member paid me the courtesy of sending me a couple of those newspaper clippings.

The Waste Management Commission has informed me that it is not aware of any major used tyre collections in this State. In other words, we do not have any very large used tyre dumps—I guess that would be the appropriate term. There are numerous small collections of tyres. Some are used, as members would know, particularly those with coastal seats, for erosion control. That is obviously a fairly positive way of using these discarded tyres. Others are stockpiled awaiting transport or reuse. But all of these collection points are of a size which the Waste Management Commission believes could be adequately handled by the fire control authorities. In other words, they do not believe that the potential exists for this major problem which has been experienced overseas and interstate.

Another point that I want to make in answering this question is that the majority of used tyres are currently used in landfill, which means that the potential for such problems is taken away. The last point that I would like to share with the honourable member is that, whilst technology exists for various recycling opportunities, such as the conversion of rubber back to oil, at this stage these options currently suffer from lack of markets or unfavourable costs. One can only hope that in future, as markets increase and costs, with the introduction of new technologies, are decreased, we might look to reusing them in terms of converting them back to oil.

MURRAYVILLE SECONDARY COLLEGE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My question is to the Minister of Education. Whilst it is not about the—

The SPEAKER: Order! Ask your question.

Mr LEWIS: I ask the Minister: did he or did he not make representations to the Ministry of Education in Victoria which resulted in a directive being given to the Principal of the Murrayville Secondary College preventing him from enrolling any new students living in South Australia?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Officers of the two departments—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am explaining to the House. Officers of the two departments have been discussing this matter. They reported to me the undertakings that the Victorian department would make in this matter. I saw those as being satisfactory in the circumstances and I have advised the House of that with the rider that I added to my comments last week in the House. I do not think that I can add any more than that.

INTERDOMINION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport report to the House on the success of the Interdominion, given that South Australia agreed to conduct the championship after Tasmania withdrew from its turn?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: One of my colleagues just asked me for a winner, but I am afraid I cannot give him much help.

The SPEAKER: The winner here will be the one who stands by Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: And indeed I will. I am delighted to have the opportunity to inform the House of the success of the current Interdominion which is being conducted at Globe Derby. The current turnover for on-course and off-course totes is creating a record based on the 1984 figures. The general impact on racing and tourism is significant. General commentary by the media and racing commentators is positive, especially as to the fields presented for the heats of the Interdominion. The harness board and the club are to be congratulated on the presentation of this event, and I hope that most members will find time to attend the final on Saturday night at Globe Derby.

In comparison with the 1984 figures, the on-course turnover for the first night was approximately 50 per cent greater. In relation to all the heats, the overall turnover has increased by about 36 per cent, and the TAB turnover for total on-course and off-course investments has reached almost $2.5 million for the whole of the Interdominion. So, we can see the positive benefits resulting from this event.

It is important to note that this is yet another successful event being conducted in South Australia, comparing favourably with other sporting and recreational events conducted in this State, such as the Grand Prix, and bringing kudos not only to the industry but to the whole State. It is estimated that about 6 000 tourists are attending the Interdominion, about 3 000 of whom will be here for about two weeks. So, the long-term benefits to the club, the industry and the State are significant. I congratulate everyone involved: the officials, the President and the Vice-President of the club, and the Chairman of the board.

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): In view of the cost and sensitivity of some of the information it stores, will the Minister of Emergency Services advise the House how many terminals and other computing equipment associated with the Justice Information System have been stolen or vandalised; what is the cost to the taxpayer; and what security arrangements have now been established to protect this equipment and, in particular, to stop any further thefts from police stations?

I have in my possession a memorandum, signed by the Manager of the Systems Development within the JIS, which reveals security problems. The document refers to the theft of two terminals from Government premises and damage to another caused by vandals. In one case, a VT220 terminal, printer, cables and modem were stolen from a police station.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not have any information on this matter at present, nor do I anticipate that the honourable member would have expected me to have it at my fingertips, but I will bring back a report for him.

WINDSOR GARDENS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Education inform the House of the way in which the Windsor Gardens High School is catering for the needs of its students? Last year the Gilles Plains and Strathmont High Schools decided to amalgamate in order to improve the educational offerings for their students. The new school, to be called the Windsor Gardens High School, would cater for students from these two schools. I ask the Minister to provide a progress report on this amalgamation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. The Strathmont and Gilles Plains High Schools are two of many secondary schools which have reviewed their operations to see whether they can combine in one form or another with other nearby schools to enhance the learning opportunities and depth of the curriculum offered to their students.

In 1987 it became obvious that the decline in enrolments and the number of young people in the age cohort appropriate to those schools would lead to a situation where both of the schools referred to would become quite small and difficulties would eventuate. So, wisely, action was taken to remedy that situation.

Wide ranging discussions with both school communities took place and it was eventually agreed that Strathmont and Gilles Plains High Schools would amalgamate, so was born the Windsor Gardens High School. That school will be established on the former Gilles Plains High School site. A principal was appointed to that new high school in 1989.

It is recognised that the needs of junior secondary students differ from those in the upper school and it was decided that, from the beginning of this school year, the Years 11 and 12 students from both schools would attend at the Strathmont site; the Years 8, 9 and 10 students are accommodated at the former Gilles Plains High School campus. In this way curriculum offerings at Years 11 and 12 are maintained, with an additional social advantage by merging the two groups of senior students. This is a temporary arrangement, and all Windsor Gardens students will eventually be located in the one school.

Demographic studies are currently in progress to determine the eventual likely enrolment of the Windsor Gardens High School. When this information is definitely known, detailed planning and associated costing of the required upgrading of the former Gilles Plains school site can be prepared. It is expected that the finance required for the necessary work will come from the proceeds of the sale of the Strathmont site.

E&WS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Labour advise why South Australian personnel selection companies have been denied the opportunity even to tender for the task of head hunting a new Chief Executive Officer for the Engineering and Water Supply Department? An advertisement in Saturday's *Advertiser* calls for applications for this position. However, the address for sending applications is Brauer Galt and Company Pty Limited, State Bank Centre, 385 Bourke Street, Melbourne.

As members would be aware, this is one of the most senior and important positions in the South Australian Public Service, and I have been informed that the many reputable South Australian personnel selection companies were not even given the opportunity of quoting for this job. While there are local companies with large client lists and

a range of contacts to search on an Australia-wide basis for suitable appointees, I am also advised that they have become increasingly frustrated with this Government's practice of allocating the selection of the most senior public sector positions to interstate firms.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question and will obtain a report.

MOTORCYCLE HEADLIGHTS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Transport advise whether the Government will compel motorcyclists to travel with their motorcycle headlights on at all times? The Commonwealth is proposing an increased grant to the States for road improvements. In return, the Commonwealth is requiring of the States uniform traffic laws. Amongst those uniform laws is compulsory 'lights on' for motorcycles or, as the Royal Automobile Association puts it, daytime running lights on motorcycles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the member for Spence said, the Federal Government in its recent road safety package tied the provision of funds to the State to a series of measures that it wants implemented on a national level. In some areas, that presented South Australia with some difficulties and, in fact, it is presenting all the States with some difficulties. It has been clearly demonstrated over the past few days that everybody seems to agree with uniform road standards. Everybody says that it is highly desirable, but everyone wants them to be uniform to their own standards: they do not mind uniformity as long as everybody falls into step with them.

At the recent special ATAC meeting, which was addressed by the Prime Minister, I made clear that I had reservations about making it compulsory for motorcyclists to have their lights on while the bike is in motion. I think that is desirable and by far the majority of motorcyclists use headlamps. The question is whether it is necessary to make it compulsory. The Motor Cycle Riders Association, which is a responsible organisation, has cooperated with the Government to implement education programs and it may not be necessary to regulate for this particular provision.

The Commonwealth has the power to impose an Australian design rule to ensure that all imported motorcycles are so constructed that, when the ignition is turned on, the headlights come on and stay on. Although there is little I can do about an Australian design rule, I put a compromise to the Federal Minister and the other State Ministers that, when considering the retro-fitting of such a device to motorcycles, it should be possible to switch it off so that a motorcyclist would have to make a conscious decision to ride without the headlamps on. The Federal Minister assured me that he would consider that suggestion and I hope that the other Ministers of Transport will do so also. It seems a great shame that, when we have made so much progress—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to complete his answer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I am, Sir. It seems to me that, when we have made so much progress with a group of road users who are complying with safety requirements over and above the law, to take the next step of ensuring that they do so is unnecessary. I hope that the Federal Government will not insist on that provision in its road safety package. However, we will not know until March, when the next ATAC meeting convenes in Western Australia.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is considering introducing the pre-1986 practice of printing the expiry date on motor vehicle registration discs? If the previous practice is to be reinstated, when will it commence?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government is considering that, but I cannot give the honourable member a precise date. I will find out for him.

ROAD FUNDING

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Transport say what are the implications for South Australia and, in particular, road funding, if the national agreement on road laws does not proceed because of a lack of bipartisanship or some other cause?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The consequences to South Australia of not complying with the Federal Government's wishes will be quite severe. Financially, it will probably cost something of the order of $12 million to $15 million. It has been estimated by various road safety authorities and researchers that each $500 000 spent at a black spot saves one life a year, and I am not in a position to query those statistics. If agreement is not reached and South Australia does not take the money, 24 to 30 lives will be lost unnecessarily each year because of our failure to take up that package. That puts this Parliament in a dilemma. It is my view that legislation to reduce the permitted blood alcohol level from .08 to .05 in the interests of uniformity would not pass this Parliament.

All the evidence we have worked on over the years from the Adelaide University's Road Research Accident Unit, headed by Dr Jack McLean, has clearly demonstrated, to us at any rate, that .08 is an appropriate level. I must admit that, when I put that position to the last meeting of Ministers, it was not well received. I was told quite clearly that that was a very small part of the research and that much more research done elsewhere in Australia shows the opposite: that there is a distinct and measureable saving of lives if that level is dropped from .08 to .05. As I said, there will be some unpalatable things for us all to swallow if we support what we all purport to support, which is uniform road standards. I hope that we do not get to that position. I hope we can take the Federal package and save those 20 to 30 lives each year.

DA COSTA SAMARITAN FUND (INCORPORATION OF TRUSTEES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 February. Page 28.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill before us. For the benefit of members, the Da Costa Samaritan Fund dates back to about 1898, when Louisa Da Costa provided some part of her estate to be put to the benefit of patients in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Part of that estate was, of course, the Aurora Hotel. That estate was administered, and moneys flowed to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. From memory, in 1953 the Da Costa Samaritan Fund (Incorporation of Trustees) Act was passed and, therefore, it became a publicly accountable body formally recognised in the statutes. To date, the funds credited to the Da Costa Samaritan Fund

amount to approximately $2.3 million, and last year the fund gave out close to $100 000 in benefits.

I would like to pay tribute to the generosity of Louisa Da Costa. The moneys that have been spent have now spread beyond the Royal Adelaide Hospital and taken in the major hospitals, such as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre. However, the trustees believe that there is scope to allow this fund to give of its good works in a wider range of areas. By way of the amendment before us, this would include all hospitals covered under the South Australian Health Commission Act.

The Opposition supports the proposition because it believes that it should have the maximum flexibility so that the benefit can flow to the place of greatest need. It is interesting to note that, despite the fact that the list of hospitals has been limited because it included only those covered by the Hospitals Act, a very large sum of money was given last year to organisations, such as Wheelchair Sports. In addition, over 300 patients were individually assisted during the past calendar year. I pay tribute to the Da Costa Samaritan Fund and formally say that the Opposition is quite pleased with the Bill before us.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): It gives me very much pleasure to support this Bill for two reasons: first, the amendments extend to the Lyell McEwin Health Service, which is the hospital that serves not only my electorate but also all of the northern suburbs; and, secondly, it also incorporates many country hospitals. Therefore, there can be uniformity in the delivery of this service to all sections of the South Australian community.

I first came to know the Da Costa Samaritan Trust in 1978, when I was a newly elected member of Parliament and a constituent came to see me with severe problems in being able to see. Even under the existing services provided by the Government, it was necessary for this constituent to have her glasses changed at regular intervals because of a problem with her vision. My office was at a loss to know how to assist this constituent. We were advised by the South Australian Health Commission to approach the Da Costa Samaritan Fund to see whether it could provide any assistance to this person. I am happy to say that the trustees—or at least the officer who dealt with my office—were only too pleased to assist this constituent and, to my knowledge, ever since that day, if there has been any need to have her spectacles altered or changed, my constituent has been able to gain advantage under that special part of the Da Costa fund.

Even before the introduction of this legislation there have been instances where constituents of mine have spent some time in the Queen Elizabeth or Royal Adelaide hospitals and it has been necessary for them to have some form of convalescence to make it easier for their families. Again, the Da Costa Samaritan Fund has been able to step in and provide that much needed respite. When the Minister of Health introduced this Bill, it occurred to me that at long last some South Australians who live in the country and who have been unable to gain access to this fund, unless they have been patients of the hospitals mentioned in this Bill, will now be included. I was rather surprised that members opposite who represent country areas have not been—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It may well be that they will stand up to speak in respect of their own areas.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will ignore the Deputy Leader because I can understand that he cannot control his tongue and that he is naturally a bad-mannered person. I thought we were talking about something that dispenses good will in the community. I make the point that, until this Bill was introduced, people in such towns as Berri, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Lincoln were not able to gain access to the Da Costa Samaritan Fund unless they were patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Modbury Hospital. That is the point I am making. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition feels that, in my saying that, I am being patronising, all I can say is that he has a very small mind. I congratulate the Minister of Health for bringing this much needed amendment before the House and I urge all members of the House to support it.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and also the member for Napier for their support for this important measure. I commend it to the House. There is one procedural matter that I should point out as I close the second reading debate. In my second reading explanation, I indicated that this was a hybrid Bill and that it would be referred to a select committee, and I did that on advice. On reflection, I understand it is not a hybrid. The original Bill and amending Bill in 1969 did affect the private rights of the trust. However, this Bill merely brings the Act up to date with its references to the South Australian Health Commission, rather than to the former hospital board, and in those circumstances it is necessary that I correct the advice I gave to the Chamber when the Bill was introduced. I commend the Bill to members.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

MAGISTRATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Magistrates Act 1983. Section 13 (1a) of the principal Act empowers the Chief Justice to direct a magistrate to perform special duties. This provides the flexibility to meet emergencies and other *ad hoc* requirements which arise from time to time. While the Magistrates Act 1983 makes provision for the appointment of supervising magistrates, no provision exists whereby assistant supervising magistrates may be substantively appointed, in appropriate circumstances. Some time ago the need was perceived to provide assistance to the supervising magistrate in the Adelaide Magistrates Court, given the heavy listing and administrative workload in the court. In order to meet this requirement, and in the absence of an appropriate, relevant provision, an appointment was made under section 13 (1a).

However, it is clear that this section is intended to cater for assignment of special duties, usually on a temporary basis, andKOdoesnot provide for substantive appointment. The requirement at the Adelaide Magistrates Court is obviously for a substantive appointment of a permanent nature. Moreover, the improvements in the management of

the lists and the significant reduction in delay in that court are directly attributable to a great extent to the current judicial administrative arrangements. It is intended that these arrangements will continue. Therefore, the Act should be amended to provide for the appointment of assistant supervising magistrates. It is not intended to make such appointments, except at the Adelaide Magistrates Court. Nevertheless, the new provisions will enable this to be done, should it be necessary in the future. The Remuneration Tribunal will be requested to fix the appropriate level of salary. The Bill has the full support of the Chief Justice and the Chief Magistrate.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act which provides for appointment to administrative offices in the magistracy. The clause amends this provision so that an office of assistant supervising magistrate is included with the other administrative offices in the magistracy.

Clauses 3 and 4 are consequential, providing for delegation by the Chief Magistrate to assistant supervising magistrates, and for the fixing of their remuneration by the Remuneration Tribunal, in the same way as for supervising magistrates.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I draw the attention of members to the deterioration of law and order in this State, particularly in the District of Hayward. Aspects of the problem of law and order were recurrent themes of many members on both sides of the House during the Address in Reply debate, and I note particularly the excellent contributions made by the members for Newland and Albert Park.

During my little time in this place, I have been disappointed that I have not heard more from the honourable gentlemen opposite who occupy the middle bench, since I believe, quite honestly, that the contributions I have heard from those honourable gentlemen are among the most thought provoking and challenging of any contributions from members opposite and are, in many instances, better than those of certain Government Ministers.

As the subject of law and order is particularly large, in the time allotted to me I should like to concentrate specifically on juvenile crime. I realise that the Government has made some commitment to upgrading the law as it relates to juvenile crime and I acknowledge its progress in this regard. However, I should be misleading this House if I said other than that I think the efforts that the Government is making do not go far enough and do not address the problem, which is becoming more and more serious within our society.

I believe that juvenile crime is an increasingly bad problem, which must be remedied, not only for the good of society as a whole but, in particular, for the good of those young offenders who are likely to fill our gaols in the future. One aspect of juvenile crime which I know greatly concerns all members of this House is graffiti. It was mentioned recently by the member for Fisher, and it is particularly bad in my area along the railway lines. Any wall or any surface area along the railway lines—including stobie poles, which have hardly any surface at all—ends up with graffiti all over it.

It is a standing joke in my electorate that, if one were to stand on the Oaklands Park Railway Station long enough, one would probably end up covered with graffiti. If and when the STA does anything about it, that effort is turned around in short order by those who delight in graffiti. I should say that the efforts of the STA are generally covered up in less than 24 hours. It is a problem of aesthetics.

While some few graffiti artists might well have talent, the way in which it is applied and over-applied, like some sort of collage, makes it look obscene, and that is being polite about it. The police have told me that many of the graffiti artists are fairly well known to them, but the first problem is to catch them. Even more importantly, when they do catch them there is the problem of imposing a sufficient penalty to deter them.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member opposite commented that they ought to be made to clean it up—and I thoroughly concur in that. Indeed, I think that most members on this side of the House would concur, and I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that that was a proposition put forward by the Leader of the Opposition during the last election campaign. It is never too late to introduce any measure for the well being of the people of South Australia, and the honourable member's Government could effectively introduce such a measure during this session, should it so choose. I hope that it will.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member in front of me says that he will introduce a Bill. If people cannot be punished, there is not much deterrent. The police have expressed to me the view that, even when they catch these people, the matter is regarded lightly because the penalty is not a sufficient deterrent. They have also pointed out to me that some of these members of the public who are well known to them and whose offerings on walls of shops and the like are quite prolific cease this activity when they reach the age at which they would be accountable in law as adults.

They realise that, in facing the courts as adults, they would be subjected to a different level of penalty; the consequence of their actions is entirely different and, therefore, they put away their aerosols and take up some other pursuit in society. I believe, however, that the habits inculcated in flouting the law at an early stage are not so easily cast off, and that perhaps the habits these people develop in later life are as insidious and unlawful as those pursued as teenagers.

The problem is no longer confined to public property. It seems, lamentably, that most people in this State regard the defacing of public property as a matter not for their concern. However, I think everyone would agree that it is the concern of all of us since public property is the property of us all. It is not the Government but every elector in South Australia who picks up the tab.

Nevertheless, in Hayward, there is great concern, because that defacing is not now limited to public property. Shops, fences, and private walls all round the electorate are being defaced more and more, and the clean-up cost to the personal landowner is fairly high. That is one aspect of juvenile crime.

A second aspect is under-age drinking. I was approached recently by a number of electors from a particular street who wished that street to be made a dry area, merely to allow the police some teeth in cleaning up a problem that exists there. They acknowledge that that does not really come to grips with the problem—that if their street is designated a dry area the problem will go elsewhere. They say, with some justification, that their first concern must

be for their immediate environs and that other people must be concerned with theirs. Again, that is a matter which can and should be addressed by the legislature of this State.

I cite for the record a specific yet wide ranging example that I came across recently in relation to a public housing area of my electorate. A 14 year-old boy is systematically terrorising the neighbourhood. The police have been called on many occasions. On one occasion, the police attended on a matter unrelated to this youth, who then proceeded to materialise from nowhere and strip the policeman of his upper uniform.

Bystanders observed that the policeman was, in fact, very restrained in his reaction and took no action on the matter. That is only one in a series of instances. The elector who complained to me is on the point of having a nervous collapse because she and her partner have to do such things as lie out on the lawn, waiting for the gentleman in question to come around to smash the windows of the car at 3.30 a.m. The police say that there is very little they can do; the Housing Trust says that there is nothing it can do; and the Department for Community Welfare does not want to be involved because it is understaffed and its current priorities are in other areas. In the meantime, I have been told by people who are officials in our society that the lady will be all right because in six months time that lad will be a street kid and it will be someone else's problem.

It will not be someone else's problem: the problem might be moved from my electorate, but it will be a greater problem for our society. So, that is perhaps one of the best illustrations of the fact that juvenile crime is having an insidious effect. It must be addressed, and it must be addressed with the goodwill of the Government and the best efforts of all members on both sides of this House. We are dealing with our future; they are our kids and they are what we will leave behind. I urge all members to think carefully about this issue.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question about the number of enrolments at the Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School this year. His answer of '520' vindicated his decision in 1987 to address seriously falling enrolments in high schools in the Elizabeth and Munno Para area. Since that answer last week the enrolments have increased to 602, and I have every confidence that the re-entry school at Elizabeth West has an exciting future.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you will be well aware that there was an attempt during the term of the Tonkin Government to rationalise education at the secondary level in Elizabeth. Whilst the intention of the then Minister was honourable, it was doomed to failure, because no-one was fully consulted, certainly not the teachers or the parents. In fact, it was carried out in what could be described only as a confrontationist manner. However, in this case, as one of the local members of Parliament for that area, I would like to place on the record my appreciation for the way in which the Minister, his officers in the Education Department, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and, perhaps more importantly, the parents involved themselves in that consultation process. I would like to thank you, Sir, for representing the interests of both you and me on the interim board when, as a Minister, I was unable to give the board my full attention.

In 1987 there were six schools in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area, with a design capacity for 5 175 students but with a projected enrolment of 3 035 in 1992. The schools involved were Craigmore, Elizabeth High, Elizabeth West, Fremont, Playford and Smithfield Plains High Schools. Also, because of Government policy at both a State and Federal level, there was a trend towards increasing adult re-entry students within those schools. Well aware of the pitfalls of the 1981 disaster, the Minister set up a consultative committee, chaired by John Joel—a well-known and well respected member of the local community.

The committee consisted of representatives from the Elizabeth and Munno Para communities, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the local education office. Its charter was to examine education offerings with a view to restructuring the schools to ensure that enrolment decline did not adversely affect the quality of education offered to students. As you will be well aware, Sir, the committee held exhaustive meetings at all high schools, involving as many people as possible. I can testify that the mood at these meetings was in direct contrast to that at the meetings held in 1981.

The committee's report was made public in early 1988. After further consultation, recommendations that were endorsed by the committee included, first, the establishment of the Elizabeth/Munno Para College of Secondary Education, which has representation from the community and district secondary schools, and which coordinates the educational offerings in the schools through a board of management; secondly, the establishment of the Elizabeth West High School as an adult re-entry school in 1989; and, thirdly, the amalgamation of the Playford and Elizabeth High Schools on the Elizabeth site. The Playford site was vacated at the end of the 1989 school year and the combined schools were renamed Elizabeth City High School at that time. The Minister has also allocated $1.84 million as an advance on the sale of Playford High School for disbursement to the secondary schools in the district through the Elizabeth/Munno Para College. This allocation will be for building and associated works. Whilst all schools will benefit, the major expenditure will occur at the Elizabeth City High School and at the adult re-entry secondary school at Elizabeth West.

The Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School is a key part of the restructuring process and so far, as I outlined earlier, has been an outstanding success. It embraces all age groups and both males and females. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table representing the age of students at the Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School as at Monday 19 February 1990.

Leave granted.

AGE OF STUDENTS

Sex	15-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Male	Female	Total
F	102	50	62	57	42	59	33	6	0	413	413
M	77	19	14	16	13	15	20	14	189	0	189
	179	69	76	73	55	74	53	20	189	413	602

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This year's enrolment has shown a change in the student profile, with a much larger number of students coming back to study at years 11 and 12. These students have a definite goal of gaining employment or going on to further study. A child-care centre is available with places for just under 100 children and can be used at various times over the week whilst their parents study. Classes are held either during the day or in the

evening to suit the students. This innovative move has taken place this year to encourage and to give complete flexibility to those people who have children and who wish to come back into the education system.

It is also important that, after encouraging people to go back to school, we make sure that they stay and that their stay is free from hassles. The school has, therefore, established a student support services team, whose job it is to support students in their return to study. There is a personal counsellor, a career counsellor, a learning support coordinator and a community liaison officer. Those four officers not only liaise with the students and other agencies but also work directly with the Commonwealth Employment Service to ensure that those students who have gained their certificates in any particular subject then have access to and a way in which to approach the Commonwealth Employment Service so that they can gain employment.

I have been told that re-entry students enrol for three main reasons: to enhance their job prospects; to qualify for post-secondary studies; or just for self improvement. The school offers a full range of secondary education subjects and specialist courses. An important part of the program is a range of bridging courses, designed to help students to re-adjust to the learning process. Sir, you will be well aware, as will most members of the House, that the Elizabeth-Munno Para area has a high ratio of single supporting mothers, young unemployed, Aborigines, and an increasing number of people of non-English speaking backgrounds. All these groupings can be catered for at the Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School. What it has to offer can be adequately summed up in the words of the principal, Miss Lea Stevens:

> Our special focus is to assist the unrepresented in the work force. Many left school because of economic necessity or chose to discontinue and have later rethought that decision. Each of the students has a story to tell. Most want to go back into the work force or to go on to tertiary studies. Some just want to enjoy the learning process for its own sake. Our aim is to provide a curriculum to satisfy their needs and enable them to be successful in achieving their goals.

The Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School is doing just that. It is an example of what is achievable using existing resources. In 1981 they got it horribly wrong; in 1987 they got it right. I congratulate the Minister, you, Sir, and every person who was involved in the program to give another chance to those persons who were denied a full education.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The two matters to which I want to refer in this grievance debate are the responsibilities of the Minister for Environment and Planning, and for both I seek some clarification from the Minister. The first relates to an issue which has been brought to my attention by people who have shacks on the Younghusband Peninsula on the Coorong, so they are within national parks. Last year those people received letters from the Minister's department stating that they had life tenure. One of those who has corresponded with me indicated that he had not received that particular letter but was aware that some of the people adjacent to him had received such a letter, so he felt that he should contact the Minister's office, which he did. The officer from the office apologised, stating that letters to shack owners had been sent but that some had been lost in the post. The officer indicated that he would pass on a copy of the letter so that the person who wrote to me would know the real situation. That particular letter was received by the writer on 20 January. It was believed that that letter was identical to the letters received by that person's neighbours, and he was quite satisfied with the response.

There was then some discussion between the neighbours about the Government's policy as it related to shacks in national parks. Therefore, he decided to ring the officer in the Minister's department and he did so, only to find that a mistake had been made, that he did not have life tenure, after all, and that he would have to evacuate before 1994. The reason why I bring this matter forward is the complete and utter confusion on this particular issue, the considerable amount of correspondence that has gone backwards and forwards on this matter and the difficulty that has been experienced by those who own the shacks.

If the Minister has brought down a policy, it must be made perfectly clear. It is not appropriate for these people to be told one thing one minute and to be told something different at a later stage. A lot of concern has been expressed by those people. They have made a further representation to the Minister and, as I understand it, they have asked for the matter to be clarified. For example, they want to know whether they are obliged to continue to pay $140 to the National Parks and Wildlife Service as per lease or whether they are to continue to pay rates to the local council. They have been paying for a lease as well as the rates. They have no access to roads—the only access to the shacks is by boat—yet they have been paying for council services for some time. I raise this issue because I am aware of the concern that has been expressed in this area, and I seek clarification from the Minister.

The second matter to which I want to refer is of considerable concern to a number of people in the Mount Lofty Ranges, and it relates to the Mount Lofty Ranges review. This review was announced in 1987 and it was stated, at that stage, that the aim of the review was to provide a clear set of guidelines for land use and management in the Hills. We were told that the review was likely to cost about $2 million, and it was certainly indicated that the review would be finalised well before this time.

One of the main purposes of the review was to bring together and to clarify a number of the problems that were being experienced in the Hills particularly in regard to planning matters because of the confusion between Government departments, and that has been the case for some time. There has been a lot of variance in the policies of Government departments. In many cases, departments have been working against each other. There has been concern about the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the harsh policies, through regulations, that it has brought down over a period of time but particularly in more latter years. This review was supposed to clarify a lot of those matters and make it easier for people in the Hills, particularly those who worked the land and those who had properties.

To the outsider, the Mount Lofty Ranges review now provides a very confusing picture. When the review commenced, the reviewers went out of their way to involve the public, suggesting that the public should come forward with evidence that might be used in formulating a final management plan. For a while it involved just local people in the Hills and I attended most of the public meetings called for that purpose. I had some concerns from the early stages about some of those meetings because I did not believe that those involved in the review were able to get a balanced outlook as a result of the representation that was being made through those meetings. Then, of course, later there was quite a bit of pressure to include people from the metropolitan area to enable them to have a say.

The final plan was a consultative management plan which was released publicly—a very confusing document, difficult to read and difficult to understand. It had conflicting directions which re-enforced current practices and really pro-

vided no hint of goals for the future or solutions to the problems of the present.

Having launched the consultative plan, the review vanished and we did not hear any more about it. A number of questions were asked. I have asked questions of the Minister in this place to try to clarify what the situation is and certainly the media, which gave much prominance to the Mount Lofty review when it was first being considered, seem to have left the subject alone as well.

As I said earlier, the review was initiated to try to solve a number of problems but, unfortunately, more recently it has taken a political direction which, if anything, seems to avoid a lot of the problems. It has created an increasing conflict within the conservation movement which has persistently produced evidence and pressured the review to face up to its environmental responsibilities. It seems that an extended period of public consultation, which came about as a result of much pressure, and a lot of technical background work by public servants, conservationists and people who live in the Hills, has been used to provide an image of credibility for the desired political direction rather than anything else.

It appears to me that this document has no priorities and is, therefore, open to competing claims, many from other Government departments. I could spend a lot of time on this subject, but because of the lack of time I will merely ask the Minister to clarify this situation and say quite clearly what the Government intends to do with this review, and when it will be completed so that the people of the Hills know what their future holds.

Motion carried.

At 4.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 27 February at 2 p.m.