

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 August 1990

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 August. Page 139.)

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I welcome this opportunity to speak during the debate on the Address in Reply. At the outset, I express my appreciation for the work that has been done by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Donald Dunstan, and Lady Dunstan over the last few years. I also wish them well in the future. I should also like to express my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and point out that we tend to forget the excellent job that she has done, and continues to do, as Queen of this country.

I welcome the new member for Custance. We know that Ivan has not been a very good name in history, but I am sure that in this House he will change the interpretation that has been put upon that name.

I want to reflect on some of the aspects mentioned in the Governor's address and point out—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much background noise.

Mr SUCH: —that at no stage have members of the Opposition reflected on the Governor. It is the job of the Governor to deliver an address to the Parliament and the people of South Australia. It was not the best journalism to portray a headline which suggested there was in any way any criticism of His Excellency. We are, of course, concentrating on the activities of the Government, not trying to attack His Excellency.

In the Governor's speech reference is made to Federal-State relations, and I would welcome an improvement in that area. It is long overdue. We should sit down and look rationally at the way that our Federal system operates. I believe that it is time that we put aside self-interest and looked thoroughly and comprehensively at the various aspects of it. I hope that we will not enter into some long drawn out talkfest, but that we get on and modify and, hopefully, improve the Federal system.

I notice that in the speech reference is made to a shortfall of \$180 million. Other speakers have already mentioned some of the areas in which there has been considerable inefficiency and waste. I will not detail them all, but there are examples such as Marineland, the South Australian Timber Corporation, and so on. I point out that in terms of expenditure I have not seen much evidence of it in the area which I represent, nor in the southern part of the metropolitan area in particular. In fact, I sometimes get the feeling that the Government believes that the metropolitan area ends somewhere around about Darlington.

Expenditure is always a question of priorities and, as members of the Opposition, we cannot be criticised for putting forward suggestions for expenditure. The Government is the body that has to assess those priorities, and in no way or at any time will members of the Opposition retreat from their obligation to represent their electorates.

Mention is made in the speech of trying to maintain services. I agree that we are in a difficult time. I believe that we should be looking at the efficiency and effectiveness of Government departments. We should be looking at the

whole structure of Government departments, not merely at the coalface. We should not simply be imposing across-the-board cuts on Government departments. I believe that is a crude way of operating. The notion of 1 per cent or 2 per cent across-the-board cuts inevitably results in cuts at the coalface and often not in areas where the cutting should occur. Likewise, there are some areas of the public sector where an increase in expenditure may be warranted, and I trust that the Government will not fall into the trap of the simplistic, crude technique of across-the-board cuts for departments. I believe that they should be looked at on a selective basis.

I believe that we should look constantly at bureaucracies because, whether private or public, bureaucracies tend to be self-perpetuating. For that reason alone, we should constantly review them. We have a very fine Public Service in South Australia. I know many of our public servants, both senior and junior. I have great faith in their integrity and ability, and I will not be party to public servant bashing, whether it is carried out by the Government or by any other section of the community. That is not to say that the Public Service should not be constantly reviewed and made more efficient and effective but, once again, it is a question of being selective and looking at areas that need to be changed and maybe boosting others that need an increase. For example, there may well be a case for an increase in some sections of the Police Force.

With reference to the MFP, a fairly emotional topic for some people, my view is that, if it is good for South Australia, I support it. A cynic might say that it represents a stationary Grand Prix that can be trotted out prior to elections, but it does not seem to fit so well into the 'up and running' theme I recall of a few years ago. I am not quite sure what 'up and running' is in Japanese, but I trust that the Government is sincere and committed to a project that will benefit South Australians. To that end, I notice that the Government is highlighting manufacturing and agriculture as part of developments associated with the MFP, and I welcome and support that.

The Government talks about its commitment to infrastructure support, a communications network and a transport hub. Once again in relation to the south, roads and public transport are key issues. Without being too flippant about it, in the south we do not have so much as a hubcap, let alone a transport hub program! The south badly needs transport facilities to assist in the development of industry in that area. There are problems in terms of existing arterial roads to convey freight from that area and, importantly (and being a great supporter of rail transport), this applies similarly in relation to rail networks.

I welcome the review of land use and development control in South Australia and I am pleased that the Government is seeking comment from interested groups and individuals, and I am aware that that process is already under way with officers consulting local councils and so on. It is the sort of thing that needs to be undertaken and it is something that has my support.

The Government says that it is committed to economic growth and sustainable economic development. One of the areas in South Australia in which I think we could do a lot better is in relation to processing our own food. It might come as a surprise to many people to discover that in our supermarkets most of the processed food originates from either interstate or overseas. Given our agricultural base here—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And our horticultural base.

Mr SUCH: Yes, and our horticultural base. I find it to be an incredible situation that in South Australia we do not

even produce the majority of our processed foods, and there is the opportunity in respect of value added to do a lot more with our primary produce not only for local consumption but also for export.

We have not even scratched the surface in terms of new technologies that are available and we should be pursuing that avenue as vigorously as possible. It is an industry that is relatively clean in environmental terms and we should be at the forefront of it rather than exporting jobs and opportunities overseas. I guess it is traditional in the Governor's speech to make reference to the agricultural sector. It is important that we do so because I think that there is a tendency in our community to forget the importance that the rural sector still plays in our economy. Many children in the metropolitan area believe that milk originates from cartons. I think it is important that we do not lose sight of the important contribution of the rural sector. Yesterday the new member for Custance made us aware of some of those aspects.

The Government highlighted, too, via the Governor's address, the importance of vegetation retention. That is an area in which I have been actively involved for at least 20 years and I strongly support the retention, as far as possible, of our indigenous vegetation. I would like to see, via our schools and community, a greater understanding of basic ecological principles such as interrelationship and interdependence. I believe that those principles and the wider aspects of ecology should be more strongly reinforced and expressed through our school system. I believe that many teachers are already doing this, but I also believe that we could do more in that area.

I believe that we could do more in terms of explaining to newcomers to this country the importance of retaining native vegetation. I would like to see more educational programs and information undertaken in that area. We still have great deficiencies with our national parks system, particularly in the high rainfall areas and in the wetlands. That occurs because we live in a very dry State and, as a result, those areas will be short by definition; but they are, nevertheless, not represented widely enough in our park system. The Marine Environment Protection Bill is to be reintroduced, and I welcome that. I hope that this time the Government gets it right.

Mr D.S. Baker: We are going to introduce it first.

Mr SUCH: That is even better. All day shopping finally looks as though it will come to pass—I believe it is inevitable. I believe in a reasonable degree of competition and open trading, and I think it is a good thing. However, we should recognise the sacrifice that many small shopkeepers and their families make in providing extended trading and also shop assistants whose contribution is often overlooked. I would not wish to see shops forced to open, but I believe six-day trading is inevitable.

In relation to workers rehabilitation and compensation, I strongly support genuine protection and safety provisions and also measures that eradicate or eliminate practices by those who seek to abuse the system, even though they are, no doubt, a minority. The Government trumpets the vital role of small business and I make the comment, 'You could have fooled me.' It plays a vital role but does not get the recognition by the Government it deserves. If one looks at the imposition of land tax, licence fees and WorkCover, one could be forgiven for thinking that the Government did not believe that small business had a vital role. Small business is the largest employer and it should be given all the support that the Government can possibly give it. Small business is not looking for handouts; it is looking for a

climate in which it can operate with certainty and without heavy and unrealistic burdens.

At the moment there is no incentive to employ or to work hard, for reasons which lie not only within the province of the State Government but also of the Federal Government. I believe that those aspects of incentive should be addressed: the people who are prepared to work hard should be rewarded for their efforts. I believe that small business has been asked to carry an unfair share of the burden and we should address that. Government should get off the back of small and large businesses.

I note the recognition of the formation of South Australia's third university. It has had a long and fairly painful gestation and I wish the new university all the best. I acknowledge the contribution of dedicated staff, both academic and general, in our current tertiary institutions and those in former institutions that are the precursors to what will be the new University of South Australia. There have been, and still are, fine people associated with SACAE. Some unacceptable behaviour and practices have gone on in the past within SACAE that I will not dwell on now, but I am hopeful that, with the restructuring of the institution, things will be better. There is a danger, of course, in assuming that big is beautiful. I think we should be careful not to fall into the trap of thinking that amalgamations are necessarily cost-saving measures. In my experience they can often have the opposite consequence.

In respect of tertiary institutions, I hope that the Government will be mindful of recent comments made by a former Director-General of Education, Mr John Steinle. Mr Steinle has spoken of teacher training and the need for teachers to know what to teach as well as how to teach. I believe that this is an area that needs to be addressed urgently. We need to look also at the selection processes for those who wish to become teachers. I believe that more effort needs to go into ensuring that we get people who will be good teachers and not simply people who have enough matriculation points. I hope and trust that the Government will take on board some of the comments made by Mr Steinle and institute a review of teacher training programs.

In respect of apprentices, the Government states that we will have the highest number of people in training in 15 years. I am pleased to see that, but I am not sure that that takes into account the population growth that has occurred in that time. One of the things that does concern me is whether, under our requirements for apprentices these days, we exclude people who would make fine tradespeople and whether, in fact, our requirements for knowledge in areas like mathematics are really pertinent and necessary given the tasks that tradespeople are likely to carry out. I have a feeling that we do exclude many potentially fine trades people who, years ago, would have been able to find a place but who now cannot get into the training arena.

In relation to the Education Department, I believe that we have a very fine teaching force and general support staff in our schools but that some areas and practices need to be changed. For instance, the Education Department should be directed to let go some of the reins that it currently holds over schools. It is my view that there should be more genuine decentralisation of decision-making and administration in schools. Further, there should be more genuine say for parents in terms of curriculum matters, not in respect of methodology but, rather, in respect of what is taught in schools. I can see no reason why we should be frightened of a significant contribution by parents. After all, it is their children who attend the schools and it is their money. I further believe that we can develop a genuine and

productive partnership between parents, teachers and children.

In line with the 'more decentralisation' theme, it is my view that we should have less central and regional bureaucracy. One of my concerns in relation to our education system—and these are major topics, so I can mention them only briefly—is that in our schools policy-making has become somewhat of a disease. Much time goes into making policies on every imaginable and unimaginable possibility and that takes up much of the time of teachers who have to develop these policies. I think that area should be examined. Further, I believe that there is a danger that education may be seen simply as an industry. It certainly has an economic aspect to it, but education is more than just an industry and, to that end, I hope that SAIT focuses strongly on its role as a professional body as well as an industrial body.

I believe that these days too many things are asked of schools. Teachers cannot get on with many of the basic teaching functions that they would like to perform. Perhaps too many programs get in the way of what our dedicated teachers would like to do. I realise, too, that the contract teacher system has enormous economic implications but, given the experiences of some of my constituents, I believe that it is a cruel system. Whilst this problem will not be easy to resolve, more effort should be made to reduce or eliminate its harsh impact.

I would like to see more emphasis in schools on key values. I believe that they should be more explicit as well as implicit—concern for others, respect for property and so on. I do not think that we should retreat from those values and there should be no apology for developing a key or core set of values within our community and promoting them vigorously, both within the school and without.

I believe that teachers need more help with curriculum areas and materials. I think that teachers would support that. Whilst I strongly support the programs that have been instituted to assist girls, we should not overlook the problems faced by many boys in our school system. Research demonstrates that boys are often the ones who experience major learning disabilities, so it is not a question of either/or but, rather, a question of not overlooking the problems and difficulties that boys face as well as those faced by girls. If many of the problems faced by boys are addressed, girls will be assisted also.

Finally, in relation to education, I believe that the whole matter of computer education should be reconsidered. In this area, I think that we have gone overboard and we need to rethink and re-examine the role of computers in our schools in order to ensure that they are used appropriately, because they are not a substitute for creativity—they are a tool.

I am pleased to note that the Government is looking at some of the concerns expressed about retirement villages, in particular, funding arrangements and village management. Constituents have expressed concerns to me about those matters and I believe that something needs to be done in that area, so I would welcome those changes.

In respect of the administration of justice and the treatment of those who break the law, I believe that it is high time there were changes. There is, of course, considerable community concern about this topic. Whilst I acknowledge many of the innovative reforms carried out by the Minister of Correctional Services, I believe that, within our prison system, we should place more emphasis on prisoners spending their time in more vigorous ways and often with a greater physical component in the time they spend in the system. Personally, I favour prisoners getting higher pay but paying a more realistic board.

There is, I believe, a danger in calling for longer sentences for all prisoners. I would be happy for dangerous prisoners to stay in prison *ad infinitum*, but I think there are disbenefits in leaving non-threatening prisoners in prison for too long. That is not in the prisoner's or the community's best interests. I believe it would be better to have shorter, more vigorous sentences rather than imposing lengthy sentences merely for the sake of time.

I would like to see greater use of prison work gangs, a system Australia used years ago, although I do not suggest that we adopt the brutality of that system. Electronic bracelets could be used for prisoners who are no risk to the community to enable them to engage in environmental tasks such as tree planting, clearing exotic plants, weeds, and so on. I know that the community work order scheme is used in this area, but I suggest we could go further and use prisoners who are no threat to the community to carry out environmental work in the community. That would be good for them, and would be of benefit to the community.

I am concerned about the Juvenile Court system and the penalties that are imposed. I believe that there needs to be reconsideration of that system, because at present many youngsters laugh off the consequences that accrue to them as a result of their appearing before that court. I believe that the system recycles offenders, and that is not the sort of recycling I support.

I think we could also look at the situation that prevails in Victoria. That State lowered to 17 years the age at which offenders are treated as adults for criminal purposes. While I do not want committees to be established to consider every subject under the sun, I believe that a committee could profitably examine that matter and consider a whole range of matters relating to age—at which age an offender is to be treated as an adult, at which age one is able to vote and so on. As I said, Victoria lowered the age to 17 years and the evidence suggests that that is working quite well.

I support the crime prevention strategy in general terms and raise the question of whether or not we use our police in the most effective way: whether, for example, we should be using them for clerical tasks, to check clearways and so on; also, whether we should not be considering an alternative system, in conjunction with conventional policing, whereby a separate uniformed group deals with traffic matters. I realise that often traffic and crime matters are related, but to me it seems silly to use crime fighters to issue parking tickets on clearways and to type up reports when that could be done by others. Furthermore, I believe there is a case for considering the use of special constables—volunteers—who can walk around shopping centres and generally help in the observance of the laws. I believe that that matter could be given greater consideration.

In relation to crime prevention I believe that, as a society, we must get back to the question of core values, to which I alluded earlier. I make no apology for emphasising this. It is not simply a task for schools; it is a task for parents, the media and the whole community. Whether or not we like it, the decline of organised religion has created a social vacuum, and it is not surprising that young people in particular and others do not follow the values of a civilised society. We should make no apology for developing a set of core values and reinforcing them through schools, the media and other areas.

In that respect I believe that we need to assist parents, particularly those with teenagers, in the rearing of their children. We need to do more to assist parents, particularly single parents, rather than condemn them.

As my time is running out, I will make brief comments about the social justice strategy. Reference is made to fam-

ilies, but too often families are used as the basis for rhetoric without much substance being provided at all. We should really get down to the serious business of trying to assist families, particularly the low wage earners who are struggling to make ends meet. We should be looking at assisting them to have legitimate holidays and excursions, which have got beyond their reach. We should look at the range of family discount concessions that could be offered to assist them in this area.

There are many other matters that I cannot mention now because of time constraints and I will come back to them at other times during the session. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I look forward to a constructive and productive session in which we will keep the Government on its toes to ensure that not only is this State up and running but also that it is sprinting rather than jogging.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): This is the last occasion on which the Parliament will respond to an opening speech by Sir Donald Dunstan. As such, it is important that we should recognise and record the outstanding service given to our State by Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan. As they prepare to end their viceregal duties in December, Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan can look back on having served a record term of more than 8½ years in Government House. This surpasses the 7½ year term served by Sir Wiloughby and Lady Norrie between December 1944 and June 1952.

South Australia's thirtieth Governor, Sir Donald has distinguished his office with interest in, and concern for, the needs of all South Australians. On behalf of my parliamentary colleagues, I wish Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan well for their future. In the last Address in Reply speech I offered to discuss with the Premier a suitable successor for Sir Donald. Of course, that offer still remains. We hope the appointment can receive bipartisan support, and that it will not be based on serving any political purpose.

Also, I welcome the new member for Custance to this House. He had an excellent win in the by-election and he follows a very distinguished member of the Liberal Party in John Olsen, who is now Senator John Olsen and who served Custance and the Liberal Party very well. I wish the new member well, and I know that his experience in the agricultural area, as portrayed in his maiden speech yesterday, will be of great benefit to this Parliament and to South Australia.

Notwithstanding the Liberal Party's achievement in winning a majority of votes at the last State election, we have recognised the right of this Government to get on with fulfilling its task and the responsibilities that it has in addressing the many problems confronting the State. On more than one occasion I have pointed out publicly that when we begin the 1990s we are at least two years away from a Federal or a State election in South Australia. This presents an opportunity to take some important, if tough, decisions in the longer term interests of our State and nation.

Therefore, it is unfortunate to have to record that now this unique opportunity is being squandered. South Australians are now seeing that they have a Government which has ignored the lessons of the last election. They have a Government which refuses to lead, and which turns its back on the hard decisions that are necessary for more effective management of our State. The Premier spoke immediately

after the last election about the need for his Administration to demonstrate more flair and light.

However, he now plans to plunge the State into darkness, and that is the darkness of more tax increases, where his Administration exhibits fright rather than flair and, of course, has not taken up the challenge. We have seen the Premier speak up only when he has wanted to talk about more tax increases. We have not seen him take up, as he should, micro-economic reform which is needed and which, if taken up sensibly, would mean that we would not need extra taxes in this State.

It was the ALP National Secretary, Mr Hogg, not the National President, who initiated the special conference aimed at resolving Labor's dilemma over telecommunications reform. The Premier has hidden behind Mr Hogg's coat once before at a very crucial time when Mr Hogg moved a motion at Labor's National Conference in 1982, which allowed the Premier to support the Roxby Downs project, the single most important action that allowed him to govern in the first place. Once again, now we find that, when a lead has to be given, not only to his Party but also to the public in South Australia, the Premier waits for others to stand up and speak out on what should be done. Labor is stumbling along down the road of micro-economic reform without any commitment and without any leadership. It is paying the price of weakness when strength is required and of confusion when debate is needed and when consistency and courage is needed to try to get the matter of taxation in South Australia resolved to the benefit of all South Australians.

We can see in New South Wales that this can happen when a State Government is absolutely committed to clear micro-economic reform, and we can see the benefits that can accrue from that. Nick Greiner is the greatest reforming Premier since Sir Thomas Playford. He is rejuvenating the State in an economic sense as only Sir Thomas Playford before him has done. In time, I look forward to being able to work with Nick Greiner and with the other Liberal State Premiers to help achieve the economic reform that is so necessary for a more competitive and productive nation in the 21st century. As Mr Greiner had, the next Liberal Government in our State will have a long Labor legacy to repair.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will tell you about workers' compensation in a minute but that is something that I will know more about than will the honourable member. However, we will not shirk the challenges in the way that this Government has done. Indeed, we will not wait to win Government after the next election to force the pace of reform.

During this session of Parliament we have foreshadowed a number of initiatives. We will seek to amend our industrial laws to remove preference to unions clauses. We will scrap the power of the Industrial Commission to order virtually closed shops. We will make it an offence to harass people to join unions and we will restore the right of individuals to be able to take union officials to ordinary courts to sue them for damages. We will introduce legislation to establish procedures to review all Government statutory authorities. This will ensure that all Government statutory authorities must justify their existence. Those identified as inefficient or unnecessary should be revamped or abolished.

We will legislate to allow judicial reviews of administrative decisions by Government departments and agencies. At present, in many respects, they are a law unto themselves. We believe that Government officials and agencies must have their actions subject to appeal or review by individuals who have been treated harshly or unfairly or who have been

caused unnecessary hardship. We will legislate to provide voluntary voting for State elections. We should not stand apart from virtually all Western democracies in denying what should be a fundamental right to choose whether or not to vote.

We will reintroduce our own marine environment protection legislation. We have led the way on this issue. It was the Liberal Party's commitment last year to end effluent disposal into our gulfs which forced the Government to promise action. However, we have yet to see that promise matched with an action. The Minister for Environment and Planning huffs and puffs about leading Australia in this case, and the noise she makes is becoming, as the shadow Minister has said, an environmental hazard in itself. We will substitute action for the inaction that we have heard.

We will initiate a full inquiry into WorkCover. When this Government introduced the present system in 1986, the Liberals warned that it would become costly and open to abuse. All Government monopolies lead to these failings. At the time of that debate the then Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins) said:

We also believe that there will be a significant saving to employers and, if there is not, we will have to reconsider our position on this Bill. Whether or not it involves this State or Victoria, if schemes like this do not serve the workers and industry as they were intended, obviously they will have to be severely modified because this State cannot afford to be out of step with our major competitors.

That was a quote from *Hansard* of 19 February 1986. Now that the Hon. Mr Blevins is Minister of Finance, I trust he will have a better appreciation of just how much many South Australian businesses are threatened by the poor administration, the rising premium levels and the threat of a continuing blowout in the unfunded liabilities, which have become hallmarks of this scheme in a very short time. Given what he said just over four years ago, the Minister must support our move for a full review of WorkCover. We have no complaints about providing for genuinely injured workers, but our business must not be forced to pay for the inefficiencies of another Government monopoly.

In this session of Parliament we will pursue our campaign for a fair electoral system for South Australia. We hope that the select committee still sitting can come up with constructive recommendations for the House to consider.

These are some of the areas that we will be considering during this session of Parliament. I contrast this with the timid and tired approach of the Government. Typical of its lack of ideas, imagination and concern for ordinary South Australians has been its traditional scene-setting for tax increases. The latest stunt by the Premier last Sunday was a contempt of this Parliament. He is threatening to expose MPs as being financially irresponsible every time they pass on to the Government the desire of their constituents for improved services. No MP on either side of the House should be bluffed by this stunt; it received short shrift from the media, and it deserved no more.

The Premier turned to stunts in the election campaign when he was put in a corner; he is doing the same thing now. For the same reasons, he used theatrics to avoid addressing the issues raised in last week's urgency motion. Constantly, we have heard the Premier cry poverty. We have seen him attempt to blame his financial woes on Canberra. But, what are the facts? He has presided over record increases in tax revenues. Since 1982, tax revenues have risen by 2½ times the CPI in South Australia.

With a record such as this, it is little wonder the Premier promised no tax increases at the last State election. Ever since, however, he has been trying to find excuses for another broken election promise. This is because of his abysmal

record in financial management in the affairs of this State. While the Premier has boosted revenues in real terms, this State's public sector financing requirement last financial year—the difference between the spending of all Government departments and agencies, and their earnings—has blown out massively. In the past two months, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the State Bank, Access Economics and Moody's have all said this Government has run down the State's assets and reserves and increased borrowings at a worryingly rapid rate.

The ABS puts our financing requirement at \$663 million in 1989-90—the highest *per capita* on the mainland, higher even than Victoria—but the Premier's reaction has been to shoot the messenger. For example, he attacked the Bureau of Statistics' estimate of the State's deficit for being 'wrong' and 'grossly overstated' and instructed a senior Treasury official publicly to denounce the figures as untrustworthy.

This shabby attack on the integrity of the Commonwealth Statistician is all the more extraordinary given that the bureau used data which is in the State Treasury's 1989-90 budget papers. On page 95 of Financial Paper No. 1, it is stated:

Because of differences in accounting and institutional arrangements among the States, it is necessary, if reliable comparisons are to be made, to turn to comprehensive data published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics relating to each State's total public sector.

But when these data show that the South Australian Government is managing the State's finances disastrously, the Premier says they cannot be trusted. I can only wonder how long the Premier thinks he can get away with blaming Canberra and saying that all of these respected organisations are wrong about his budget overspending.

It is quite obvious that the reason why the Premier is pushing up taxes and charges to record rates is his fiscal mismanagement, particularly in the run up to the last election. During that election campaign, he claimed that the programs of a Liberal Government 'would plunge South Australia into a financial crisis'. That is a quote from a press statement issued by the Premier on 19 November—just six days before the last election.

In that statement, the Premier also criticised Liberal programs to contain spending—programs such as productivity initiatives in the public sector and a reduction in administrative duplication between the Commonwealth and the States. The very fact that initiatives such as these are now being embraced by the Prime Minister as the new way to go in public sector management and efficiency exposes yet again the appalling failure of our Premier to demonstrate the leadership required for South Australia.

The unalterable fact now is that this State faces a financial crisis of this Government's own making—no-one else's. After more than eight years in office—and despite record revenue rises—it has failed to contain Government spending and to control Government waste and inefficiency. The Premier turns to Canberra once again, trying to hide the sorry truth of those facts, but, even here, his expediency and reliance on a short public memory are outrageous.

During the last Federal election campaign, the Premier put out a press statement on 6 March under the heading 'Services to be axed and jobs to go under Peacock policy'. I quote from the statement as follows:

The Liberal plan released yesterday listed another \$125 million in cuts to the States in addition to the \$300 million the Liberals announced last year they would be cutting. South Australia's share of this \$425 million would be approximately \$42 million. This would have disastrous consequences for the provision of vital community services in South Australia. Just to give some practical idea of what these cuts would mean: for every \$10 million of funding that is cut, we could lose 100 teachers, 100 police and 100 nurses.

Taking the Premier's words at face value and his claim—a false claim—that the State has faced a \$180 million cut by the Hawke Government for this year's budget, blaming it for that, and taking those previous figures through to their logical conclusion, are we to believe that 1 800 teachers, 1 800 members of the Police Force and 1 800 nurses will be cut? Or can we say that the Hawke Government, the Federal President's friend, has been more than five times as tough on the States as a coalition Government would have been? Of course, neither is the fact. However, both are legitimate conclusions that can be drawn from the sort of juvenile, and jingoistic nonsense that the Premier has substituted for rational debate about the need for expenditure at all levels of Government to be responsibly looked at and responsibly contained.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Political rhetoric.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Quite right. The Opposition has already demolished the Premier's claim that he is \$180 million behind following the Premiers Conference.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I do not expect the honourable Minister to know anything about finances because he has not shown that since he has been in this place.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You certainly haven't.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will cease interjecting. The honourable Leader will return to his speech and address the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Through you, Sir, I suggest that, since he has been in this place, the greatest thing the Minister has contributed was taking the back page off a report which gave South Australia its future in Roxby Downs. He has not demonstrated one thing in this place that shows that he knows anything about the economic future of this State.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: I raise a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach has a point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I am sure that members realise that a member must not reflect on another member of this House, and I refer to—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to come to order while the Chair considers the point of order raised by the member for Henley Beach. Has the honourable member finished?

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Sir. If you wish to have a direct reference to Standing Orders—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If that is the honourable member's point, there is no point of order. I ask the Leader to return to his speech and I ask the Minister at the bench not to interject.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member could become the second one to be called 'the fabricator'.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Leader has just made certain allegations against me. I have never been accused—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach will come to his point of order quickly.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, Sir. I take particular objection to the Leader making reflections against me and accusing me of being a fabricator.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable gentleman suggested that there was a second member in this House who could be called 'the fabricator'. He referred directly to me as being a fabricator. I take objection to that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach has made a point of order which the Chair does not accept. The Chair asks the Leader of the Opposition to return to his speech.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Obviously, the \$180 million is a very sore point on the other side of the House and it is not only the Treasurer who cannot understand it. I am sure that the taxpayers of South Australia do understand, because it is they who will have to pay the increased taxes. Of course, the \$180 million claim is fraudulent and false. It is a front for tax increases and nothing more. During the budget debate, I will put the full facts on the parliamentary record, and I will demonstrate again that in 1990-91 the real level of Commonwealth funding to the State will be about the same as it was last year. The Premier, therefore, has no excuse at all for breaking the commitment he made repeatedly during the last election that any rises in taxes and charges would be held within the CPI. I assure members that there will be further opportunities to debate this issue. I put the Premier and his Ministers on notice that the Opposition will analyse the budget line by line. It will no longer tolerate the fudging and the fobbing off which have marked this Government's approach to legitimate financial questions in the past.

There has been much debate about this Government's approach to public sector restructuring. I understand and support the reaction and opposition of blue-collar workers to these claims. They heard the Premier, when he was opposing the last Liberal Government, promise that the public sector would grow under Labor. They heard him promise their jobs were safe—and that he would not raise taxes into the bargain. They heard this Premier, between 1979 and 1982, oppose every step of the way the last Liberal Government's program for public sector reform. The last Liberal Government was as far ahead of its time in micro-economic reform as this Government remains behind.

The Liberals in the State have also been talking, since the early 1980s, about privatisation; about stopping the unnecessarily costly and inefficient competition between the public sector and services already being provided by the private sector. Now with some Federal Labor Ministers wanting to open up important Commonwealth instrumentalities to more private ownership, it is interesting to note that the freedom of choice that we talk about will have to come about in order to reduce costs to the consumer.

In Victoria the Premier's friend Mr Cain wanted to privatise the Government Insurance Office and the Gas and Fuel Corporation. But Labor as a Party cannot handle these issues with maturity because people such as our Premier have refused to walk firmly down this road to its logical conclusion. In 1987, his Government commissioned PA Management Consultants to advise on improving the efficiency of the STA. PA reported in the following terms which neatly summarise the case for public sector reform and its benefits. I quote from that company's report recommending the introduction of an STA business plan:

The goals of the business plan should be to reduce the deficit, increase revenue and productivity, cut overheads and direct the maximum feasible percentage of available funds into direct service delivery so as to maintain standards of service.

That is the goal we should have for all Government services but, as the honourable member said, nothing has happened. But the immaturity of the debate within the Labor Party, encouraged by the weak meanderings of people like the

Premier, means there is a great hang-up about who delivers a service—whether it is the public sector or the private sector—rather than the standard of the service received by the public of South Australia.

In the void created by this lack of leadership, the higher paid public sector employees have been able to manipulate, largely to preserve their positions, meaning lower paid blue-collar workers are bearing a disproportionate share of the burden of employment rationalisation. Take the STA as one specific example. The emphasis in the PA report was on service delivery. Those at the coalface of service delivery in the STA are the bus and tram crews, the train running staff and the train station staff. They have the most contact with the public, and they cop the complaints when a bus or a train is late. However, over the past three years, these direct service providers have had their numbers cut from 2 007 to 1 844—163 people.

I would not argue so much with this, in the interests of efficiency, if salaried STA staff had also been dealt with in accordance with the report's recommendations. In this respect, the report called for a reduction of approximately 100 in salaried staff numbers. Of course, that was supposed to have happened and got down to June 1986 levels. At that time the number of STA salaried staff was 696. On the latest figures, it is 632, meaning a reduction of a little over half of the recommendation compared with the much more significant reductions in those areas which the report stated more directly were involved in service delivery.

The same can be seen in other departments and agencies. I have already commented publicly on Marine and Harbors, much to the ire of the Minister. In Marine and Harbors, between 1984 and 1989, the number of salaried staff has been reduced by 20 and the number of weekly paid staff by 111.

In Woods and Forests over the same period, the salaried staff has been reduced by 22 and the weekly paid work force by 192. In the Engineering and Water Supply Department, salaried staff has been reduced by 138, but the weekly paid pool is down by 695. In ETSA, wages staff numbers are slightly down but salaried staff numbers have increased by 332. Even in the more sensitive areas of service delivery, administrative staff numbers have grown more than those directly providing the service.

In the Health Commission, central office staff grew by 9.6 per cent between 1984 and 1989—more than three times the rate of nursing staff in recognised hospitals. The education bureaucracy has remained relatively static at just over 820 employees, while the total number of teachers—and I can understand their grievances—is down by 455. In the Police Force, total police strength, including cadets, has increased by 6 per cent, but other departmental employment, mainly in administration areas, is up by 9.6 per cent.

Overall, since 1984, the number of weekly-paid employees in the public sector is down by more than 1 560 while the number of staff employed under the GME Act is up by more than 900. This point is of great significance and should be brought home to the blue-collar workers in South Australia. It was in 1984 that the Premier, in his budget speech, committed himself to significant reductions in employment at the executive and administrative officer classification. The stated aim was to achieve salary savings of 15 per cent. However, as I have said, exactly the opposite has occurred. The salary cost of these positions is about \$5.53 million greater than it was five years ago because the number of staff at these classifications has increased overall from 712 to 897—a rise of 26 per cent in total numbers.

I am afraid that no twisting of the figures by the Government can hide the fact that it has decimated the blue-

collar workers in the public sector. Public sector restructuring cannot be implemented effectively, with the continuing commitment of all public sector employees, unless the Government levels with its staffs and unless the burden is shared equitably between different worker classifications. The fault is not with public servants. The responsibility lies with the Government.

Unlike Labor, the Liberal Party is a low tax Party that believes in maintaining services through greater public sector efficiency. Unlike the Premier, the Minister of Finance has at least publicly admitted that the people of South Australia will no longer stand for a bloated low-productivity public sector fed by ever increasing taxes, and I agree with those sentiments. It is also essential that the matter of expensive and unnecessary duplication between the Commonwealth and the States be urgently addressed.

In contrast to the Premier's admission that nothing much has been done since he promised to investigate duplication in 1986, the Liberal Party's policy at the last State election detailed savings of \$347 million from public sector employment limits, asset sales to reduce debt, contracting out and competitive tendering of all Government services and productivity improvement. All these will help to reduce duplication. Not only should duplication and the tax burden be reduced, but there is a crying need to look at the sources of State revenue to see if there is a more efficient and fairer way of raising it. At present, we have the ludicrous situation where the Commonwealth takes the odium for raising half the money that the State Government takes the credit for spending. This means that there is little fiscal discipline on the States and it promotes an annual whingeing pilgrimage by the Premier to Canberra with demands for even greater handouts. 'Success' is measured by the size of the handout each Premier gets which of course is paid for by hard-pressed taxpayers.

At the same time, the Commonwealth's control over the purse strings has led to a steady erosion of the legitimate constitutional role of the States and State Governments. To break out of this failing federalism, the Commonwealth must cut its taxes and the States must broaden their revenue raising base. I made this point in April when I spoke about a possible State consumption tax and again at a Liberal Leaders' meeting in June, chaired by Dr Hewson. As far as possible, the States should raise all of the revenue they spend with the exception of the fiscal equalisation top-ups which smaller States like Tasmania and South Australia rely on because of their smaller revenue-raising capacity. I was pleased to see in late June that the Premier accepted the principle of the Commonwealth relinquishing tax raising to the States when he used the example of the Commonwealth's bank accounts debits tax, which quite unusually is called the BAD tax. This tax is presently levied in addition to the financial institutions duty (FID) collected by the States.

But, in 1988-89 BAD raised only \$358 million across Australia and only \$5 million of this was from South Australia. So, it will make only a trivial difference to our Commonwealth funding of over \$2.6 billion if this is sent back to South Australia. A more significant possibility is if the Commonwealth handed over company tax to the States. This could net South Australia over \$400 million without adding a cent to company tax obligations. This could net a quite large amount to other States in Australia, and I believe it would be in the interests of Australia as a whole if this was handed back by the Commonwealth. More importantly, it could provide added incentive for the State Government to attract sorely needed business and development to the

State and to get out of unnecessary Government enterprises, which only duplicate activities in the private sector.

But the most obvious means of taxation reform is to look at replacing Commonwealth sales tax, which in South Australia raises about \$600 million, with a broadly based consumption tax where its rate is set by individual States. To the extent that it raises more than sales tax, the Commonwealth could reduce grants to the States and give taxpayers substantial income tax cuts. Of course, a consumption tax would not be applied to exports but it would tend to discourage imports and encourage saving—all essential, given this country's chronic foreign debt and balance of payments problems. A State-based consumption tax is already levied in the USA and it would be possible to combine the best features of that system with the cleanest consumption tax among OECD countries which is the New Zealand goods and services tax (GST). A consumption tax would also give efficient States a means by which their taxpayers could receive a reward for undertaking micro-economic reform.

The best run States would have the lowest consumption tax, and that would have to be in the best interests of us all. If the Premier is really serious about federalism and greater responsibility, I urge him to consider these proposals. They could also allow him to remove existing inequities in State imposts such as payroll tax and land tax. The ultimate aim would be more accountable State Government and a lower level of total taxation.

I conclude by saying that many of the measures proposed since last session, which began in February, have been looked at in a bipartisan fashion by the Opposition. It is quite obvious, from the last election, that the Premier does not enjoy majority support in South Australia. The Opposition has told the Premier that one of the ultimate goals in South Australia must be for fair elections. We asked him to go along with this. When we introduced a motion to put that proposal to a select committee it was obvious by the Deputy Premier's speech that it was not going to be bipartisan at all; it was going to be along the old Labor Party adage that it has an advantage and does not want democracy in South Australia. It will be very interesting to hear the deliberations of that committee, and I hope, as the Prime Minister of Malta said during his recent visit, that South Australia can have fair elections in the future as is the case in his country, and that the meaning of one vote, one value will not be equal numbers of electors in electorates.

We have tried to be bipartisan in our approach to the MFP. When the Premier rang me when I was overseas, giving me 24 hours' notice that he was going before the committee and urging me to support it, I said that I would support it and would encourage all South Australians to support it while the Opposition looked at the cost benefits to South Australia. The Opposition adopted a bipartisan approach, and the Premier said to the people of South Australia that the MFP would be their city and that it would house 100 000 people. However, officers of the Premier's Department now tell us that is not quite right, that that was only to get the MFP site here and that it will have only 35 000 people. We now want to see the cost benefits of the MFP to the taxpayers of South Australia. Once we know that, and, if we and the taxpayers of South Australia are told the truth by the Premier, that will enable us to give the proposal bipartisan support.

Before the last election we made a promise to help residents of South Australia who were in trouble with interest on home loans. The Premier then showed bipartisan support by coming out two days later and saying, 'Me, too, plus one. We are going to be better.' Now we have the sickening situation of the Minister's getting up in this House and

saying that the Government will curtail that program. The Government promised that it would help 35 000 South Australians, but it has helped only 1 300. The Premier knows the cynical way that the Government changed that program two days after the election. The Premier's bipartisan approach at that time backfired, yet he wonders why we will not give it to him.

Micro-economic reform is the only way this State can go if we are to cut the tax rises that the Premier keeps promising he will not continue to increase if we cannot get our Public Service to run efficiently. We have said, 'Let's look at micro-economic reforms. Let's look at cuts across the board,' but what do we get? We get a very cynical view from the Premier that the blue-collar workers of South Australia have to take all the cuts while his mates, the salaried staff, are protected from the cuts that are so vital and have to take place in this State.

We have seen the Government try to fog the \$180 million which the Premier claims he did not get from the Federal Government and about which members on the other side of the House are sensitive. The Premier is trying to hide those cuts because, according to Access Economics, the whole problem with the last State budget is that the Premier overspent by some \$130 million.

He overspent that sum because he could not control expenditure in an election year. He overspent it because he went out there and bought only 48 per cent of the votes of South Australia, and that cost \$130 million. The financial management of this State has been very bad indeed. In closing, I should ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker how much longer can you support a Government when the Treasurer cannot even remember bailing out his mate from Victoria to the tune of \$300 million?

Mr HERON (Peake): In my first speech in this House earlier this year I emphasised the importance of Governments, unions and employers negotiating to achieve low inflation and low unemployment by using the consensus approach. To me, consensus means reaching an agreement between all Parties. I say that because I vividly remember the disgraceful breaking of an agreement with the agricultural manufacturer, John Shearer Ltd, in April 1989, when it reneged on its agreement with the trade union in relation to membership. Understandably, the workers at John Shearer took strike action and set up a picket line at the Kilkenny factory. The dispute went to the Industrial Commission, which recommended a return to work and that the unions set up a committee to negotiate and examine various recommendations. Following the breakdown of these negotiations, union officials were threatened with legal action under section 45(d) of the Trade Practices Act backed up by the National Farmers' Federation.

The National Farmers' Federation offered John Shearer cash from its union-smashing fighting fund. The cash was offered from the federation's \$13 million reserves for common law suits against union officials who could face fines of up to \$50 000 each. Mr Paul Tremwith, industrial officer with the National Farmers Federation, stated that the Northern Territory Mudginberri legal fight had cost about \$1.6 million, that the fighting fund reserve could cover 10 Mudginberri and that the cash was ready for legal action against union officials under the restraint of trade provisions of the Trade Practices Act. The National Farmers' Federation also threatened the AMWU secretary with legal action under a section of the 1926 Commonwealth Crimes Act, which prohibits obstruction of exports. That could mean a one year gaol sentence and a no-fine alternative.

The Shearer workers ended their strike and returned to work on 18 April 1989. Within three weeks of that return to work the Managing Director of John Shearer, Mr Mike White, announced that the factory would close with the loss of about 300 jobs. He forgot to announce that to the unions. He also announced that Shearer's manufacturing base would be moved overseas. The owners of John Shearer, Arrowcrest, were asked to explain why they were closing the factory. They said that the decision was based on two key issues: the Federal Government's scrapping of the 10 per cent bounty on locally-manufactured agricultural machinery and the enforcement of compulsory unionism at John Shearer. It is also worth mentioning that Arrowcrest, the principal owner of John Shearer, also owns ROH, a wheel and office equipment manufacturer. Arrowcrest has received assistance from the Government totalling nearly \$4 million. John Shearer, itself, over the past 25 years has received millions of dollars in Government aid.

Further, it wanted to sack the 300 workers whose taxes helped Arrowcrest buy John Shearer in the first place. Throughout that dispute numerous hearings in the Industrial Relations Commission were held, but all to no avail. The Managing Director, Mr White, was forced to apologise to the commission for an inappropriate choice of words in claiming that the commission was forcing him to accept compulsory unionism, at the same time saying that the board of John Shearer would not reverse its decision in relation to the factory closure.

The Commissioner, Mr Greg Smith, accused the company of dishonesty in its decision to shut down its Adelaide plant, which entailed the loss of 300 jobs, and was at a loss to know why the decision was taken. Then came the intervention by John Bannon. The Premier negotiated with the Chairman of the board of John Shearer, Mr Andrew Gwinnett, who is also the Deputy Chairman of the Shearer-based parent company, the Arrowcrest group. The Premier also negotiated with the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, John Button, who agreed to restore the bounty for orders completed before 15 June 1989. A few days after these negotiations, John Shearer publicly announced that the factory would remain open, saying that key work force issues had been resolved.

Also of interest in this dispute was the role played by the South Australian Employers Federation, which refused to comment after having talks with the Managing Director, Mr White. During that dispute the manager of John Shearer, Mr White, said that he found it hard to fit unions into his plans for the future of John Shearer. If that is the attitude of Mr White, who apparently has no idea of industrial relations in this country, I suggest to him that he is the one who should go offshore.

Despite the dispute, John Shearer Holdings recorded a turnaround of \$7.7 million for the 12 months to 30 June 1989. The Chairman of John Shearer, Mr Andrew Gwinnett, said that they were quietly optimistic that results for the current year would see a further improvement. One must remember that this is the company that wanted to sack 300 workers and go offshore in that same year.

That dispute commenced in April 1989. It is ironic that, in the first week of April this year, John Shearer sacked 15 employees and also dumped 12 contract workers. The company notified the shop stewards of the sackings only 16 minutes before the day shift ended. The unions said that the agreement reached in the Industrial Relations Commission required management to advise the unions seven days before it intended to dismiss casual workers.

A meeting of about 250 workers voted to refer the matter to the Industrial Commission, so it was the workers and

not the company who called on the commission. I suggest that the bollocking the company received by the commission in the dispute last year would have made the commission the last place that the company wanted to go. However, the hearing did take place on 17 April 1990, this time before the Deputy President, Michael Keogh. He expressed his disappointment and disgust with the management of John Shearer in its handling of the latest retrenchments. He also stated that, if the negative attitude of John Shearer continued, particularly that of management, the time spent in the commission would have been wasted. The commission ordered the parties to meet immediately to discuss the issue.

On 19 April, 70 workers staged a sit-in in the Kilkenny plant car park. The sit-in occurred as the negotiations on the retrenchments, indicating the likelihood of further sackings, broke down. The company called the police, and four union officials were arrested. Unions stated that, if the union officials had not agreed to the arrests, management of John Shearer had made clear that it would go to any lengths to have the police remove and arrest every member. Those officials were to appear in the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court on 7 May and, the following work day, members voted to return to work. Once again the dispute ended up in the commission with the company not changing its dogmatic attitude, so the Metal Trades Federation of Unions endorsed a 24-hour stoppage of members of its affiliated unions for 7 May, the same day the officials were to attend the Magistrates Court.

The United Trades and Labor Council carried a motion unanimously condemning John Shearer's management and endorsing the action taken by the Metal Trades Federation of Unions. The stoppage went ahead on 7 May with over 2 000 workers attending a rally at the Lighthouse in Port Adelaide. The workers then escorted the four union officials to the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court, but proceedings against the officials were dropped and the four were discharged. The police officer who appeared for the prosecution told the court that the officials had been arrested under the Summary Offences Act apparently for trespassing but were never charged. At the insistence of Shearer's management, officers of the South Australian Police Force threatened over 220 workers with arrest and charging, and it was only the humane initiative of the four union officials that prevented such an abhorrent action. The Police Department should not be put in the position of having to use the Summary Offences Act in industrial disputes.

The action of John Shearer in the long-running dispute, I must say, is the worst I have come across in South Australia for over two decades. Its anti-union bashing has caused job losses and has led to strikes and sit-ins, the arrest of union officials and a State-wide stoppage, let alone the trauma workers must go through when they attend work every day. There have been over 30 appearances in the Industrial Commission and still, to this day, no end is in sight.

I now go back to my original remarks about consensus and agreements. If John Shearer does not come to its senses and use the consensus approach in negotiations with the trade unions, abide by industrial agreements and respect the Industrial Commission for what it is, maybe it should take up its original option and go offshore and leave the rest of the agricultural machinery manufacturers to profit from its misgivings.

It is no secret that South Australia has the best industrial relations record in Australia, and we should not allow that record to be broken by one company. I give notice to overseas companies that wish to establish in South Australia—and hopefully some will—that they should fully

understand our industrial relations system and not place caveats in contracts indicating that they will establish in South Australia as long as they do not have to abide by award rates of pay and conditions. Any overseas company, or John Shearer, that wants to write its own rule book is not welcome here in South Australia.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to again take part in the Address in Reply debate. I am not sure how many Address in Reply speeches I have made in the past 20 years, but I have made a number. Unfortunately, most of them have been from this side of the House. I congratulate the Governor on the way in which he presented his speech when he opened this session of Parliament. I believe he has carried out his duties as Governor not only in an excellent fashion but also in a way which has proved to be beneficial to the people of this State.

I sincerely hope that he has an enjoyable and long retirement and that whoever is next given the honour of representing Her Majesty in this State has the same qualities and expertise as the current incumbent. He has not engaged in controversy and has not set out to upstage those who have the responsibilities of governing or making statements in relation to general political matters.

I sincerely hope that the recommendation going forward from the Government nominates a person who has these qualities. It would be unfortunate if the Government attempted to follow the so-called trend-setting that we have had in past years in putting forward people whose main contribution has been their divisive actions or other radical views that are not accepted by the general population of South Australia. Again, I commend His Excellency for the manner in which he has carried out his duties, and I look forward to the Government's making a similar recommendation to Her Majesty.

The speech which the Government prepared for His Excellency lacked the criteria that will put South Australia on the map. We have had in South Australia for the past eight years a Government that has used press statements to raise community expectations but, unfortunately, it has not produced the substance to match them. In recent times there has been circulated to the media a list of requests by Opposition members to Government Ministers. In my time in this Parliament I have always been led to believe that it was the role of the Government to set the criteria.

The Government makes the decisions and, if one does not have the capacity, will, wit or ability required, one should not be in Government. It is the responsibility of every member to draw to the attention of Ministers, departments and the Government matters that are of concern to their constituents and, if the Government has the capacity, expenditure should be provided. My name is on the circulated list, and I suppose it involved an attempt to criticise me for making representations that the Port of Thevenard should be deepened and improved, and I would like to go into that matter.

Over a long period I have been involved in making strong representations for the provision of a suitable outlet for this important sector of our economy. Therefore, I organised a deputation to meet the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory). The deputation comprised the State Manager of the Wheat Board, the State Manager of the Cooperative Bulk Handling Company, the State Manager of Boral and representatives from the parent company in Sydney. The meeting, which took place in the Ceduna council chamber, included representatives of the District Council of Murat Bay and other local residents.

It was made clear to the Minister and his officers—which officers had a peculiar outlook on life, I thought, based on some of their comments—that, unless the port facilities were substantially upgraded, South Australia ran the risk of having gypsum imported from Thailand or Mexico. This is because the margins were so fine in the industry, which is an efficient and effective industry at Thevenard employing many South Australian citizens, and the cost structure was such that, unless they could load boats of a reasonable size and get them turned around quickly, there was a grave possibility that supplies would be obtained from elsewhere and that this operation would close down.

Not only would that happen, but also it would put in jeopardy the operation of the port for wheat, barley and oats. Who has been irresponsible? Was it me making these representations on behalf of those people, or was it some upstart of a press secretary or ministerial minder who has never been in the real world but who put out this silly list and gingered up the Premier to release it to the press? That is the sort of standard that the Government has reached in South Australia. I make no apology for making those representations. Indeed, as long as I am a member of this House I will discharge my duties in a responsible and well thought out manner.

I have always tried to act responsibly in respect of requests made of the Government. I am fully aware that the Government has not a large bag of money from which it can pluck money. I know that every dollar the Government spends comes from the hard-earned dollars that the taxpayers provide. I am fully aware, as a person who has been in the agriculture industry all my life, that one has to balance the books; otherwise one has to deal with the bank manager.

I make no make no apology for the representations I have made, because in an electorate such as mine one could justify most productively the expenditure of millions of dollars, because it would be in the long-term interest of the people of this State; it would be promoting industries which could export and from which we could earn income and which could employ further citizens. The Minister and his officers should have got the message clearly, because directors of large Australian companies do not come all the way from Sydney just for the good of their health; those people made it very clear. The State Manager of the Wheat Board and the State Manager of the Cooperative Bulk Handling company made it very clear.

The story goes a little further. Following that deputation, the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling company, an organisation that is owned and operated by the grain growers of this State, put forward a suggestion to the Minister that they purchase the loading facilities in the ports of South Australia. Any person with an ounce of intelligence would know that that would immediately release many millions of dollars, which the Government could spend in upgrading other port facilities or the port facilities at Thevenard. The Minister rejected it out of hand. I put to you, Mr Speaker, that there was no great benefit to the taxpayers to own those facilities. The cooperative company not only has the financial resources: it also has the management and maintenance expertise to enable it to operate effectively and efficiently. If one looks at the criteria that the Australian Wheat Board is now applying, where they or their agencies must have control of the total operation so that they can guarantee the quality that is going into the hold of the ship, one can see that the recommendations and suggestions make patent commonsense.

I hope the Premier will intervene in this exercise and have a little chat with the Minister and advise him that once again he is not acting in the interests of all South

Australians. I believe that a Government that is hard pressed for money would want to take up this offer to sell to the Cooperative Bulk Handling company. It is not a private organisation but a company that is set up by a Statute of this House; it is not owned by an individual and does not involve privatisation. It would be transferring those operations to an organisation that has proved beyond doubt that it has one of the finest records of storing and handling grain anywhere in the world.

We ought to be proud of it and assist it to go on and carry out its functions in a manner that is in the interests of all citizens. If this Government does not have the wit to do it, an incoming Government after the next election will put paid to this nonsense. We are not talking about doing away with people's jobs. Every one of those people currently employed could be employed by the bulk handling company, probably under better conditions, because they would know where they stood. They would not be at the whim of this Government trying to get rid of the blue-collar workers and prop up its mates up the ladder.

I make no apology for my representations, and the Minister and the Premier can trot out every day of the week a list of this nature with my name and other people's names on it; it will only demonstrate again to the community that it is a Government that has run out of steam and a Government that has run out of ideas. If that is the best they can do to attack the Opposition, heaven help the welfare of the people of this State.

Now I want to proceed to another problem in my district. I have been alarmed and perturbed for some time that there has been a deliberate attack on people living outside the metropolitan area. The Government has been determined to run down their services and facilities. In most decent societies Governments pride themselves that they give their citizens a decent education and provide them with reasonable health facilities.

Mr S.J. Baker: An even chance.

Mr GUNN: An even chance, as my friend, the Deputy Leader, rightly points out. There is a cost, but I thought that we took it for granted that spending money on our young citizens was one of the best investments that we could make so that we could provide them with an opportunity to develop skills that would then benefit every section of the community.

What has happened? We have had a task force set up to examine the school system in the Mid North of South Australia. It has been—and I will be kind to those involved—a shambles from day one. It has been an absolute shambles. They set about conducting interviews and making suggestions. From day one, there has been considerable anxiety within those communities, but we have now reached a stage where there is absolute revolt in relation to the course of action suggested.

A few days ago I attended a meeting at Gladstone. In my time in Parliament that has been a very reasonable, responsible and calm community, but those people are enraged beyond all reason because they believe they have been tricked; they were given written undertakings that their school would not be on the hit list and that they would not have to start bussing their students to other parts of the area. But now the recommendations have come out that year 11 and 12 students will have to put up with three days a week at Jamestown and two days a week at Gladstone—but they will not be supervised. Not only will the students have three days at Jamestown and two days at Gladstone with no supervision but many of them will have to be bussed from the district of the member for Custance, from Redhill and other places; because of the distance involved,

it has been suggested that the school buses will have to travel in school time. What sort of nonsense are we getting involved in?

I say to this House that, if the Government wants a fight, it will have one, because, unless it seeks the cooperation and agreement of those communities, it will not happen. There will be, effectively, civil disobedience if it attempts to impose that sort of nonsense on members of that community, because they are entitled to be treated fairly. There is the idea that if one lives beyond Gawler there have to be two sets of rules. What is the next group on the hit list? Will it be Burra, because that has been suggested? Where else will it go? It is time this nonsense came to an end.

On Saturday, I will be at a combined school sports day, and I am looking forward to that. I understand the Director-General will be there, and I will have a chat with him, because I have one or two things to say to him; that will not take long. I will say to the Director-General, and I can say to the Minister that, if this problem continues, I will have no alternative but to move the appropriate action on the Minister in the House because, unless the Government and the Director-General want to have a confrontation, they had better change the system. If they want to try out these new systems, I am quite happy for them to start in the electorates of Norwood and Florey. If these principles were supplied there, they would not last for one day.

I will read a fax I received from the people at Gladstone, as follows:

OUTCOMES NEEDED

1. A result which ensures the support of family and community life.
2. A result which minimises student travel.
3. A result which provides continued and improved access to curriculum through face-to-face and distance education (open access methods) which satisfies individual career and life choices of each student. (These first three points are similar to ones made in correspondence by the South Australian Association of School Parents' Clubs Inc.)
4. A result which ensures strong area control over the effective coordination, cooperation and delivery of senior secondary education. This particularly applies to the management of open access (e.g., the need for a common timetable; for the provision of open access course materials; subject coordination, teacher coordination and student and teacher support).
5. And a result which maximises available staff and other resources to provide the best courses possible for all students to fit them for life in the next century.

I will also quote a note from the public meeting:

PUBLIC MEETING—GLADSTONE TOWN HALL TUESDAY, 31 JULY 1990

Expressed total rejection of recommendations of Dr Keith Were (prepared in consultation with three task force members).

Felt that, once again, the Government had used the myth of 'rural decline' to rationalise their action.

We have recently had our hospitals and railways downgraded, and it is now planned to do the same to our schools. 'The Government is creating rural decline.' A statement from the 'South Australian Social Justice Strategy' reads, 'In fact, last year South Australia spent the equivalent of its entire export earnings for wheat, wool and meat on educating its children.' It is interesting that these particular commodities are mentioned.

Reasons given for rejection of recommendations include the fact that they were:

Inequitable: Gladstone High School and Primary School students and community were not given the same opportunities as others.

Misleading: Dr Were stated on 24 May 'will not insist year 11 and 12 students travel to another school'. While these students can stay at Gladstone High School, no teachers will be available.

Inadequate: Does not achieve stated outcomes.

Discourteous: Gladstone Primary School not consulted on area school proposals.

Irrational: Claims to strengthen cooperative venture by removing the major suppliers of courses to students at other schools.

Gladstone High School Community Statement rejected the possibility of centralising face-to-face at Gladstone, because it means excessive travel for other students, but the taskforce suggested that the parents were willing to accept the travel from their own students.

Disruptive to rural communities

Divisive: In that it will 'split' our widespread students from Yacka, to Red Hill, Crystal Brook and Wirrabirra who will find the extra travel excessive. Many will not proceed to year 12, thus negating the expectations for 'Educating for the Twenty First Century'.

A positive aspect from the meeting is that the five school communities are united and have agreed to fight together on this issue. This can only strengthen the cooperation between the schools.

A general feeling that the recommendations were already made before consultation process and that 'while they propose to kick the roof off Gladstone, they have also dug holes under the foundations of three of the other schools'.

The exercise has been very expensive and drawn out, and the proposal is unacceptable. If the money spent had been given to the schools to manage training their teachers in new methods of curriculum delivery and supplying appropriate technology, an artificial and short-term solution which sacrifices one school, initially, would not be needed.

I refer you to the media release from Dr Ken Boston, dated 10 July 1990, headed 'Restrictions on Mallee School enrolments to be lifted', in which he says 'I have one strong and clear message for people concerned in education in rural areas... the most important thing you can do to ensure high quality education is to send your own children to your local school.'

He is going to send them away! There is one other aspect to this matter. Recently I was in one of these towns on a Saturday morning, making myself available to my constituents, and a large number of parents came up and said to me, 'We are now making inquiries to private schools in Adelaide, because they have so disrupted and undermined our confidence in education that we are not sure what we can do with our students.'

When that takes place, you immediately reduce the number of year 11 and 12 students in the area again, and cause further problems. The Government talks about having a social conscience: these people are entitled to the same considerations as the rest of the community. They are entitled to be treated fairly, and their point of view should be considered, not brushed aside. That is the hallmark of a democratic society. The meeting agreed to the following action:

- Support for a meeting of three community representatives of each of the schools affected to be held at Orreroo on 9 August.
- A delegation to meet with Dr Were to pass on our total dissatisfaction.
- Contact to be made with Dr Boston expressing our dissatisfaction and requesting an extension of time to respond.
- Advice to be sought from the Ombudsman and legal advice.
- Extensive media campaign to educate all members of the communities of the implications for them.
- Active encouragement of all members of the community to pass on individual concerns to Dr Were.

And the document goes on. From the beginning of this exercise I have had continual representations from the District Council of Mount Remarkable and from other people—all very reasonable people—who are concerned about their community. We have already been through the exercise of a downgrade of the hospital facilities at Laura and Blythe. On Eyre Peninsula we are going through the disgraceful exercise affecting the Elliston Hospital. How much further does this Government want to downgrade services in rural areas?

These people have a right to expect fair treatment. The thing that annoys me more than anything else is that we have a Government in power that has no right to make these decisions. If there was any electoral justice, these decisions would not be made because, usually, 52 per cent of the vote beats 47 per cent. If John Olsen were Premier, as he should be, these decisions would not be made because

a Liberal Government would not tolerate the unnecessary downgrading of these essential facilities.

Yet, we can spend millions of dollars on stupid dolphins because the Government is so incompetent that it cannot make a proper decision. We can spend nearly \$50 million on an entertainment facility on Port Road because the Government thinks that it will appease a few people in marginal seats. That facility will never pay its way. Millions of dollars can be spent at the whim of the Government, but, when we talk about maintaining an essential Government service, we are told that there must be rationalisation and reorganisation. All that does is create confusion and a great deal of resentment.

Rural communities have taken a great interest in their education facilities. They work hard for them, they participate and the overwhelming majority of parents are very interested in their schools. Yet, that interest and effort has been rewarded with an attack on the very foundation of education in rural areas. I will have a fair bit more to say before this matter is concluded. For example, I could refer to a letter I received from a Mrs Longmire expressing her concern about school buses in her district, and I have already mentioned what the Chairman of the District Council of Mount Remarkable (Mr Roocke) has had to say.

We in the rural sector are facing a most difficult situation. It is bad enough having Government officials racing around the country endeavouring to impose their own ideas on the community, as happens with the Department of Environment and Planning. The department's assessment team is travelling through the pastoral areas of the State and it is headed by a woman who would not know anything about the pastoral industry. The Department of Environment and Planning wants to get a grip on the whole Government apparatus and has been put in charge of these assessments. It is a nonsense. People with years of experience in that section were pushed aside, yet this new assessment procedure is under way. In my judgment, there is no regard for the long-term needs, feelings and contributions of these people.

That is one of the great problems with this Government. It has allowed this massive army of public servants, which it has created, to go out into rural areas and impose its own ideas on those communities, ignoring the needs and wishes of rural people. Officers of the Lands Department used to be the friends of the farmers. The Vegetation Clearance Authority has been imposed on people without any consultation, and they have been treated in a disgraceful fashion. Every section, including the National Parks and Wildlife Service, wants to impose its will on the community. It must come to an end because those rural communities want to make their own decisions and not have decisions imposed upon them.

Thanks to the cooperation of the State and Federal Governments, an economic crisis has arisen. The Commonwealth Government, in its decision to support economic sanctions against Iraq because of its outrageous, gangsterish behaviour, has endangered the viability of the wheat industry. It is no good people saying one thing and meaning another. The Middle East is a very significant market and it is obvious that we in South Australia will face a loss of income from wheat because of that decision. I sincerely hope that the Government is fully aware of the long-term difficulties that could be created.

Mr Blacker: Plus an increase in fuel costs.

Mr GUNN: That will have a flow-on effect; it will step all the way up. People should be aware that, in 1989, it was estimated that the gross value of wheat was about \$473 million. It has been estimated that for 1990-91 that amount

will be only \$240 million—a drop of 49 per cent. The estimate for barley was \$200 million but it will drop to \$138 million, or 31 per cent less. Wool will drop from about \$1 287 million to \$823 million, or 38 per cent less. These are significant drops which will affect the economy of this State.

The honourable member who just spoke about the problems of Shearer's will have plenty of problems in the farm manufacturing sector before this is allowed because it is drastically affecting the purchasing power of those people. They will not need to have strikes because they might not be employed unless some commonsense prevails across this nation. These communities have been tightening their belts for a long time.

I do not know whether anyone has looked carefully at the cost structures and the effects they are having on those communities. In the past, the rural sector of this State has been one of the most efficient in the world. It has managed to be efficient because it has had access to the best technology, good advice and the best range of equipment that can be obtained anywhere in the world—and it has been able to compete. It has been able to do that because until a few years ago it enjoyed sensible taxation arrangements which encouraged people to keep abreast. However, that has all gone. The cost of these machines have escalated out of all proportion and many people have been maintaining and holding up machinery for many years and have not replaced it. They are now facing crisis point.

It is in the interests of this State and this nation to recognise these matters and do something about them. To continually wind up the cost structure by increasing charges by some 500 per cent is no answer. In my judgment, only three industries can do anything, at least in the short term, to support the standard of living in this State: the agricultural, mining sector and tourist industries. All three have been continually harrassed and impeded by irrational environmentalists and other fellow travellers who want to get on the band wagon. It is about time the Government took a firm stand, because otherwise those people—and particularly those whom members opposite claim to represent—will not have a job. Unless we can responsibly continue to develop our mining industry, there will not be any jobs.

When police escorts are needed to escort material to the wharves, and cranks and irresponsible elements are demonstrating, what are we coming to? Irrational environmentalists and irrational people in Government departments talk about imposing conditions on the spraying of crops which would make it nearly impossible to carry out such operations. Anyone who knows anything about agriculture in this State—and the farmers do not want to do this—knows that, unless they can effectively use chemicals, their viability will be destroyed. The people involved do not want to spend tens of thousands of dollars on chemicals, but they cannot successfully and economically farm today unless they do—it is as simple as that. Anyone who says that mineral fertilisers or alternative methods can be used in the short term is speaking nonsense. This is a prescription for bankruptcy that could only have been put forward by people who do not have to rely on agriculture for an income or who know nothing about long-term agricultural practices.

I look forward to this session of Parliament because we have the chance to do something. It is no good the Government endeavouring to tax the people out of existence. In the mining industry at Coober Pedy the Government, without consultation, whacked up fees, and this will probably cost an average miner, who has a fair number of claims each year, up to \$200 000 for the right to mine. That is the encouragement that the Government is giving to the mining

industry. There is no consultation. In conclusion, I believe this Government has voided the right to be in power.

Mr MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

PETITION: NOARLUNGA STADIUM

A petition signed by 8 318 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to finalise negotiations for a stadium at Noarlunga, suitable for use by the South Australian National Football League was presented by the Hon. M.K. Mayes.

Petition received.

PETITION: ROBE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

A petition signed by 328 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to improve the means of electricity supply to Robe was presented by Mr D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: BICYCLE HELMETS

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to make the wearing of bicycle helmets compulsory was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE BANK OF VICTORIA

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question concerning the purchase by the South Australian Finance Trust of \$300 million of floating rate stock from the State Bank of Victoria. I indicated to the Leader that I would obtain the details of that transaction. Given the importance and sensitivity of financial transactions undertaken by SAFA and its subsidiaries, it is, and will remain, my practice to check precise details before conveying information to the House. In the event, however, the general comments I made yesterday concerning this transaction were correct. Before providing further details, I think it would be appropriate to again comment on the way in which the Leader is choosing to deal with financial issues.

His question yesterday was quite proper. However, he has chosen by way of his comments outside the House to create an impression of financial irresponsibility on the part of the Government and SAFA. The Leader of the Opposition has a reputation as a successful businessman who understands financial issues. He has also made it clear that he intends to adopt a constructive approach in his dealings in this place. However, Mr Speaker, I believe his actions yesterday either call into question the financial credentials he claims for himself or indicates that he has already chosen to abandon a constructive approach. Despite the normal market practice of maintaining confidentiality in respect of

commercial transactions, SAFTL has confirmed with the State Bank of Victoria that it would have no objections to the details of the transaction being released.

Therefore, I am able to confirm SAFTL's purchase of State Bank of Victoria floating rate capital notes, with a total face value of \$300 million and an interest rate at a substantial margin above the bank bill rate. The three tranches were settled on 22 December 1989 and mature in December 2004, unless SAFTL exercises its option at year 10 to extend the maturity of the deal. The State Bank of Victoria capital notes were issued to meet the Reserve Bank of Australia's Tier 2 capital adequacy requirements, which State Banks adhere to on a voluntary basis. The State Bank of Victoria entered into the transaction in full consultation with, and with the approval of, the Reserve Bank. SAFA also consulted the Crown Solicitor before concluding the transaction.

The State Bank of Victoria capital notes are unconditionally guaranteed by the Government of Victoria. Hence, from SAFTL's perspective, the transaction represents a secure and profitable investment, earning an attractive return. The transaction earns several million dollars for the State in present value terms. This transaction by SAFTL needs also to be placed into context of SAFA's overall domestic borrowing program which in 1989-90 exceeded \$4 billion. This money management task involves approximately 100 transactions per month of which this particular purchase was only one.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. In view of the State Bank's foreshadowed reduced operating profit, will the State Government continue to run down the bank's reserves in both nominal and real terms in determining the contributions the bank will make to general revenue in 1989-90 and 1990-91 and, if so, does the Treasurer believe that this is a prudent course of action given that economic conditions are worsening and the bank is having to increase its provisions for bad and doubtful debts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Obviously—and this would apply not just to the State Bank but to any other net contributor to the State budget through financial operations—what can be taken out by the owner (which, of course, in this case is the State Government of South Australia on behalf of the community of South Australia) must be financially prudent. It is also something that needs to be determined, and that can be done only in consultation with the board of directors of the bank. I think it is essential that one refers back to the State Bank Act, which I have already mentioned in this place, and the constraints it imposes in terms of direction by the Government. So, in brief, what the Leader of the Opposition implies in his question is correct: one must take only those prudential contributions that are appropriate for the long-term viability of the bank. Of course, one must bear in mind that the bank operates under—and underlying that for its core banking operations—a Government guarantee.

I also add that, when one looks at the contribution made by the State Bank to our budget in the form of tax and profits, one must also set that off against the capitalisation of the bank that has been contributed to by the Government through the course of its establishment. Of course, there is a *quid pro quo* in that arrangement. However, as the Leader

of the Opposition would well know, and I agree with him, in any business one must ensure that there are appropriate and adequate reserves, and there is no doubt that that is the case in relation to the State Bank.

PARKING FOR DISABLED PERSONS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Employment and Further Education representing the Minister of Local Government. Has the Minister given consideration to redrafting the legislation in respect of parking for disabled persons? *Link*, the journal for the disabled, of March-April 1990 suggested that changes were needed to further assist disabled people with their parking problems in shopping centres, etc. One of the problems is the need for permit holders to take up two car spaces because of the difficulty of disabled people using wheelchairs in the single parking space.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have received advice from my colleague in another place, the Minister of Local Government, and can advise the House on this very important matter affecting disabled people. The erection of prescribed notices at entrances of private car parks, at supermarkets, hotels, etc., to which the general public have access is, of course, covered by the Private Parking Areas Act 1986. Under the regulations there is provision for private car park owners to enter into an agreement with local councils to enforce parking controls. Council authorised officers may then issue expiation notices and prosecute offenders. In reality there are few such agreements, as councils have generally proved reluctant to become involved in policing private car parks without the payment of a fee.

The issue of ensuring that disabled people have access to parking spaces for the disabled has been addressed by the recently completed report 'Parking for people with disabilities in private parking areas: Some options for improvement'. This report found that the problem of non-permit holder use of disabled parking areas tends to occur primarily during the peak shopping periods of Thursday night and Saturday morning. I think that all members would have seen this happening, much to their disturbance.

This report has suggested a number of appropriate measures, including educational campaigns, ensuring that signage is uniform to all car parks, encouraging councils to be involved in enforcement, and allowing a vehicle driven by or transporting a permit holder to occupy two parallel parking spaces, especially for the convenience of wheelchair users. The options outlined in this report are currently under consideration by a top level steering committee.

In respect of on-street parking, councils may, but are not required to, set aside permit areas for disabled persons under the Local Government Act parking regulations. Council parking inspectors police the parking regulations, and very few complaints have been received by the Department of Local Government about the misuse of on-street disabled parking spaces. The parking regulations are about to be modified by the introduction of the definition of 'disabled persons parking permit' contained in the Private Parking Areas Act. This term, which applies to permits issued pursuant to provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, also gives reciprocal recognition to similar permits issued interstate.

Draft Local Government Act parking regulations, which incorporate the two space parking measure for permit holders, were recently circulated to all councils and interested government and non-government organisations, inviting their comment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCE TRUST

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As the Treasurer has now recalled approving a \$300 million capital note deal with the State Bank of Victoria, can he explain to the House whether the deal was done at fixed interest rates, at fixed margins to the bank bill rate or at floating interest rates, and can he confirm whether there were discussions between the South Australian and Victorian Governments prior to the transaction taking place?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not just recalled such a transaction. I think that the Deputy Leader is being misled by an inaccurate report in today's newspaper of my answer to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I would like to make quite clear and reiterate what I said in my ministerial statement a moment ago: I am not going to deal with these questions simply off the top of my head, on spec, where detailed financial information is involved, because I believe that to do that would be irresponsible. If, in fact, the House is genuinely seeking information, it should be information that has been properly checked. It is not my practice simply to speculate.

I would have thought that the general statements I made about that transaction indicated to the House its nature. I have confirmed today that they were quite precise and accurate. In answer to the Deputy Leader's question (and I will take on notice his remarks about the structure of the deal), I simply restate to him that it was a very favourable transaction, a guaranteed transaction, a transaction entered into with the approval of the Reserve Bank of Australia, a transaction which is guaranteed by the State Bank of Victoria and which will earn money for this State, as it should do.

In relation to the second part of the question, in these matters there is no communication between Governments. As a Government, we are not concerned about or involved with how the SAFA business is operated on a government-to-government basis. It is dealing with financial institutions and that is the appropriate way in which it should go about it. If the implication is that, in some way, these notes were taken up because of a governmental arrangement, I can only say there is absolutely no basis for that whatsoever. They were taken up purely on the commercial assessment of SAFA's money managers and I am sure that the Deputy Leader would understand that.

I might say that what is being done here is very similar to a case with which we dealt earlier where a certain short-term transaction was undertaken by SAFA with, I think, the Western Australian Development Corporation. All sorts of sinister implications were placed around that. It was somewhat to the discomfort of the Opposition to discover that an identical but very much larger transaction had been entered into by the Government of New South Wales Treasury Department, its money market authority. I would have thought that that indicated precisely what I am saying: irrespective of political colour or the politics of these situations, money market operations of a State are carried on separately and commercially.

The innuendo contained in the Deputy Leader's question is identical to the innuendo in that earlier question relating to Western Australia. I would have thought that that would have proved to the Opposition once and for all that it was a wrong approach to take. I would be very concerned if, in fact, the purpose of these questions was to try to undermine the financial status of South Australia, because that would have very serious ramifications not for us as a Government necessarily but indeed for our State and, therefore, for the Opposition in this State.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the results of South Australia's July employment figures that were released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sure that members would be interested to know that the figures released several hours ago show that South Australian employment levels are remaining resilient to the general national slowdown in the economy. The current South Australian participation rate for the July quarter remains high, indicating continued confidence in the State labour market. South Australia's unemployment rate did rise slightly from 7.1 per cent in June to 7.2 per cent in July. Overall the South Australian economy is continuing to perform relatively well and is probably better able to withstand a national economic downturn than in the past.

Current unemployment levels in South Australia for the July quarter remain below those recorded a year ago despite expectations of a downturn in this State at this stage. In seasonally adjusted terms, the divergence between the South Australian unemployment rate and the national rate diminished further in July—6.9 per cent nationally to 7.2 per cent in South Australia.

It is very interesting that members opposite do not seem to like this news. I know that the Opposition's entire strategy rests on members keeping their fingers crossed and hoping that South Australia slides backwards as it did in the Tonkin years. It is a substitute for new ideas and policies, and perhaps a diversion from the current leadership problems—but that is another issue. The good news (and I know the Opposition does not want to hear this) is that over the year to May 1990 manufacturing employment rose in South Australia by 7.6 per cent compared with a national decline of 3 per cent. South Australia's full-time youth unemployment rate fell in July from 21 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to 19 per cent. While some sectors of the South Australian economy have been hit hard by interest rates and lower levels of local and national demand, other sectors are obviously continuing to perform well. I hope that, while job losses may occur in coming months, major job losses can be avoided following the easing of monetary policy and the clear indication by the Federal Treasurer that he wants the economy to continue to grow. I know the Opposition does not like this good news about the employment levels, but, as I said, it is a diversion from the member for Braggs' leadership aspirations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology confirm that, in a telephone call between the Minister and Mr Lawrence Lee of the Zhen Yun company on 2 February last year, it was agreed (to quote a letter written the same day by Zhen Yun to the Minister to confirm its understanding of the Minister's proposals) 'that the Department of State Development and Technology will take appropriate steps to stop the development of Marineland'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will not confirm that. I have stated before what the context of the member's—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I will come to that in a minute. The particular context of that telephone conversation has been detailed by me to the House on many occasions and has been documented by means of the copy of the fax that was sent by John Frogley of the then Department of State Development and Technology to Mr Lawrence Lee detailing what had actually taken place. This has been on the public record and read into *Hansard* on a number of occasions, and I do not intend to do so again on this occasion.

It has transpired that in the hands of a law firm there is a letter that has been attributed to Zhen Yun, signed by Lawrence Lee, making the comments read by the member for Hanson just now. The Hon. Mr Lucas in another place contacted my office to ask why that letter had not been included in the papers tabled, and I have answered him. The answer I have given is that we have found that letter nowhere in the Government's possession in any of the files we have been able to search. We have indicated our belief that that letter was never in fact received by the Government. I ask the member for Hanson to look at the letter I have written to the Hon. Mr Lucas explaining that element.

In support of that claim, I draw attention to the letter that was received from Mr Lawrence Lee later in the year detailing his recalling of those conversations. If the member for Hanson chooses to remember that, he will find that those letters clearly confirm what I had been saying earlier about the way in which that matter had been handled, and that it was Zhen Yun that made the decision not to proceed with the oceanarium element of that development.

In fact, that letter was tabled in the House because it was in our possession, and I note that that letter is dated later than the letter from which the member for Hanson is quoting and which he is saying we received but of which we can find no record. In any event, all these matters are presently being considered by a select committee in another place, and I am sure that those matters will be pursued further in that committee.

PORT GILES JETTY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Marine advise the House of the extent and nature of the damage caused to the Port Giles jetty by the incident yesterday in which a ship hit a section of the jetty?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Albert Park for his very important question. At 8 a.m. yesterday, 8 August, an Iranian grain vessel, while docking, came in contact with the catwalk and two piles on the seaward end of the Port Giles jetty. The collision destroyed the catwalk, and the impact shook the jetty. Initial reports indicated that damage was minor, but investigations and inspections by the Department of Marine and Harbors engineers indicate that it is a little more extensive. Divers are looking for underwater damage, but it is possible that six piles have been damaged. At this stage it is believed that damage amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Fortunately, the grain belt is still operating at full capacity. The ship was taking on about 10 000 tonnes of grain at Port Giles and about 5 000 tonnes was loaded last night.

Loading should be completed today, provided that it does not rain too heavily. All in all, about six hours of loading work was lost through the incident. As the vessel was under pilot at the time, an inquiry into the matter will be carried

out by a senior officer from the Department of Marine and Harbors Marine Safety Division. Members will be pleased to know that damage from this accident is nowhere nearly as severe as the incident in January 1987.

Mr Meier: Is the jetty—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Goyder, the shadow Minister of Marine, asks by way of interjection whether the jetty will remain open to the public. I appreciate that the honourable member would have in mind the utmost interest in people's safety at all times. He would now understand why those professionally involved in safety on the waterfront are anxious that people are not present on harbor facilities when they are being worked. Members can imagine what would have happened if the member for Goyder had had his way and there had been fishermen on the catwalk when the vessel was berthing. They could have been knocked into the water.

This is something that members opposite do not seem to appreciate, that is, when work is in progress on jetties and people's lives are in danger, we will not allow members of the public to have access so that they can become injured. There seems to be this smug acceptance that—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: That shows how much the Leader understands about industrial safety. I imagine that he would have a factory which he would allow members of the public to walk through. That is the reason why the public do not walk through factories—because their lives can be endangered by the equipment being used.

The SPEAKER: I draw to the Minister's attention the fact that the question was about the jetty, not about somebody's factory or its safety aspects. I ask the Minister to relate the answer back to that question.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: When machinery is being used on jetties, and on the Port Giles jetty in particular (and I draw the Leader's attention to this), we cannot have the public wandering around at large, because their lives may be placed in danger. If the Leader spent more time studying the waterfront (and he sought my permission when he wanted to go there) he might become more adequately and properly informed, like the member for Goyder.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. Following the precedents set by the indentures for the West Lakes and Golden Grove developments, will the Government be drawing up an indenture for the proposed MFP, and, if so, when does he anticipate that the necessary legislation will be presented to Parliament? If not, is the Government prepared to move for the appointment of a joint committee of the Parliament to oversee planning of the MFP to ensure full parliamentary and public consultation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That issue has not been determined as yet, that is, the need for an indenture or some special arrangements to cover the overall development. Certainly, as the honourable member points out, in the case of large and integrated developments of this kind it is often necessary to bring in a special indenture provision. At the moment we are still waiting on the formal decision by the Federal Government to proceed to the next stage which is the detailed feasibility stage, during the course of which the question the honourable member asks obviously will be one of the issues considered.

HIGHWAY 1

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Transport tell the House how much work is still to be done on the section of Highway 1 between Redhill and Crystal Brook and when this road is expected to be open for traffic?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I know that the member for Stuart uses this road at least twice a week, and some weeks a lot more, so she has a very deep interest in it.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, the question asked by the member for Stuart relates to a section of road, consideration of which may be currently before the Public Works Standing Committee, in which case I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule it out of order.

The SPEAKER: That would not rule the question out of order, in the opinion of the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government so far has spent almost \$3 million on this project to reconstruct some 5.3 kilometres of National Highway 1. Although it is a relatively short stretch of road (5.3 kilometres), one can see that at a cost of almost \$3 million roads do not come cheap—as the member for Bragg has now realised. Incidentally, this road is very well travelled by my constituents, as well as the constituents of the member for Stuart, and the upgrading is very welcome and appreciated by them.

The project has been carried out by private contractors, who commenced site works in February. The whole project was due to be completed on 13 August but, because of the vagaries of the weather and a technical problem with a bridge piling, that date is now 10 September. Traffic will be able to use all the road at the end of August but the turn-off to Merriton will not be completed for another couple of weeks. This is a very good example of the way in which the State and Federal Governments use road funds very wisely because this road goes in and out, and through, a very important part of this State, economically and industrially. I have travelled along the road for 25 years and, over the past few years, I am aware that the upgrading of the road has given the whole region something of a lift. It is no more than the region is entitled to and I am very pleased that road funds have been spent in this way. I am sure that all our constituents who use it constantly also appreciate the degree of attention that this particular stretch of road has received.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: will the core site of MFP Adelaide house a maximum of 35 000 people, as advised to us by a senior Government MFP official, or 100 000 people as previously suggested by the Premier?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter has already been responded to publicly by the Premier following assertions made by the Hon. Mr Lucas in the media. Mr Lucas failed to consider how wide is the MFP area. It deals with a wider area than just the core site around the Gillman location, and the concept of 100 000 people is the population that will inhabit the wider region. The core site itself will not be able to take 100 000 people but the surrounding areas with it will be so able.

The detail of how that will happen will be the subject of a lot more work, and that has also been spelt out by the Premier on a number of occasions. I refer members to the documentation that has already been made available. One

can see from that documentation the kind of work that still has to be done and the kind of elements that will be built into the multifunction polis. It would be a mistake for anyone just to consider the core site in reading that document with all that is contained in the MFP. One must look at the surrounding areas, as well, and that point has been made on a number of occasions.

MILK CONTAINERS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether the Department of Environment and Planning has examined the question of the desirability of returning to milk bottles as opposed to milk cartons? An organisation known as the Green Party (formerly Friends of the Earth Adelaide) wants concerned consumers to have a choice between milk cartons and milk bottles. During my recent visit to New Zealand, I discovered that this was very much a live issue in that country. Arguments have been put about the environmental acceptability of both containers, with a percentage of people coming down in favour of a return to milk bottles.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter because all members would be aware that there has been some difference of opinion. Indeed, many statements have been made about the relative environmental impact of cartons, glass and plastic containers. In order to obtain more detailed and objective information, the South Australian Waste Management Commission has engaged the services of the Centre for Environmental Studies at the University of Adelaide to prepare a report which establishes the total resources required from cradle to grave for each type of milk container and the associated environmental impact.

The report of the Centre for Environmental Studies is now in the process of being finalised. The one litre paper-board, gable-topped carton and the 568ml refillable glass bottle have been studied in some detail, with information being sought from a variety of industries. Where these industries have been reticent or unable to provide the relevant information, the authors have had to rely on similar studies conducted in other parts of Australia and the world. The pre-release version of the report has been criticised for its reliance on data from such sources. However, it is to be hoped that industry will be stimulated to provide more accurate information.

It is one thing to criticise the findings of such a report when you have not been prepared to provide the background data and information upon which the study can be conducted, but it is important that all industries provide the accurate data that is sought by the Centre for Environmental Studies. In conclusion, I note that both Tetrapak Pty Ltd and ACI are reportedly undertaking studies which may be of relevance to both the community and the Government in terms of ascertaining the claims and counter-claims that have been made about the relativities of the particular milk container with respect to the environment.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Does the Government accept the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research estimate of State Government social infrastructure expenditure on an MFP in Adelaide of \$1.2 billion as cited in the South Australian MFP submission,

or the latest Bureau of Industry Economics estimate of \$2.5 billion?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, I would like to know exactly where the Opposition is choosing to stand on the MFP in terms of the questions it is asking. I noticed that the honourable Leader of the Opposition earlier today indicated his bipartisan support for this project, for which I commend him. Now we find the nitpicking is starting whereby various attempts are being made to indicate an erosive attitude towards the MFP.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Concerning the question about social infrastructure, one must ask: what is the intent of the member's question in trying to raise figures that sound—and are—very large indeed? Is he trying to lead to an implication that the community will have an enormous cost to bear in providing the social infrastructure? I notice that the member nods when I say that, so that seems to be the implication to which he is trying to lead. Is he then trying to say which of the big figures is correct? What we are saying about the MFP and the social infrastructure is that there will be population growth in South Australia in the years ahead, and there will be a social infrastructure cost to that population growth. We need to ensure that we do that in the best possible way for the development of our community within the resources available and in terms of providing for new people who live in this State, either by being born here or by migrating to the State.

The point that needs to be made is that those costs will have to be borne by the community and by the Government anyway in the years ahead. The next question relates to how we do that. Do we end up with a situation whereby extra population in South Australia is catered for by urban sprawl or do we cater for it in a planned way that also helps South Australia build a focus of reaching out to the world? It is the MFP that enables us to do that. I cannot give an exact figure in respect of the social infrastructure costs at this stage because a number of questions still have to be answered. First, the various population projections; secondly, the nature of the social infrastructure that will be dependent upon the final plans for the MFP site; and, thirdly, the extent to which the social infrastructure costs are built into our future planning by virtue of the population that will take place in this State in any event.

I will certainly ask for some detailed work on this matter to be given to me to present to the House, but I hope that the purpose of asking the question is an attempt to agree with the Government that what we are trying to do is have the best possible development in South Australia, recognising that there will be social infrastructure costs no matter what happens in South Australia. Even if we did not have the MFP in South Australia, there would be social infrastructure costs. The MFP helps us get a focus on that and do it in a way that should enhance the quality of life for all South Australians.

ETHNIC UMBRELLA ORGANISATIONS

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs outline to the House the work of the ethnic umbrella organisations? I understand that the ethnic umbrella organisations were set up with the objectives of assisting ethnic organisations to improve the quality and range of their services, to support ethnic umbrella organisations to give expression to the distinctive cultural, welfare, social, information and recreational needs of ethnic groups, and to promote the full

and effective participation of ethnic umbrella organisations and thereby ethnic groups in the social, cultural and political life of the South Australian community.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I make the point that the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, which serves a very important focus for the promotion of multiculturalism in South Australia, cannot do that by itself; it has to do it in close consultation and work with ethnic communities and the wider community throughout South Australia. In doing that, of course, the clear focus of work is with the individual community organisations, and the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission has done that very well over the years and continues to do so.

However, there is a particular role to be played by what may be referred to as umbrella organisations that bring together a number of groups. That makes the work of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission more effective in promoting multiculturalism in the community and supporting the work of community groups aiming to do the same. If these umbrella organisations did not exist, there might be the danger that the great number of ethnic organisations would not be able to create the unified approach that is needed in promoting multiculturalism in South Australia.

The groups that I think are worth mentioning in this context are the Ethnic Communities Council of South Australia, which brings together a large number of ethnic organisations and which has worked to promote multiculturalism; United Ethnic Communities of South Australia Incorporated, which has existed for some seven years doing much the same but with a membership of different organisations from the Ethnic Communities Council; Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated, which brings together the large number of ethnic groups that put to air their own programs on 5EBI or 5UV or 5PBA; the Adelaide Folkloric Society, which was established some 14 years ago to unite the various folk dance and music groups, which evolved from the previous Folk Arts Committee of the Good Neighbour Council and which currently represents more than 50 groups; and the Multicultural Art Workers Committee which is a community based multi-disciplinary arts organisation the programs of which bring together artists and community members who have a focus in promoting multicultural arts.

ROADS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Has the Minister of Transport or the Government made an assessment of the effects on South Australia of the proposals of the interstate commission on road user charges and, if so, what are the expected increases in costs to transport operators and, therefore, in the cost of living to country people? Will the Government be representing country people and, therefore, opposing the proposed massive increases at the September meeting of ATAC?

It has been proposed that there be massive increases in charges for road hauliers, for example, up-front charges of \$55 000 per annum are expected to apply to road trains up to 75 tonnes gross. To quantify that and to relate it to an area with which we can perhaps identify, I point out that road train haulage of grain from Cowell to Port Lincoln costs an extra \$147 return. In addition, it is proposed that distance measuring devices be fitted to every trailer; each prime mover plus trailer would have to have this equipment. I understand that the cost would be approximately \$1 000 per trailer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At present I am having a considered view of the proposals compiled and that will be released, of course, prior to the ATAC meeting. I have already indicated in the media that I do not think it is a proposition that ought to be dismissed out of hand. There is no doubt that reform in the road freight industry is necessary—and there is no question about that—if for no other reason than to ensure proper apportionment of the costs of building roads to certain standards and also maintaining them to certain standards. That apportionment has to take into account those that require the higher standard; those vehicles that do the most damage ought to pay a higher proportion than the ordinary motorist, for example, who, in the main, does no damage whatsoever to the roads. There are some real issues to be taken into consideration. I was very pleased to see that the Federal Opposition spokesman in this area has said pretty much the same as I have said, that is, that it is not a proposition that ought to be dismissed out of hand and that very careful consideration ought to be given to it.

There will be winners and losers in any alteration to the present allocation of charges. I see it as my job in this area to ensure that, as much as possible, South Australia does not lose, but I point out that South Australia has a very good and high class road network. It may well be that the Federal Government sees its priority in those States that have a low quality road network, and that makes me a little nervous. I would not want South Australia to be penalised because we spent so much money in the past in developing a very high-class infrastructure. As I said, at present a considered view is being compiled and I will let the member for Flinders know the final view of the Government prior to the ATAC meeting. Of course, it has to go to Cabinet prior to its release.

In relation to the second part of his question about country representation, as somebody who lives in the country, as does the member for Flinders, I can assure him that country people will be very well represented indeed, and at the very highest level, to wit, by me.

TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTAMINATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House what ongoing action is being taken by the Government to ensure that building blocks that were previously zoned or used for industrial purposes are not contaminated from any form of toxic substances? The Minister will be aware that, as a result of the Government's successful urban consolidation program, more and more land that was previously zoned for industrial purposes is now being used for residential housing. I have been approached by some building workers who have expressed concern that the health of not only future residents but also those workers building the homes is at risk.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Of course, the member for Napier has a direct interest in this topic not only on behalf of his constituents but also as my predecessor in this job when he had a very keen interest in and responsibility for the management of this area. As Minister, he initiated various steps to ensure the confidence of the community that reclamation of these former industrial sites involved correct remedial action.

The matter that has been brought to our attention in the past few days, particularly my attention as well as that of my colleagues, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Health, relating to the area of land at

Eighth Avenue, Hindmarsh, is very important. It is also important to report to the House details of the way in which we have dealt with this matter.

The honourable member has raised a number of points dealing with the occupational health and safety of workers who are actually working on the treatment of those sites and ensuring that they are safe for future occupation. In relation to the particular site at Hindmarsh, the Minister for Environment and Planning and I met with our senior officers to discuss this matter and we came up with a remedial plan that will address those particular sites. Basically, we propose a five-point plan.

We intend to remove the contaminated soil from the proposed western reserve site and the eastern site proposed for housing development and then bulldoze that into a central lot. This will be done on the advice of the experts from the Health Commission, the Waste Management Commission and the Department of Environment and Planning. We will excavate at least 6 000 cubic metres from the reserve and stockpile it on the now cleared eastern development site. We will place the contaminated material into the hole and compact it, leaving a one metre deep depression. We will spread uncontaminated fill over the site to a depth of 500 millimetres on the development site and one metre on the reserve, build up landscaping mounds to a height of up to 1.5 metres, and cover the reserve with additional imported clean fill and topsoil to a depth of 100 millimetres.

In addition, my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning has proposed that in future all declarations under section 90 will be required to identify the way in which the property will be used, and she, I am sure, will outline what detail will have to be provided. That detail will be an important guide to members of the community so that they can have confidence about a property's previous uses in respect of not only public but also private purchase.

The Housing Trust is undertaking tests on all sites at Albert Park, even those sites that were purchased before we had the matter brought to our attention, as I am sure the honourable member knows. The way in which the trust is dealing with this matter will, I am sure, give the community confidence about the way in which its safety and well-being are being looked after.

The group representing the residents in that area, the Eighth Street Action Group (ESAG), met with me today and we reached agreement on how to deal with the matter. We will ensure full consultation with that group and, I am sure, will have its confidence in relation to the way in which we manage this contaminated site.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. In view of the answer to a previous question, what environmental and pollution issues, such as the past dumping of chemicals, have been identified to date on the MFP site? What action will the Government take to deal with them and what, at this stage, is the estimated cost of dealing with them?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I take it that the honourable member is coming at this particular issue from a perspective of seeking general information and supporting the Government's proposals for the rehabilitation of the Gillman site and the exciting proposals that have been outlined by my parliamentary colleague, the Premier and Minister of State Development. I can assure the honourable member that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, Mr Speaker, I was asked a question and I am attempting to answer it. It would

seem to me that the Opposition is not remotely interested in the answer. The honourable member's question contained a number of specific matters about costs and the complete identification of the substances that have found their way to the Gillman site over the years. I am sure the honourable member would appreciate my getting him a report on this particular matter, bearing in mind the breadth of his question, as opposed to giving a reply that I do not think will fully answer some of the aspects of the question. However, I am quite happy to provide the honourable member with an answer to his question.

The gagging coming from across the Chamber I find interesting, because I take this as a very serious question which indicates ongoing support for this exciting concept and project. I put on the public record, as the State's Minister for Environment and Planning, that I welcome this project. It will provide an opportunity for this State to ensure that we rehabilitate an area of this city where rubbish and other chemical compounds have been dumped. It will give us an opportunity to clean up the area and move forward with this really positive project. I am delighted that the honourable member has given me the opportunity to put this on the public record.

MAY STREET RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the Government intends closing the May Street railway crossing at Albert Park?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, it was a disaster, and you are a bloody fool because it could have cost a life.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I withdraw, Sir, but I hasten to point out—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn for the question. The honourable member will resume his seat. That type of behaviour is definitely not permitted in this Chamber. Luckily, the school children who were in the Chamber have just left. That behaviour will not be accepted. Leave is withdrawn.

Mr Hamilton: Despite someone having been killed!

The SPEAKER: The member for Albert Park is out of order. The honourable member for Coles.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier as Minister of State Development. Does the Government intend to appoint, or has it already appointed, a public relations consultant to coordinate publicity and information about the proposed multi-function polis? If so, what will be the value of the contract in the first year and what tender procedures are involved in selecting the consultant? If the consultant has already been appointed, what is the name of the firm?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware that a consultant has been appointed. It is certainly true, as I think I mentioned in response to a question earlier this week, that we are going to embark on a major consultation process with the community; that is an essential element of this process. I also referred then to the fact that the Federal Government, when it makes its decision about the next stage of the project, will be authorising a major community consultation program for which funds will be provided and

for which preliminary work has already been done by Mr Bob Lansdown, who has had a number of meetings.

I refer the honourable member to my response to a question earlier this week, I think from the member for Price, on that very point. Certainly, there will be major community consultation and publicity around the various stages of the MFP, and whatever resources are appropriate for that will certainly be employed. At the moment we have a number of persons involved within various departments who have made their contribution to the MFP. Mr Colin Neave is now working full time as the project coordinator on behalf of the Government. The former Director of Consumer Affairs has been doing it on a part-time basis to this time. He has one or two staff assisting him particularly in responding to the large numbers of letters and requests for information coming from the public. There is a great deal of interest, and we will make sure that resources are available so that we can respond to those requests for information.

LITERACY

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the future plans for literacy courses in the Port Adelaide region?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this area of literacy provision. First, I would like to clear up some matters that have been canvassed in the *Advertiser* in recent weeks. There are two main areas of literacy provision provided through my portfolios; these are community based literacy programs and workplace literacy programs. Of course, community based adult education is a powerful means of redressing disadvantage in the community, as it offers a valuable service to members of the local community who are unable to access programs offered by the more formal Government institutions.

This year the total funds available for community adult education grants through my portfolio amounted to \$194 000, comprising \$134 000 from the Commonwealth Government and \$60 000 from the State. This does not include funds devoted to literacy by the Department of Employment and Further Education. The honourable member specifically asked questions about literacy programs in TAFE colleges that are provided in a number of ways: first, through group tuition and one-to-one tuition in an informal setting; secondly, support for students in vocational certificates who have literacy or numeracy problems; thirdly, literacy in the workplace programs; fourthly, literacy through formal award programs, particularly the Certificate in Vocational Education; and, finally, through the provision of literacy modules in other structured programs in TAFE colleges.

The demand for literacy programs in TAFE is high. Workplace education in particular is important to many individuals and to employers, as people must have good literacy skills in order to get jobs and keep them. Reports about the closure of community literacy classes at the Port Adelaide College of TAFE quite clearly have been misrepresented in the press. South Australia received \$250 000 from the Commonwealth in 1988-89 for community literacy activity. That source of funding ceased at the end of 1989—much to our disappointment. TAFE colleges were then faced with the extremely difficult task of continuing to provide a literacy program to meet the needs of the community.

Port Adelaide college decided to use its available resources to meet the workplace literacy needs of students to support them in securing employment. This is being achieved through the new certificate in vocational education program—an

accredited program which will equip students well in both their personal life and their employment. I will make a major statement on literacy programs within a few weeks.

SHEEP SHEARING ROBOT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology confirm that representations from the Australian Workers Union regarding the impact on employment in the shearing industry have forced the Government to refuse to continue to support the completion of research and development on a sheep shearing robot being developed by Marino Wool Harvesting at The Levels, Pooraka, and will he explain the grounds of the union's opposition?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will most certainly not confirm that. It is quite scurrilous for the member for Goyder to indicate that the Government would have taken such a course of action. This Government operates with great honour in terms of industry support—it does not operate with the kind of implication that the honourable member has made. Indeed, I would indicate that this is not a recent project—it has been around for some years. In fact, it has already received a large amount of support from the private sector and, about two years ago, I think, it received financial support from the South Australian Development Fund. Recently, it asked for more support because its private backers had pulled away.

As I understand the situation, the private investment in that project to date has been some \$9 million—most of which came from Elders. We examined the situation as to whether or not it would be eligible for support under the South Australian Development Fund, and under the criteria of that fund we deemed it not eligible for any support. The point is that we believe our role is to try to find alternative private sector investors to take over the project from where the previous private sector investors left off.

The fact is that this Government cannot be a lender of last resort for companies that are involved in technology areas. We cannot just suddenly pick up the tab when a private sector firm says, 'We have spent enough. We do not want to spend any more. Let's give it to the Government.' This is another example of an Opposition that would want to involve us in more expenditure all the time. Of course, then it would attack the Government for being involved in the project, because it would say, 'What are you doing in business? What are you doing providing money for business? That is not the role of Government; you should get out.' The Opposition cannot have it both ways. The Government had to ask the question: if the project had not yet reached the stage of being commercially viable, what was the prospect of it being made commercially viable by the sums that the Government might have available to invest? The answer is that there was no prospect of that occurring.

However, there is a prospect for a major infusion of funds from the private sector to pick up the work that has been done to date. I hope that that does happen. My Department of Industry, Trade and Technology is trying to assist in the search for private sector investors, because it is important that this intellectual property be kept for South Australia—I agree with that.

Also, the point needs to be made that the Australian Workers Union, to my knowledge, has known about this project for many years. Indeed, it has not expressed, to my knowledge, any concern at all. Certainly, whatever view it may have had has played no role in the attitude we have taken to this matter with respect to Government investment. We will not be a lender of last resort.

MAY STREET LEVEL CROSSING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise whether it is the intention of the Government to close the May Street railway crossing at Albert Park? The Minister would be aware of the death that occurred at that crossing and the feeling of my constituents.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Over a number of years, even prior to becoming Minister of Transport, I have known that the member for Albert Park has shown a very great interest in this area, pressing the State Transport Authority to make these level crossings safer. He appreciated that there was a restriction on funds and that it would take some years to upgrade all the crossings. I regret deeply the death that occurred at that crossing, and I am sure every member of this House feels the same.

It will be of interest to the House, particularly the member for Albert Park, to know the program for this year. It is our intention to upgrade the Morley Road crossing, which is currently in the process of being upgraded. When that crossing is open, it is the intention of the STA to close the May Street crossing. The Tapleys Hill Road crossing is also due for upgrading this year, as is the Frederick Road crossing, so there will be considerable improvements in the electorate of the member for Albert Park.

The closure of the May Street crossing has not been an arbitrary exercise. I know that the member for Albert Park circularised a large number of his constituents to determine their views on the closure of the May Street crossing, and they indicated clearly, by a significant majority, that they were in favour of closing the May Street crossing. Given that advice from the member for Albert Park, the STA has agreed to do that. There will be extensive signage to warn people that the May Street crossing is no longer open, thereby improving safety. In addition, I am sure that the member for Albert Park and his constituents will be pleased by the upgrading of some other level crossings in the area. I hope that it will prevent another tragedy like the recent one which caused the member for Albert Park to be so upset, quite legitimately, earlier in Question Time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CITY VIOLENCE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MATTHEW: I was offended by yesterday's attack on my character by the member for Albert Park during his closing remarks in his Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech. The honourable member stated that my speech was:

... one of the most debased contributions I have heard in this House in many years, and I condemn him for abusing his privilege as a member of Parliament to use emotive terminology to attack this Government, not to address the problems associated with that couple.

I strongly deny any abuse of parliamentary privilege and I refute the accusation that I did not address the problems associated with the couple. For the benefit of members who did not hear my speech, I point out that the couple to whom the member for Albert Park referred are John and Vera Koop, who live in my electorate. I used my time in the grievance debate of 7 August 1990 to draw the Government's attention to their plight. John and Vera were savagely beaten by a group of up to 11 youths outside the Adelaide Casino during the early hours of 1 January 1989. Mrs Koop spent 5½ weeks in hospital after her ordeal—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the member's attention to the fact that he has presented this to the House previously

and that he is making a personal explanation. It must be relevant.

Mr MATTHEW: It is relevant, Mr Speaker, I assure you. I detailed to the House the fact that, after that ordeal, Mr and Mrs Koop found that the one person who pleaded guilty to the offence was given six weeks in prison. I further handled their case by pointing out that I had written to the Attorney-General to ask him to investigate the case with a view to appealing against the leniency of the sentence. In doing so, I think that I handled that couple's case as I should have, rightly representing not only their interests but those of the people of South Australia.

In his continuing offensive attack on my character, the member for Albert Park said:

The fact that he was prepared to use and abuse his position as a member of Parliament to try to get a cheap headline will, in my opinion, ensure that he will not last any more than one term in this Parliament. In my view, he is a oncer only, and I will attack his contribution later during this session of Parliament.

I wish to remind the honourable member that my statements about this case had already received press coverage in a feature article in the *News* of 2 August 1990, five days in fact before I gave my address on the issue in this place. Far from being an attempt to gain publicity, it was a means of educating members about the problems of violence in our city and drawing their attention to a case in which justice appears not to have been done. As to the honourable—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to repeat himself. His comments must be pertinent to a personal explanation and I ask him to be very careful that they are.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The honourable member also referred to my length of tenure in this place.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am very sorry that the honourable member has taken offence at what has been said and I feel that he ought not to, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: Every member is allowed to make a personal explanation—

Mr Lewis: What is the point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I feel that the honourable member is going over every point he made in the original debate, and I am sure that he ought not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have raised with the honourable member on several occasions the relevance of his comments. I would ask him to be very careful, otherwise leave will be withdrawn.

Mr MATTHEW: I note that the honourable member intends 'to attack' my contribution at a later date. While I welcome this special attention, and even regard it as a compliment, I look forward to closer scrutiny by perhaps a more senior member.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member has made his point in his personal explanation.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notice of Motion Government Business Nos 1 to 5 and Supply Bill (No. 2) to be introduced.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1991. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$1 140 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$800 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year. This Bill is for \$1 140 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. The amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$70 million on the second Supply Bill for last year to cover wage and salary and other cost increases since that time.

I would also like to take this opportunity to outline to the House the 1989-90 budget outcome. Full details will of course be set out in the papers which will be tabled as part of the forthcoming budget for 1990-91. However, speculation by members opposite, including irresponsible allegations of massive overruns, only serves to damage South Australia's reputation for financial strength and fiscal integrity and should be brought to a halt as soon as possible. Members will recall that the budget for 1989-90 provided for a balance on Consolidated Account made up of a projected surplus of \$95.1 million on recurrent transactions offset on the capital side by \$249.4 million, leaving a net financing requirement of \$154.3 million.

Given the rapidly changing economic circumstances experienced throughout Australia, particularly during the latter half of the financial year, I am pleased to be able to report to the House that the final results for the year just past show a deterioration of only \$26.2 million in a budget of over \$5 000 million. This represents a variation of approximately .5 per cent. Furthermore, this deterioration is due almost entirely to a decline in receipts. Members will be aware that the State budget contains large sums which are 'passed on'. When account is taken of these items, total recurrent payments were actually \$9.6 million below estimate while capital payments were \$10.5 million lower. The lower than expected level of payments which impacted on the budget included a saving of \$23.3 million on general provisions for salaries and other expenses. In addition, the E&WS deficit was \$6.7 million less than expected. This was offset in part by an increase in interest costs of \$16 million reflecting higher than anticipated interest rates and higher than expected superannuation payments of \$7.7 million.

Consequently, the relatively small deterioration in the 1989-90 budget outcome is not due to any increase in expenditure in 1989-90 but is explained by a \$46.2 million reduction in those receipts which impact on the budget. Of those, recurrent receipts were \$33.5 million less than expected and capital receipts were \$12.7 million lower. The deterioration in recurrent receipts was largely due to a shortfall in stamp duty revenues of \$22.5 million and in liquor and petroleum franchise fees of \$4.1 million as a result of lower levels of economic activity than expected. Lower than expected recoveries from Government agencies as well as a shortfall in fees, fines and charges and fees for regulatory services totalling \$3.2 million also contributed to the reduction in receipts. Royalties were also \$9.2 million below expected levels.

In answer to questions over the past few days, I have indicated that in common with virtually all other financial institutions in Australia the State Bank's profit for 1989-90 will be affected by the sudden deterioration of the national economy. This has, in turn, also had an impact on the State's receipts. The State Bank's contribution to the budget is \$17.2 million in lieu of the \$40 million budgeted. These shortfalls were offset in part by a net impact improvement of \$6.7 million through indexation of Commonwealth general purpose grants and higher than expected payroll tax receipts of \$6.8 million. In addition, there have been a range of other variations in the final receipts and payments figures from those estimated at the time of presenting the budget to Parliament in August 1989. For the bulk of these variations there is no net impact on the budget; for example, many Commonwealth specific purpose payments to the State and recoveries for superannuation pension payments, where the change is reflected in both receipts and payments, and payments from the round sum allowances for wage increases anticipated during the year. Full details on the 1989-90 budget results will be provided in the 1990-91 budget.

Members of the House will appreciate that this picture is vastly different from that which the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have attempted to draw. Indeed, the Leader's claims in the debate on the Supply Bill (No. 1) in February of this year and his recent suggestion that there had been a \$100 million deterioration now look a trifle absurd. Furthermore, the results highlight the quite surprising lack of understanding of financial issues displayed by the Leader during the urgency debate on the opening day of this session. I say 'surprising', because the Leader comes to this place with a reputation for a degree of financial acumen. The Leader has consistently confused the likely results for the year just past with a very severe—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, those matters will be debated at a later stage. It is not common practice for the Premier to include remarks about what the Opposition has said about the budget in the second reading explanation. It is supposed to be an explanation of the contents of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: What is the exact point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The point of order is that the Premier is departing from the accepted practice.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader does not like his words and his false predictions and false impressions being set right. Let me continue. The Leader has consistently confused the likely results for the year just passed with the very severe financial problems the State faces in the present financial year. As is clear from these results, the Leader was quite wrong about the Government's financial performance in 1989-90. The statement he has made that we will experience a shortfall in this financial year as a result of over-spending in 1989-90 is equally quite wrong. As I have demonstrated, it is largely attributable to the cutbacks in Federal funding at the Premiers Conference this June. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to preserve his reputation as a man who understands matters of finance, he should begin by being able to distinguish one financial year from another.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$1 140 million.

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

RURAL INDUSTRY ADJUSTMENT (RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT) BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve execution on behalf of the State of an agreement between the Commonwealth, the States and the Northern Territory relating to the provision of assistance to persons engaged in rural industries, and to repeal the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act 1972 and the Beef Industry Assistance Act 1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: 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

In introducing this Bill, the Government is continuing its 1985 commitment that any future rural adjustment agreements will be individually formalised by the introduction of a short approving Bill, and is also continuing to effect rationalisation of legislation in the interests of efficiency.

The Bill repeals the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act 1972 and the Beef Industry Assistance Act 1975 and ratifies the Commonwealth-States-Northern Territory Rural Adjustment Agreement 1989 which is authorised under the States and Northern Territory Grants (Rural Adjustment) Act 1988 of the Commonwealth assented to on 12 December 1988.

The Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act 1972 which provided grants for a treepull scheme for the removal of peach and pome trees and the Beef Industry Assistance Act 1975 which provided financial assistance to specialist beef producers are to be repealed because there are no longer any active accounts in either of these schemes. Furthermore, residual amounts in the Fruitgrowing Assistance Fund which was associated with the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act 1972 was transferred to consolidated revenue in 1983 and the last repayments on amounts advanced by the Commonwealth Government under the Beef Industry Assistance Act 1975 were made in 1985.

Following negotiations in 1988 the Commonwealth and States agreed to certain changes in the method in which Commonwealth funding was made available to the various States for rural adjustment schemes. The 1988 agreement replaced one originally made in 1985, and subsequently amended in December 1986. The new agreement allows provision of assistance similar to that of previous rural adjustment schemes but with increased emphasis on adjustment, greater managerial and financial flexibility and therefore increased accountability for the States and Northern Territory.

As before, assistance falls into three categories.

Part A provides assistance to marginally non-viable primary producers for farm build-up, farm improvement and debt reconstruction purposes.

Part B assistance is for carry-on finance for eligible farmers in rural industries or regions experiencing a severe short-term downturn.

Part C provides household support and re-establishment assistance to support farm families while they decide whether to adjust out of farming and if so, to enable orderly realisation of their farm assets and to help with their subsequent off-farm re-establishment.

There have been refinements to the funding arrangements and major changes to some assistance measures although

subsidies and grants provided by the Commonwealth continue at the same rates as in the previous scheme. To date most of the changes to the Commonwealth-States agreements have involved the amount of interest rate subsidy that the Commonwealth pays to the States.

In the 1985 Commonwealth-States-Northern Territory Rural Adjustment Agreement the Commonwealth instigated a scheme of providing annual grants to subsidise the interest cost of borrowings by the State to fund loans to farmers. The 1986 amendment to the Commonwealth-States-Northern Territory Rural Adjustment Agreement limited the amount of interest subsidy by defining a maximum interest rate that could be used in the subsidy calculation. The Federal Minister nominated the Primary Industry Bank of Australia to be the benchmark lender.

The 1988 Commonwealth-States-Northern Territory Rural Adjustment Agreement provides, in essence, that under Part A the total amount of interest subsidy of any given year is now determined as the additional subsidy for that year plus the sum of similar determinations for the previous six years.

Also under the new agreement a State may allocate Part A assistance between farm build-up, farm improvement and debt reconstruction as it sees fit without the requirement of meeting target percentages specified by the Commonwealth. A state is now entirely responsible for bad debts arising from its lending or interest subsidising activities in contrast to the former 5 per cent of total borrowings. However, assistance received from the Commonwealth and any surpluses earned may be used in providing for such bad debts. Trading in land by the States is also possible under Part A of the new agreement. Carry-on finance for drought recovery may now be included in Part B assistance.

Significant changes have been made to Part C assistance. Household support is now available for up to one year unless clients genuinely attempt to sell their farming assets at realistic prices in which case it may be extended for a further year (reduced from two years). Assistance is provided as a secured loan which is only converted to a grant if clients' farming assets are sold within two years (30 months in certain circumstances) of first receiving household support. The maximum amount available as a re-establishment grant has been increased from the former \$8 000 to \$28 000 indexed (in line with the consumer price index) from 1 July 1988.

Despite the greater accountability imposed on the States (reflected in the more detailed reporting required by the Commonwealth) the new rural adjustment scheme provides scope for more effective assistance to primary producers because of its greater flexibility and enhanced adjustment measures.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for retrospective operation of the Act.

Clause 3 defines 'the Agreement'.

Clause 4 repeals the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act 1972 and the Beef Industry Assistance Act 1975.

Clause 5 gives approval to the execution of the Agreement and ratifies acts of the Minister done in anticipation of the Agreement coming into force.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wrongs Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Pursuant to section 100 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 the State Transport Authority is a self-insurer for personal injury claims arising out of the use of its public transport vehicles up to \$1 million for any one incident. Calamity insurance risk over that amount is covered by the Government General Insurance and Risk Management Program.

Section 127 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and section 35a of the Wrongs Act 1936 have been amended in respect of claims procedures and restricted financial entitlements for persons who have been injured as a result of a motor accident involving the specific usage of a motor vehicle. These amendments were enacted in an effort to reduce the cost of third party personal injury claims in South Australia.

The definition of a motor vehicle in the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act specifically excludes 'vehicles' operating on a railway or tramway. The Wrongs Act does not provide a definition of a motor vehicle.

The amendment to section 35a of the Wrongs Act was passed in an effort to reduce the cost of third party personal injury claims arising from motor vehicle accidents. In broad terms, this amendment limits the non-economic loss component. Where claimants are not significantly incapacitated for seven days or more, or do not incur medical expenses of \$1 000, they do not have an entitlement for a claim.

Because trams and trains do not fall within the scope of the legislation the authority will not be subject to the amendments. The Crown Solicitor states that 'the provisions of section 35a of the Wrongs Act will not apply to incidents arising exclusively out of the use of the authority's trains or trams'.

The authority has a lower number of claims arising out of the trams or trains in comparison to those arising out of buses. However, if a number of passengers were injured as a result of an accident involving a train or tram, savings could be significant. If, say, 100 passengers were injured as a result of an accident involving a train, it could be assumed that, without the amendments to the Wrongs Act, about 75 non-serious injuries could have a quantum of about \$3.75 million. It is estimated that this could be reduced by about 50 per cent if the amendment applied. In the case of a claimant only having an entitlement to a non-economic loss the quantum could be reduced by about 50 per cent.

The costs of litigation in respect of injury claims arising out of the use of trains or trams would also be significantly reduced. The Public Actuary has indicated that he would give consideration to reducing the authority's premium for calamity insurance when the legislation is changed.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 35a of the principal Act by inserting a definition of 'motor vehicle' for the purposes of that section. Section 35a sets out the method of determining the damages to be awarded to a person in respect of an injury that occurs as a consequence of—

- (a) the driving of a motor vehicle;
- (b) a collision, or action taken to avoid a collision, with a stationary vehicle;
- (c) a motor vehicle running out of control.

The amendment defines motor vehicle for this purpose as:

- (a) a vehicle, tractor or mobile machine driven or propelled or ordinarily capable of being driven or

propelled by a steam engine, internal combustion engine, electricity or any other power, not being human or animal power;

(b) a caravan or a trailer;
and

(c) a vehicle that runs on a railway, tramway or other fixed track or path.

The amendment achieves this result by incorporating the definition of motor vehicle from the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and adding to that definition vehicles that run on a railway, tramway or other fixed track or path.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953; and to repeal the Pawnbrokers Act 1888. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move.

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill repeals the Pawnbrokers Act 1888. It also amends the definition of 'second-hand dealer' in the Summary Offences Act to ensure that pawnbrokers are covered by that definition.

The Pawnbrokers Act has three basic functions:

- to provide for the licensing of pawnbrokers
- to regulate the activities of pawnbrokers and deter criminal activity
- to protect pawners (and pawnbrokers).

The decision to grant a licence is made by the Local Court following an enquiry into the fitness of the applicant and the premises. The licence is issued by Treasury on the payment of a \$50 fee. Treasury plays no other role than this. It has no resources dedicated to the enforcement of those provisions of the Act designed to regulate the activities of pawnbrokers and protect pawners.

The Pawnbrokers Act has scarcely been amended in its 100 years of operation and still applies only to loans of up to \$40 (in 1888 twenty pounds would have covered most transactions). Thus the section in the Consumer Credit Act which exempts from the provisions of that Act:

'... a licensed pawnbroker who provides the credit in the course of his business as such;

is no protection in respect of transactions involving more than \$40. The Crown Solicitor points out that a pawnbroker who undertakes transactions both of more than \$40 and of less than \$40 requires both a credit provider's licence and a pawnbroker's licence.

An investigation of the list of licensed credit providers suggests that none of the 22 licensed pawnbrokers is also a licensed credit provider. The effect of repealing the Pawnbrokers Act will be to make all pawnbrokers subject to the Consumer Credit Act.

The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has indicated his support for repeal of the Pawnbrokers Act. He has advised that a new Uniform Credit Act is expected to be introduced into Parliament shortly to replace the Consumer

Credit Act. In his view the new Act should not regulate the operations of pawnbrokers.

Instead he suggests that the interests of pawners be protected by a code of conduct which would require pawnbrokers to advise clients whenever sale of their goods was about to take place and to account to the clients for the proceeds. Should pawnbrokers fail to observe such a voluntary code of conduct he would recommend the introduction of a mandatory code under section 97 of the Fair Trading Act.

The Commissioner will shortly be discussing the proposed code of conduct with pawnbrokers. In the meantime no pawnbroker will be prosecuted under the Consumer Credit Act as a result of losing an exemption consequent upon the repeal of the Pawnbrokers Act.

The businesses of pawnbroking and dealing in second-hand goods are carried on together. Therefore it is arguable that pawnbrokers already fall within the definition of 'second-hand dealer' in the Summary Offences Act. However, the Crown Solicitor suggests an amendment to the definition to clarify the matter. The specific powers given to police in the Pawnbrokers Act would then be unnecessary and the police would have the same powers in respect of pawnbrokers as they were recently given with respect to second-hand dealers when the Second-Hand Dealers Act was repealed. The Police Commissioner has no objection to the repeal of the Pawnbrokers Act under these conditions.

In July 1989 the Under Treasurer wrote to all licensed pawnbrokers advising them that the Government was contemplating repeal of the Pawnbrokers Act. He also outlined briefly the proposals of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs for a voluntary code of conduct and mentioned the possibility that pawnbrokers would formally be brought within the definition of second-hand dealer in the Summary Offences Act. The letter invited comments from pawnbrokers on these proposals.

One pawnbroker responded in writing expressing the view that the Pawnbrokers Act was the most suitable way of protecting the interests of the pawner and the pawnbroker. He argued that it provided a basis upon which disputes between parties could be settled and opposed deregulation of the industry. Another pawnbroker indicated orally his preference for stricter enforcement of the Pawnbrokers Act against unlicensed pawnbrokers.

The Government is confident that the transfer of responsibility for pawnbrokers from Treasury to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs will provide a better basis for regulating the activities of pawnbrokers and for providing protection for both parties. The Government does not consider that a separate Act of Parliament is necessary for this purpose and considers that the proposed voluntary code of conduct is the best approach. If necessary a mandatory code will be introduced.

The licensing year for pawnbrokers begins on 1 August. Therefore it has been necessary to ask pawnbrokers to renew their licences for 1990-91 in the normal way. Should Parliament agree to pass this legislation the Government will refund the \$50 licence fee to each licensed pawnbroker.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends the definition of 'second-hand dealer' in section 49 of the principal Act to make it quite clear that pawnbrokers are included in that definition.

Clause 4 amends section 64 of the principal Act. This amendment is unrelated to the subject matter of the other provisions of the Bill. It is consequential on amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1961 made by the Road Traffic Act Amendment Act 1989 (Act No. 25 of 1989). Section 10 of that Act replaced sections 146, 147, 149 and 150 of the

Road Traffic Act with new sections. The substance of former section 147 is now contained in new section 146 and it is therefore necessary to change references in section 64 to section 147 of the Road Traffic Act to section 146 of that Act.

Clause 5 repeals the Pawnbrokers Act 1888.

Mr **INGERSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

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

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966-1975, allotments 93, 97 and 98, Town of Oodnadatta, North out of Hundreds, out of Counties be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Mr **LEWIS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Technical and Further Education Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 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

This Bill is intended to achieve three things. First and foremost it amends the Act to provide wider opportunities for alternative employment for officers of the teaching service who became temporarily or permanently ill or disabled and are unable to perform the duties of their normal employment. The proposed amendments follow the more flexible and fairer approach contained in the Education Act and the Government Management and Employment Act, in that provision is made for transfer of such a teacher to other employment with the Government. Provision is also made for leave without pay in some cases.

Second, the Bill seeks to extend the delegation power of the Minister of Employment and Further Education and of the Director-General of Technical and Further Education to permit delegation of the powers and functions contained within the Act to officers and employees appointed by the Minister under section 9 (6) of the Act. The opportunity is also taken to reflect in the Act the new title of the Minister responsible for the administration of the Act.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the Act on proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the definition of 'Minister' so that it now refers to the Minister of Employment and Further Education.

Clause 4 provides that the Minister may also delegate powers to a person who has been appointed to office by the Minister under section 9 of the Act, as well as to departmental officers and members of the teaching service.

Clause 5 similarly provides that the Director-General may delegate powers to such a person.

Clause 6 re-enacts section 17 of the Act so as to include powers to transfer an incapacitated officer of the teaching service to any other position in the teaching service or to some other Government position, or to grant the officer unpaid leave. This section is now identical to section 17 of the Education Act.

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

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION BILL

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a Bill forthwith.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I will not oppose the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the Minister to introduce this legislation, but I question whether it is appropriate for the suspension of Standing Orders to be sought this afternoon to enable the Minister to introduce the Marine Environment Protection Bill when I already have on notice my intent to introduce a private member's Bill for the same purpose next Thursday.

Motion carried.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I really do not need that sort of sexist nonsense.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I find the comments made by the member for Murray-Mallee quite offensive.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the protection of the marine environment, to make consequential amendments to the Environmental Protection Council Act 1972 and the Fisheries Act 1982, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank members opposite for their obvious interest and involvement in this matter and I would be quite delighted—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Opposition denied leave for this second reading to be included. Obviously, they want to listen to it being read by the Minister, so they should respect their own wish to have it read. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This legislation will complete the Government's package to manage water quality in South Australia. This started with the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1984, includes the Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act 1987, and the extensive amendments to the Water Resources Act which were passed in the last session of Parliament. The need now is for legislation to bridge the gap between the requirements of the London Convention, and the management of the freshwater resources of the State. It would be inappropriate

to bring in the rigorous provisions of the Sea Dumping Act without stringent controls on discharges to the inshore waters.

When the previous Bill lapsed in April of this year, the Government pledged itself to continue several initiatives, including adapting the draft National Water Quality Guidelines for use in South Australia. A major consideration was to keep faith with those industries in this State which were attempting to be environmentally responsible. Several of these companies have released proposals, the result of years of testing and planning, to reduce their discharges to natural waters. They had proceeded, in all good faith, to develop programs to comply with the criteria set out in the White Paper of June 1989. The company which has been a target for protests, Pasmenco—BHAS at Port Pirie—has announced major environmental improvement programs, costing at least \$12 million, since the previous Bill lapsed. The problem for BHAS is that they still have no legislated standards against which their performance can be assessed. They are pouring the foundations for a new thickener, and will continue with their program to improve waste water quality as a demonstration of the company's commitment.

The Government has also received a proposal from Apcel at Millicent to change its manufacturing process and eliminate chlorine bleaching and, with it, the source of most of the environmental concerns about this plant. In that case, the proposal follows several years of undramatic, often tedious, negotiation and planning. In debate on the previous Bill, there were attempts to cast doubt on the good faith of this company. The company has now set out its proposals for redevelopment, with the required environmental impact statement, which is open to anyone to comment. That proposal is going through full, proper assessment, but it is there, before the public, as evidence of the intentions of this company.

The Government, as collector of the waste waters of most South Australians, is also committed to cease discharging sewage sludge to the marine environment off Adelaide. There has been good acceptance of the 'user pays' principle from the public, who will pay more in their sewerage rates so that the negative impacts of this sludge may be converted to more positive uses.

One matter on which the Government was accused of being intransigent in the previous Bill was in not setting this commitment to legislation. Members in another place seemed quite prepared to ignore the requirements of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1986 in demanding immediate commitment to expenditure—on their estimate—\$2.5 million. This Bill again contains no such provision. The Government has made the clearest possible commitment to ceasing discharge of sewage sludge by the end of 1993; but it also recognises that it is not proper to introduce a Bill authorising works, of a value equivalent to \$2 million in 1986 dollars, unless the work has first been inquired into by the committee. That action requires no further explanation nor justification.

The present Bill also leaves the period for general compliance, by existing discharges, at eight years. It is expected that most operators could comply with the national guidelines within a lesser time. But laws do not apply to 'most'—they apply to all. The problem arises with those who are not able to say when they will be able to comply, often because the technology is still being developed. Neither does it promote longer-term environmental management to force an existing industry to use a particular kind of technology just to meet some arbitrary deadline, if there is more effective technology being developed.

This Bill now includes a provision that would allow the Minister to place a bond for compliance on any licence. In

its simplest form, the legislation would require that a bond be posted. If the company complies with its conditions, the bond is discharged; if it fails to meet those conditions, the bond is forfeited.

To provide an incentive for a licensee to comply with conditions quicker than the eight-year period, provision can be made to stage the posting of a bond. Potential loss of the bond could provide an incentive for a licensee to introduce the necessary technology to comply with the conditions of a licence as quickly as possible. Bonds which have been forfeited may be available to compensate for impacts caused by lack of compliance.

When the previous Bill lapsed, the Government needed to maintain impetus on the National Water Quality Guidelines. The task of coordinating local technical input, and wider consultation, was taken up by the Environmental Protection Council. That council commissioned a subcommittee, including persons with eminent qualifications in the marine environment, which meets each month, and has made commendable progress in guiding State input to the national document, and adapting the national guidelines to the practical needs of this State. This Bill continues to nominate the Environmental Protection Council to advise the Minister on regulations and general administration of the Act.

Apart from these changes, the Bill differs from that introduced in February of this year mainly in setting penalties reaching \$150 000 for individuals, and \$1 million for companies, who are responsible for discharges which could damage the marine environment. This Bill includes definitions of 'pollutant', 'criteria' and 'standards'. It no longer includes powers for the Minister to issue individual exemptions. It provides a trust fund to be used for a wide range of investigations into protection of the marine environment and for public education.

This Bill mirrors the style of the amended Water Resources Act in setting out objects of the Act, and functions for the Minister. The objects are positive statements for which performance indicators can be devised. They also establish the 'user pays' principle, and indicate priorities for action. The functions strengthen ties with the other Acts which constitute the package to manage all the State's water resources. It is the package which is important. The need now is to be able to control the many small impacts that collectively cause much of the loss of amenity around our coastal towns and cities.

The method chosen is to prohibit discharges to the coastal waters, except by licence. Licences would be available for all existing discharges. There can be economic incentives to promote compliance in the shortest possible time. The people of South Australia support this. They have accepted their share of the costs of treating sewage sludge. There is widespread support for the levy on sewerage rates. National water quality guidelines are being adapted for practical application under this Bill. We have had extensive consultation over the 14 months since the White Paper was released. The Bill recognises the Environmental Protection Council as the body constituted under legislation to advise the Minister on administration of this Act and which has made substantial progress on documenting its technical advice.

The only danger from this Bill is if members do not give it constructive support. It does not stand alone. Delay in its passage is making life difficult for those companies and individuals who want to ameliorate those impacts that humans have made on the marine environment. The only persons who gain from further delay are those who are inclined to continue with behaviour that simply is no longer acceptable to the general community. This Bill contains

every provision that could reasonably be included from debate on the previous Bill.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I understand that I was compelled to read this second reading. The Opposition having given me that honour—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This Bill contains every provision that could reasonably be included from debate on the previous Bill. There is no disagreement on the need to protect the marine environment. This Bill presents practical means of achieving that outcome. The Government looks forward to a positive response to the Bill in this form. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 is an interpretation provision. The following definitions are central to the measure:

'pollutant' means any wastes or other matter, whether in solid, liquid or gaseous form but does not include stormwater or specified kinds of matter excluded by regulation from the application of the Act;

'coastal waters' means any part of the sea that is within the limits of the State or that is coastal waters of the State within the meaning of the Commonwealth Coastal Waters (State Powers) Act 1980 and includes any estuary or other tidal waters;

'declared inland waters' means waters constituting the whole or part of a watercourse or lake, underground waters or waste waters or other waters, and declared by the Minister (with the concurrence of the Minister of Water Resources), by notice in the *Gazette* to be inland waters to which the measure applies;

'land that constitutes part of the coast' is land that is—

(a) within the mean high water mark and the mean low water mark on the seashore at spring tides;

(b) beneath coastal waters;

(c) beneath or within any estuary, watercourse or lake or section of watercourse or lake and subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;

or

(d) declared by the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to be coastal land to which the measure applies.

Clause 4 provides that the measure binds the Crown. Clause 5 provides that the measure is in addition to and does not take away from any other Act. It expressly provides that the measure does not apply in relation to any activity controlled by the Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1984 or the Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act 1987 and that it is subject to the Pulp and Paper Mills Agreement Act 1958, the Pulp and Paper Mill (Hundred of Gambier) Indenture Act 1961 and the Pulp and Paper Mill (Hundreds of Mayurra and Hindmarsh) Act 1964. The clause enables regulations to be made excluding activities of a specified kind from the application of the measure or part of the measure. Part II (clauses 6 and 7) sets out general objects and functions under the measure.

Clause 6 provides that the objects of the measure are:

(a) to protect the marine environment and preserve or enhance its quality for beneficial use by the community by preventing or controlling, and mitigating the effects of, pollution;

(b) to ensure that persons engaging in activities that might adversely affect the marine environment monitor and report the effects of those activities and bear the cost of any necessary ameliorative action;

(c) to promote the minimisation and treatment of waste and, where appropriate, disposal of waste to land to reduce the impact of pollutants on the marine environment.

The clause requires the Minister, the Environmental Protection Council, a committee or any other body or person involved in the administration of the measure to act consistently with, and seek to further, the objects of this Act.

Clause 7 sets out general functions of the Minister under the measure. These are—

(a) to keep under review the condition of the marine environment;

(b) to conduct or promote investigations, research, public education and other programs and projects in relation to the marine environment and its protection;

(c) to promote and coordinate action by public authorities to control the drainage of surface waters and reduce their contaminant loads to the marine environment;

(d) to promote public awareness of the beneficial uses of the marine environment and public commitment to achieving the objects of the measure;

(e) to integrate and coordinate Government policies that affect the marine environment and, for that purpose, to consult where necessary with other Ministers and public authorities with responsibilities in relation to land or water management, management of fisheries and other living natural resources, management of boating and shipping or the planning laws of the State;

and

(f) such other functions as are assigned to the Minister.

Part III (clauses 8 to 13) makes provision for advice with respect to the administration of the measure to be provided by the Environmental Protection Council. Clause 8 provides that the Environmental Protection Council is to have, in addition to its functions under any other Act, the following functions:

(a) to advise the Minister in respect of the formulation of regulations and other statutory instruments for the purposes of the measure;

(b) to provide general advice to the Minister in respect of the granting of licences under the measure;

(c) to investigate and report on matters relevant to the administration of the measure at the request of the Minister or of its own motion.

Clause 9 provides that the Environmental Protection Council may, with the approval of the Minister, or must, if so required by the Minister, coopt as an additional member or as additional members of the council a person or persons with knowledge or experience that may be required by the council for the better performance of its functions under the measure.

Clause 10 requires the Environmental Protection Council to establish a special committee of the council to be known as the Marine Environmental Protection Committee. This committee is to consist of:

(a) the chairman of the council;

- (b) the member of the council appointed as a person with expertise in matters relating to the marine environment and its protection;
 - (c) the member of the council appointed as the nominee of the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated;
 - (d) the member of the council appointed as a person with knowledge of and experience in manufacturing or mining industry;
 - (e) the member of the council appointed as a person with knowledge of and experience in fisheries;
 - (f) the member of the council appointed as an officer of the Public Service of the State with knowledge of and experience in public health;
- and

- (g) such other ordinary or coopted members of the council as the council may, from time to time, with the approval of the Minister, appoint to the committee.

Clause 11 provides that the Environmental Protection Council may, with the approval of the Minister, or must, if so required by the Minister, by writing over the council's seal, delegate to the Marine Environment Protection Committee all or part of its functions under this Act together with any of the other powers or functions of the council.

Clause 12 provides for the procedure at meetings of the committee and for public access to the minutes of meetings of the committee and minutes of meetings of the Environmental Protection Council at which matters relating to the measure are dealt with.

Clause 13 requires the Minister to ensure that the Environmental Protection Council and the Marine Environment Protection Committee are provided with such staff, facilities, information and assistance as they may reasonably require for the effective performance of their functions under the measure.

Part IV (clauses 14 to 27) contains provisions for the purposes of controlling discharges into the marine environment.

Clause 14 makes it an offence to discharge any pollutant into declared inland waters or coastal waters or on land that constitutes part of the coast except as authorised by a licence under the measure. The clause expressly provides that lawful discharge into a sewer will not result in the commission of an offence.

Clause 15 makes it an offence to carry on an activity of a kind prescribed by regulation in the course of which any pollutant is produced in declared inland waters or coastal waters, or any pollutant that is already in such waters is disturbed, except as authorised by a licence under the measure.

Clause 16 makes it an offence to install or commence construction of any equipment, structure or works designed or intended for discharging any pollutant or carrying out any activity of a kind referred to in clause 15 except pursuant to a licence. The clause also contains an administrative provision facilitating the issuing of licences for more than one purpose. The maximum penalty provided for any offence against clause 14, 15 or 16 is, in the case of a natural person, a fine of \$150 000 or division 3 imprisonment (seven years) and, in the case of a body corporate, a fine of \$1 million.

Clauses 17 to 25 are general licensing provisions. Clause 17 provides that an application for a licence must be made to the Minister and enables the Minister to require further information from the applicant.

Clause 18 gives the Minister discretion as to the granting of licences but requires the Minister to make a decision within three months of an application for a licence.

Clause 19 provides that a licence is subject to any conditions prescribed by regulation and any conditions imposed by the Minister. The clause empowers the Minister to impose, vary or revoke conditions during the period of the licence.

Clause 20 sets the term of a licence at one year and makes provision for all licences to expire on a common day.

Clause 21 is a machinery provision relating to applications for renewal of a licence.

Clause 22 gives the Minister discretion as to the renewal of licences but requires the Minister to make a decision before the date of expiry of the licence.

Clause 23 requires the Minister, in determining whether to grant or refuse a licence or renewal of a licence and what conditions should attach to a licence, to give effect to or apply such standards or criteria as are prescribed by regulation and applicable. Before granting a licence the Minister must be satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold the licence. A licence cannot be granted authorising the discharge of any matter of a kind prescribed by regulation.

Clause 24 makes provision for the continuance of a licensee's business for a limited period after the death of the licensee.

Clause 25 enables the Minister to suspend or cancel a licence if satisfied that:

- (a) the licence was obtained improperly;
- (b) the licensee has contravened a condition of the licence;
- (c) the licensee has otherwise contravened the Act;
- (d) the licensee has, in carrying on an activity to which the measure relates, been guilty of negligence or improper conduct;

or

- (e) the activity authorised by the licence is having a significantly greater adverse effect on the environment than that anticipated.

Clause 26 requires the Minister to give public notice of any application for a licence or exemption, the granting or refusing of a licence or exemption, the variation or revocation of a condition of a licence or the imposition of a further condition of a licence.

Clause 27 provides for a public register of information relating to licences.

Part V (clauses 28 to 32) contains enforcement provisions.

Clause 28 provides for the appointment of inspectors by the Minister. The instrument of appointment may provide that an inspector may only exercise powers within a limited area. An inspector is required to produce his or her identity card on request.

Clause 29 sets out inspector's powers. An inspector may enter and inspect any land, premises, vehicle, vessel or place in order to determine whether the Act is being complied with and may, where reasonably necessary for that purpose and on the authority of a warrant, break into the land, premises, vehicle, vessel or place. An inspector may exercise such powers without the authority of a warrant if the inspector believes, on reasonable grounds, that the circumstances require immediate action to be taken. Among the other powers given to inspectors are the following:

- (a) to direct the driver of a vehicle or vessel to dispose of any pollutant in or on the vehicle or vessel at a specified place or to store or treat the pollutant in a specified manner;
- (b) to take samples for analysis and to test equipment;

- (c) to require a person who the inspector reasonably suspects has knowledge concerning any matter relating to the administration of the measure to answer questions in relation to those matters (although the privilege against self-incrimination is preserved).

The clause makes it an offence to hinder or obstruct an inspector or to do other like acts. Special provisions are included for dealing with anything seized by an inspector under the clause and for court orders for forfeiture in certain circumstances.

Clause 30 empowers the Minister to require a licensee to test or monitor the effects of the activities carried on pursuant to the licence and to report the results or to require any person to furnish specified information relating to such activities.

Clause 31 requires the Minister to take any necessary or appropriate action to mitigate the effects of any breach of the measure. The Minister may direct an offender to refrain from specified activity or to take specified action to ameliorate conditions resulting from the breach. The Minister may take any urgent action required and may recover costs and expenses incurred in doing so from the offender. The clause makes it an offence to contravene or fail to comply with a direction under the clause with a maximum penalty of, in the case of a natural person, a fine of \$150 000 or division 3 imprisonment and, in the case of a body corporate, a fine of \$1 million. A person who hinders or obstructs a person taking such action or complying with such a direction is also to be guilty of an offence and liable to a maximum penalty of a division 1 fine (\$60 000).

Clause 32 provides that the Minister may, by a condition of a licence, require a licensee to lodge with the Minister a bond (supported by a guarantee or other security approved by the Minister), or a specified pecuniary sum, the discharge or repayment of which is conditional on the licensee—

- (a) not contravening or failing to comply with a specified condition of the licence or a specified provision of the measure;
- (b) satisfying a liability of a specified kind that might arise under the measure.

A pecuniary sum lodged with the Minister in accordance with such a licence condition is to be paid into the Marine Environment Protection Fund and, on satisfaction of the conditions of repayment, is to be repaid to the licensee. Where the conditions of discharge or repayment of a bond or pecuniary sum lodged with the Minister are not satisfied, the amount of the bond or the pecuniary sum is forfeited to the Crown and must, if not already paid into the fund, be paid into the Marine Environment Protection Fund. Under the clause, money held in the fund as a result of forfeiture of the amount of any bond or a pecuniary sum lodged by a licensee may be applied in payment into the Consolidated Account or to a public authority or other person for or towards costs, expenses, loss or damage incurred or suffered by the Crown or the public authority or other person as a result of any contravention of, or non-compliance with, the measure on the part of the licensee or for any other purposes of the fund, as the Minister thinks fit.

Part VI provides for review of decisions of the Minister under the measure.

Clause 33 provides for a review by the District Court of a decision of the Minister made in relation to a licence or an application for a licence or of a requirement or direction of the Minister made in the enforcement of the measure. Any person aggrieved may apply for review. The application must be made within three months of the making of the decision, requirement or direction or, where the effect of

the decision is recorded in the public register, within three months of that entry being made.

Part VII provides for the establishment of a Marine Environment Protection Fund.

Clause 34 provides for the establishment of the fund and requires that it be kept at the Treasury. Under the clause the fund is to consist of—

- (a) the prescribed percentage of licence fees paid under the measure;
 - (b) the prescribed percentage of penalties recovered in respect of offences against the measure;
 - (c) any money required to be paid into the fund pursuant to clause 32;
 - (d) any money appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of the fund;
 - (e) any money received by way of grant, gift or bequest for the purposes of the fund;
- and
- (f) any income from investment of money belonging to the fund.

The fund may be applied by the Minister (without further appropriation)—

- (a) in making any payment pursuant to clause 32;
- (b) for the purposes of any investigations, research, pilot programs or projects or for public education programs relating to the marine environment or its protection.

Part VIII (clauses 35 to 48) contains miscellaneous provisions. Clause 35 requires that the department's annual report must contain a summary of—

- (a) every allegation or report (whether of an inspector or otherwise) of any contravention of, or failure to comply with, the measure;
- (b) the investigative or enforcement action (if any) taken in response to each such allegation or report and the results of that action;
- (c) if no such action was taken in any particular case—the reasons why no such action was taken.

Clause 36 makes it an offence to furnish false or misleading information. The maximum penalty provided is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Clause 37 enables the Minister to delegate powers or functions to a Public Service employee.

Clause 38 makes it an offence to divulge confidential information relating to trade processes obtained in the administration of the measure except in limited circumstances. The maximum penalty provided is a division 5 fine (\$8 000).

Clause 39 provides immunity from liability to persons engaged in the administration of the measure.

Clause 40 sets out the manner in which notices or documents may be given or served under the measure.

Clause 41 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 42 makes an employer or principal responsible for his or her employee's or agent's acts or omissions unless it is proved that the employee or agent was not acting in the ordinary course of his or her employment or agency.

Clause 43 provides that, where a body corporate is guilty of an offence against the measure, the manager and members of the governing body are each guilty of an offence.

Clause 44 imposes penalties for an offence committed by reason of a continuing act or omission. The offender is liable to an additional penalty of not more than one-fifth of the maximum penalty for the offence and a similar amount for each day that the offence continues after conviction.

Clause 45 provides that offences against the measure for which the maximum fine prescribed equals or exceeds

\$150 000 are minor indictable offences and that all other offences against the measure are summary offences. A prosecution may be commenced by an inspector or by any other person authorised by the Minister. The time limit for instituting a prosecution is five years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed. Where a prosecution is taken by an inspector who is an officer or employee of a council, any fine imposed is payable to the council.

Clause 46 enables a court, in addition to imposing any penalty, to order an offender to take specified action to ameliorate conditions resulting from the breach of the measure, to reimburse any public authority for expenses incurred in taking action to ameliorate such conditions or to pay an amount by way of compensation to any person who has suffered loss or damage to property as a result of the breach or who has incurred expenses in preventing or mitigating such loss or damage. The maximum penalty for non-compliance with such an order is, in the case of a natural person, a fine of \$150 000 or division 3 imprisonment and, in the case of a body corporate, a \$1 million fine.

Clause 47 provides a general defence to any offence against the measure if the defendant proves that the offence did not result from any deliberate or negligent act or omission on the part of the defendant or was reasonably justified by the need to protect life or property in a situation of emergency that did not result from any deliberate or negligent act or omission on the part of the defendant. The defendant must prove in addition, in the case of an offence involving the discharge, emission, depositing, production or disturbance of any pollutant, that the defendant reported the matter to the Minister in accordance with the regulations. Such a person can still be required to take action to ameliorate the situation or can be required to pay compensation.

Clause 48 provides general regulation making power. In particular, the regulations may provide for different classes of licences and may authorise the release or publication of information of a specified kind obtained in the administration of the measure.

Schedule 1 contains transitional provisions. The Minister is required to grant a licence in respect of an activity that was lawfully carried on by the applicant on a continuous or regular basis during any period up to the passing of the measure. The Minister may impose conditions on the licence requiring the licensee to modify or discontinue the activity within a specified time but not exceeding eight years.

Schedule 2 makes consequential amendments to the Fisheries Act 1982. The schedule also amends the Environmental Protection Council Act 1972 to allow for two further members to be appointed to the council—one being a person with expertise in matters relating to the marine environment and its protection and the other being a person with knowledge of and experience in fisheries.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.
(Continued from page 160.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I rise to support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech and, in doing so, I formally extend my congratulations to my new parliamentary colleague on his election as

the member for the seat of Custance. He has a difficult act to follow in filling the shoes of his predecessor, the now Senator John Olsen. Nevertheless, I am sure that he will not be daunted by this challenge and will serve both his electorate and the State of South Australia in an admirable fashion.

Today I will concentrate on the budgetary associated aspects of His Excellency's speech and will look, in particular, at three main areas associated with Government funding: first, the disgraceful neglect of southern and south-western Adelaide suburban residents in Government funding programs; secondly, the massive waste of money on Government information technology projects; and, thirdly, the attempted deceit of South Australian taxpayers by the State Government.

The first area of Government funding—this Government's neglect of residents in the southern and south-western suburbs of Adelaide—has been nothing short of disgraceful. This part of our city is in danger of becoming the Cinderella section of Adelaide at the hands of the present Administration. The residents of these suburbs responded appropriately at the last poll by unceremoniously throwing out their Labor members and installing Liberal members in the seats of Fisher, Bright and Hayward. Residents in the electorates of both Baudin and Mawson issued a strong warning to their incumbent Labor members by forcing the two Government Ministers who occupy these seats to suffer the embarrassment of their historically safe seats going to preferences.

As one of the three new Liberal members covering the southern and south-western suburbs, I have been inundated with requests for the funding of projects not only for my electorate but also for the electorates of Baudin and Mawson. The residents of those two electorates all relate a similar tale: there is no point in seeing a Labor member because they get nowhere; at least when they see a Liberal member they get a hearing.

To add insult to injury for these neglected residents, the Premier himself had the impudence to issue a press release on 5 August entitled '\$1.8 billion Liberal spending spree does not add up, says Premier'. As we have already heard members state, this document is one of the worst pieces of gross misrepresentation that has ever been prepared by a Government. It implies that Liberal members dream up vague wish lists of expenditure items that the Government should meet. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Premier's list includes seven items of Government expenditure which I have requested on behalf of my electors, totalling \$99.042 million. Without exception, every single one of those items is on that list because the Government has ducked, weaved and avoided decisions for years, has failed to recognise the needs of residents in those areas or has simply kept deferring projects.

A little later, I will look separately at each of those seven items attributed to me. However, first I will look at the broader implications of the list which the Premier and his ill-informed minders prepared. The Premier's press release accuses Opposition members of urging the spending of \$1 821.64 million since the beginning of the year. If we exclude the \$1 419 million attributed to my colleague the member for Bragg for urging investigation into the feasibility of building dual highways between major cities, we are left with a balance of \$402.64 million attributed to both me and my colleagues for 31 items of capital expenditure.

Interestingly, the member for Fisher and I, between us, have been credited with 13 of those 31 items, totalling \$294.5 million—that is, 73 per cent of the figure derived after excluding the member for Bragg's single item. This

percentage, the number of items and the dollar value, a direct reflection of the disgraceful neglect of the southern and south-western suburbs that has occurred under this Government. This statement can easily be backed up when we analyse the seven items of expenditure requested that have been attributed to me. The first of those items is for \$90 million for the third arterial road.

In August 1984, after having scrapped the north-south corridor and later realising the mess it had made of southern transport, the State Government announced a \$45 million road plan to cut the Darlington bottleneck. The plan was to include a two-stage nine-kilometre road running between Reynella and Sturt Road at Tonsley, and the road was to run parallel between South Road and Ocean Boulevard, with the first stage between Sturt Road and Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill costing \$30 million.

The \$15 million second stage was to be between Majors Road and the northern end of the Reynella bypass. In the *Advertiser* of 16 August 1984 the Premier was quoted as saying:

The Government, through the Minister of Transport, would direct the Highways Department to start immediately with the design work and pre-construction work.

The fact that this road has not been constructed, and its cost continues to blow out from \$45 million in 1984 to \$90 million, is a significant example of the consequences of this Government's neglect of the southern and south-western suburbs.

The second item on the list is \$3.3 million for the new Hallett Cove East Primary School (also referred to as the Karrara Primary School). The local community and I have been negotiating and lobbying for this school for the past 2½ years. The Premier might be interested to recall that on Thursday 2 August 1990 the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works concerning the Hallett Cove East (Karrara) Primary School was tabled in this place. The committee recommended as follows:

The proposed public work of the establishment of a new Government primary school at the junction of Quailo Avenue and Forresters Road, Hallett Cove, at an estimated cost of \$3.3 million based on costs as at May 1990.

This school is needed to alleviate the intense pressure on the existing Hallett Cove (R10) school which, by the end of this year, will have 1 050 students. The R10 school has the second largest junior primary school component in South Australia.

The new Hallett Cove East School should receive budget funding in accordance with the Public Works Committee's recommendation to enable it to be completed for occupation by May 1991. The third item on the Premier's list attributed to me is \$5 million to extend the Hallett Cove R10 school to cater for year 12. I do not know where the Premier got these figures from, but clearly \$5 million for this project has to be wrong. If it only costs \$3.3 million to build an entire new Hallett Cove East Primary School, it cannot possibly cost \$5 million to provide education for years 11 and 12 in the same area.

Mr Lewis: Overtime!

Mr MATTHEW: Perhaps it is overtime. Provision of education to year 12 at Hallett Cove has been the subject of broken promises by successive Labor Governments over the past 19 years. The Government's failure to provide complete education to Hallett Cove is yet another example of this Government's neglect of the southern suburbs. The Director of Southern Education, Ms Rosemary Graegin, has acknowledged that education to year 12 at Hallett Cove is inevitable.

The fourth item on the Premier's list attributed to me is an amount of \$120 000 to provide a school bus from Hallett

Cove to Seaview High. The inclusion of this item on the Premier's list is the most disgraceful of all.

Because the Government has failed to provide education to year 12 at Hallett Cove, it has been necessary to guarantee Hallett Cove students' education beyond year 10. Therefore, from 1991 the Hallett Cove R10 school will be zoned with Seaview High, some eight kilometres away. While Seaview High is indeed an excellent school that is capable of providing a good standard of education for year 11 students who have completed education to year 10 at Hallett Cove there is one problem: there is no public transport between Seaview Downs and Hallett Cove. Therefore, naturally on behalf of concerned Hallett Cove parents, staff from Hallett Cove High School as well as staff from Seaview Downs High School, I sought a guarantee from the Minister of Education that a bus service would be provided. The Minister gave that guarantee. Now the Premier seeks to criticise my stance. What a disgraceful situation! I am sure that residents of Hallett Cove will be pleased to hear of the Premier's view on this matter. What a disgrace!

The fifth item on the Premier's list attributed to me is for \$150 000 for a pick up and set down area for the new Karrara school to which I referred earlier as part of the second item on the Premier's list. On Thursday 2 August 1990 the Minister for Environment and Planning tabled the report (and I hope members will bear with me because it has an inordinately long title) 'Crown Development Report by the South Australian Planning Commission on a Sacon/Minister of Education Proposal to Establish a Primary School Pursuant to Section 7 of the Planning Act 1982'. The Minister signed her concurrence to the following recommendation:

The Minister of Education/Sacon be directed to provide a combined car park and set down/pick up bay in the north-east corner of the site, with entry only from Quailo Avenue and right-turn exit only into Forresters Road.

Once again the Premier criticised me for requesting this vital safety feature for the new school, a feature to which the Minister, to her credit, has agreed. Further, the report from the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee on the Hallett Cove East (Karrara) school makes the following statement about the pick up and set down facility:

The committee notes that, despite an assurance given in 1989, a clear Government policy on traffic management in association with new school sites has not been developed and submitted to Cabinet for endorsement. As traffic management continues to be an issue of dispute between the Education Department and local government and a concern to local residents, the Public Works Standing Committee recommends strongly that a Government policy be developed.

I remind members, and particularly the Premier, that these are the words of a bipartisan parliamentary committee. The sixth item on the Premier's list is \$500 000 for an underpass under Lonsdale Road. This issue has lain unresolved for years, during which time it has been subjected to endless procrastination, buck-passing and inaction on the part of the Government. It has been given cursory examination by the present Minister of Transport and his predecessor and it was given some lip service by the previous member for Bright.

For the benefit of members, I point out that Lonsdale Road was opened in 1980 as a four-lane arterial road stretching from Majors Road, O'Halloran Hill, to Sherriffs Road at Lonsdale. The section of the 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. Quite rightly, the designers of the original road plan envisaged the need for pedestrians to travel from one side of the busy

road to the other, particularly schoolchildren getting to and from their schools and needing to cross a 100 km/h road.

The Government of the day decided in its wisdom to defer the project—the building of the underpass—until the population grew and schools and facilities were built. Now the population has grown, the schools and facilities are there, but schoolchildren are still expected to cross a 100 km/h road. Certainly, I do not hold back in my calls for the construction of the underpass in accordance with the original construction plan. Perhaps the Premier should reflect on those documents.

The seventh and final item attributed to me in this disgraceful document of the Premier is for \$80 000 for lights at the junction of Neath Avenue and Seacombe Road, South Brighton. This item was extracted from a letter I wrote to the Minister of Transport on 9 March 1990. For the benefit of members I refer to the Minister's reply of 9 April 1990, as follows:

I refer to your letter of 9 March 1990, on behalf of the proprietor of a delicatessen expressing concern at the proposed traffic signals for the Seacombe Road/Neath Avenue/Davenport Street intersection.

The Minister goes on to say that his department has investigated the situation and believes that lights are needed at that location. It was not my request for the lights—the Minister made that decision.

The Premier's disgraceful document is nothing more than a pathetic attempt at clutching straws to launch a feeble defence against the Opposition's onslaught regarding the Premier's deceit of South Australians over State funding. The Premier and his minders missed items of expenditure that I have requested. Indeed, it is a pity that they were omitted from the list, because the Premier's list serves as a reminder of this Government's disgraceful neglect of the southern and south-western suburbs.

To illustrate my point further I turn to the 1998 Commonwealth Games bid that was mentioned in His Excellency's speech. As honourable members opposite are aware, the Liberal Party has been happy to give the bid bipartisan support. However, while the games will be an excellent event for South Australia, if our bid is successful, they also highlight the Government's poor sports funding for the southern and south-western suburbs. Indeed, that funding has meant that the games venues are located either in the city or the western, northern or north-eastern suburbs.

In all, 10 sporting venues have been nominated, those being: Football Park stadium at West Lakes for the opening and closing ceremonies and for athletics; the Adelaide Aquatic Centre for swimming and diving; the Adelaide Entertainment Centre for gymnastics; the Adelaide Festival Theatre for weightlifting; the Adelaide Convention Centre for boxing; the Basketball Association stadium for badminton; the Exhibition Hall for wrestling; the State Shooting Park at Virginia for shooting; the yet to be constructed Adelaide cycling velodrome for cycling; and the West Lakes Bowling Club for lawn bowls. Even the games village will be north of Adelaide.

Mr Hamilton: Hear, hear!

Mr MATTHEW: I note the concurrence of the member for Albert Park in respect of the two venues in his electorate. It is interesting that funding has occurred in that area of town but nothing has happened in the southern or south-western suburbs of Adelaide. Not one venue, not even the games village, is located in that section of Adelaide. Why? Because this Government has neglected those areas of our city. That is why it threw out three Labor members and that is why more Labor members will be thrown out of those areas. That is why it will lose the election whenever the Premier has the courage to call it.

This choice of northern venues goes one step further. I believe that it will even compound the shortage of major sports venues in the south. The Commonwealth Games bid could have been seen as a valuable opportunity to build sporting venues in those neglected parts of our city. To further illustrate my point, I turn to the provision of hospitals to serve the southern and south-western suburbs.

There are approximately 900 hospital beds available to the general community in the south and south-western suburbs. Of these, 620 are public beds (including those available to the community at the Repatriation Hospital) and the remainder are private. This represents a bed population ratio of approximately three beds per 1 000 people. For planning purposes, the South Australian Health Commission has set a goal of an overall bed supply rate of four beds per 1 000 people. The southern and south-western suburbs do not have enough hospital beds to meet the demands of their growing population. On the basis of current population and hospital activity data, this area has a shortfall of some 200 beds, and on projected data—and this is projected Government data—this shortfall will increase to more than 300 beds by the year 2001.

As a result, patients are often discharged from Flinders Medical Centre much quicker than one might expect. Elective surgical patients cannot be guaranteed admission on the scheduled day. Naturally, first priority is given to emergency patients, and that means delays are likely for elective patients, even though their condition may be serious and painful.

The southern and south-western suburbs had a population of only 174 000 in 1966. This population grew to 280 000 by 1986, and on Government projected figures is expected to reach 324 000 by 1996. Flinders Medical Centre, as some members may remember, opened in the early 1960s when the South Australian Government, under the fine leadership of Sir Thomas Playford, recognised the need for a new hospital to serve the growing communities of the southern and south-western suburbs.

The first phase of the hospital, which included teaching and research facilities, was officially opened on 26 February 1975 by Sir Mark Oliphant. The second phase of the centre became operational in 1976 with the first patient admitted on 6 April that year. This phase included, amongst other things, 320 beds and outpatient facilities. The third phase of the centre, with an additional 180 beds, was completed in early 1978. The fourth and final phase of Flinders Medical Centre, planned to contain a further 200 beds, was cancelled in the late 1970s by the Dunstan Government. No date has yet been set for its construction, so Flinders Medical Centre remains a 500 bed hospital.

I would like to draw the attention of members to some interesting aspects of the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works of 23 June 1976 entitled 'Flinders Medical Centre Development—Phase IV', and members should remember that this is the phase that was scrapped by the Dunstan Government. The report states:

(1) Completion of dining room accommodation to cope with the additional staff which will be recruited at that time (building A);

(2) completion of 'shell' area on level 3 of building G;

(3) completion of 'shell' ward areas on levels 5 and 6 of building M;

(4) completion of single-bed labour and delivery ward on level 3 of building G;

(5) conversion of temporary accommodation in building M to patient-ward accommodation.

Apart from the completion of the so-called 'shell' areas, the following additional parts of the project are included in Phase IV:

(1) Extensions to the supplies department stores and animal house in building B;

- (2) a day-hospital for psychiatric and psycho-geriatric patients;
- (3) the introduction of accommodation for a possible future cardiac surgery unit;
- (4) completion of a second clinical demonstration theatre;
- (5) additional residential blocks.

It is interesting to note the third item, which I repeat, as follows:

The introduction of accommodation for a possible future cardiac surgery unit.

The report continues:

The need for Phase IV therefore is based on three factors: first, the need to provide for the southern suburbs of Adelaide an adequate number of 'acute' beds, based on the best possible calculation of the population trends. On Australian and international standards for the number of 'acute' beds this would justify the 708 beds which it is hoped Flinders will achieve in the near future.

Secondly, much of Phase IV consists of new developments and this is because of the essential introduction of new treatment facilities which will be invaluable to southern areas of Adelaide. Thirdly, there has been a commitment from the beginning to provide the Flinders University with clinical facilities for its medical school with a current intake of 64 students per annum. Again, by accepted standards this would justify the provision of some 700 beds.

I remind members that that report is dated 1976, and it states that Flinders Medical Centre needed 700 beds. Today in 1990 it still has only 500 beds. What a disgrace!

No doubt members opposite have been wondering about the affordability of the projects about which I have been speaking. Certainly, I have heard them bleating about this aspect before. Now they can sit up and take note because I am about to tell them about areas where the money could come from—areas of Government mismanagement and waste. I will concentrate in the main on Government information technology projects and, in so doing, place this Government on notice that I will be carefully watching the development of systems such as: those developed by the State Computing Business Unit; the Justice Information System; the on-line registration and licence system for the Motor Registration Division; the Austpay system; the On-line Procurement Service; the isolated development of computer systems by the Police Department; the information supply project of the Corporate Affairs Commission; the Court Services Department computerisation program; and the maintenance activity and recording system for the Highways Department—to name but a few.

In his report for the year ended 30 June 1989, the Auditor-General said of information technology in the State Government:

There is a wide diversity of computing equipment and operating and application software (both within and across public sector agencies) which has led to processing and system inefficiencies, particularly where systems extend across agency boundaries. The on-line procurement service is an example.

The Auditor-General goes on to say:

... there is a need to ensure that broad policies and plans are in place and promulgated in a clear and concise way in order to avoid, to the greatest extent practical, the inefficiencies referred to ...

Members opposite would no doubt like an example of waste in some of these computing projects. I remind them that in June 1985 approval was given for the development and implementation of a computerised on-line motor vehicle registration and driver licensing system. The cost of development and implementation of that system was estimated to be \$4.5 million. As members would be aware, the system has been plagued by delays, a lack of corporate management commitment and direction, inexperienced staff, inadequate training of staff and inadequate technical guidance and daily project control.

As at 30 June 1989, the cost of the project had blown out to \$7.2 million. The Auditor-General expressed concerns

about the adequacy of initial project costing. To date the cost has blown out to a staggering \$9.5 million and is still rising. To make matters worse, on day one of the system going live it could not even cope with the transaction volumes and fell over. This wonderful Government-developed system fell over—flat on its face. Quite clearly, load testing of the system was inadequate and poorly controlled. However, this sort of Government waste and mismanagement is not just limited to computers.

Two other notable examples involve the Government meddling in areas that should be left to private enterprise. I refer to the scrimber project which has blown out from a cost of \$22.6 million to a massive \$55 million and rising. The other example is the State Clothing Corporation, which made an operating loss of \$591 000 to 30 June 1989 after this Government had sunk \$460 000 of taxpayer's money into it. What an absolute disgrace!

Now, in a desperate bid to hide the reasons for ripping even more taxes from the pockets of hard working South Australians, the Premier has falsely represented moneys received from the Commonwealth Government. The phoney \$180 million figure used by the Premier, and regrettably repeated in his Excellency's speech, has been concocted by the Premier in an attempt to justify the big tax increases he is planning for ordinary South Australians and pay for his Government's own financial mismanagement and last year's election bribes. I will repeat that statement: last year's election bribes. Even the State Bank came out and exposed the Premier's hollow attempt to blame Canberra for his own mismanagement. The State Bank says:

As part of the pre-election build up, the 1989-90 budget contained provision for an 8.7 per cent increase in recurrent expenditure and a 13.5 per cent increase in capital expenditure, with a budgeted public sector deficit of \$545 million. This was the second largest of any State and the highest on a per capita basis.

So, our budget deficit was the highest in Australia on a per capita basis. What an absolute disgrace! That is the sort of mismanagement to which this State is being subjected. Now is the time for the Premier to stop blaming others for his mistakes and just get on with the job of getting the State's finances into some sort of order.

In the short time remaining, I will put on record examples of some of the disgraceful rises in State taxes and charges that have been sneaked through the *Government Gazette*. Under the Real Property Act, 20 separate fees for registrations have been increased by up to 8 per cent. Under the Crown Lands Act, 21 fees have been increased. Under the Physiotherapists Act, four licence and registration fees have been increased by up to 10 per cent. The list goes on and on. Some of the more important ones are under the Health Act, where four fees for licensing nursing homes and rest homes have been increased by up to 40 per cent and, under the Waste Management Act, two licence fees have been increased by up to 82 per cent.

Perhaps members opposite can remember the Premier's guarantee—his promise—before the last State election that no taxes and charges would be increased by more than the rate of the CPI. Perhaps the Premier is intending to bring about a CPI increase of 40 per cent to 80 per cent in South Australia. Perhaps he is taking lessons from some of the third world countries. The way this State is moving backwards, that is the way we are heading, anyway. It is a disgrace.

Members on this side of the House will be looking with interest at the Premier's financial documents as they are tabled in Parliament. We will not hold back. We will look at those documents, scrutinise them and point out the inefficiencies as they occur. This Government has a disgraceful record of mismanagement. The people of this State—ordi-

nary, everyday South Australians—are the ones who will have to bear the brunt of it. The member for Albert Park may well sit there and yawn but, after his episode in the House today, I would not have thought he has much to yawn about. What a disgraceful situation!

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion and congratulate the Governor on his excellent speech, as usual, on the opening of Parliament. I pay tribute to Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan on the wonderful job they have done as viceregal representatives in South Australia. Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have always looked and acted the part. They are very pleasant people to deal with and talk to and they show great interest in what is happening in our great State. The Governor's appointment was an excellent one, and Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have carried out their duties with distinction. While I am by no stretch of the imagination a royalist, I recognise their position and pay tribute to them. I wish Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan all the best for the future.

I will touch on some points in the Governor's speech. First, I refer to the Premiers Conference. Mention was made in the speech of the \$180 million plus shortfall in our share of the Federal cake. While members opposite seem to have trouble grasping this fact, I think that explains why they are in Opposition and we are in Government. The shortfall will put enormous pressure on the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, and on the Government to run a State already stressed by Federal cuts over the past couple of years. These cuts have been very hard to take but, in fairness to the Hawke Labor Government, it must be said that the Commonwealth is squeezing the States in order to get the nation well and truly back on the rails after decades of Liberal Government mismanagement.

An area of great concern to South Australia is housing. With further cuts, that sector will be further stressed, with more homeless people in our community. South Australian Governments of all persuasions have done the right thing over the past 30 or 40 years, putting every cent of available grants money into housing. Because we did that, we are now being penalised; yet, States such as Queensland, which did not do the right thing over the years, have extra funding to provide housing.

At the Federal level, the necessary but hard decisions are being made. The bandaid measures applied by previous Governments are no longer appropriate. New remedies are needed and are being put in place. The medicine for the nation's economy includes restructuring at all levels in the public and private sectors, and changing the way we do business, the way we manage, and the way we market our products and services. These new concepts are being initiated across the board. However, like all good medicines, they are unpopular because they do not taste very nice.

My second point concerns the multifunction polis. The selection of the Adelaide site is both interesting and exciting and presents a real challenge for the State Government in the years to come. The decision is of particular interest to me because most of this concept will be situated in my electorate of Price. Therefore, I am concerned that the project should get off the ground and go through to finality. It is the biggest thing since the establishment of the new colony back in the 1830s when Port Adelaide and the city of Adelaide were established. I hope that the people of South Australia, particularly those in the electorate of Price and the surrounding electorates, will recognise the project's enormous potential and support it.

I congratulate the Premier and the Government team on the way in which they put together an outstanding submis-

sion and presented it in such a professional way, with the result that South Australia has been given this great MFP concept. There is no doubt that the excellent presentation was the prime reason for Adelaide's selection. It is strange how history repeats itself; just over 150 years ago the colony of South Australia was established as a joint venture between the British Government and private enterprise. Today, 150 years down the track, a similar situation is occurring with the MFP in as much as it will be a joint venture between various Governments and the private sector. We are all aware of the environmental problems of the area, but I am sure that they can be fixed. In fact, it is a magnificent chance to get those environmental problems fixed up once and for all.

Mr Hamilton: Look at West Lakes.

Mr De LAINE: As my colleague from Albert Park suggests, the area that is now West Lakes was similar to Gillman. Look at it today; it is a magnificent area. From looking at aerial photographs of West Lakes, I do not think that there is anything to equal it in the world. The eyes of the world will be on the multifunction polis as it gets under way. It is amazing how the concept links up with existing facilities and infrastructure. I speak of the port itself, the Adelaide central business district, Technology Park, the airport and, especially, the unused land at the site. Much infrastructure is already in place.

It would be hard to envisage planning being done in a better way if we knew 100 years ago that this exciting concept was to be developed in the area. Because of the existing infrastructure and facilities, the area is tailor-made for this type of development, and it has great potential. Over the past 4½ years I have spoken at various times about my vision for the area. Without knowing that the multifunction polis would be coming along, I have mentioned that the area could be used for people to live, work and recreate there. That is what the concept endorses. About three years ago the Federal Government decided to sell off vast amounts of land at Gillman for industrial purposes. I was shocked, having known the area all my life. I made representations to the Premier and the appropriate Federal Ministers.

In the end the land was purchased by the State Government and kept aside, and it was very lucky that that was done because the Government controls all that land now paving the way for this exciting concept of the MFP. I am amazed by the opposition to the MFP and these sorts of projects by individuals and organisations without their knowing any of the details. The editorial in the *News* of Friday, 18 May 1990 states:

Multifunction pie in the sky
It doubtless seemed like a good idea at the time. The politicians and their hangers-on sat around the table and dreamt up this good idea. Things started to go wrong when they gave it a daft name: multifunction polis. But academics, bureaucrats, planners and others who know a gravy train when they see one climbed aboard.

Most Australians, caught up in the everyday real world, were not really aware of what was contemplated.

In the heat of an election campaign, however, a few real questions about what was being billed as a hi-tech dream city began to be asked.

The questioners, especially the then Opposition Leader, Mr Peacock, were given a terrible kicking for suggesting it could be an elitist enclave and for daring to suggest that the heavy Japanese involvement might not be such a good idea.

Events took a turn for the sillier when it was suggested it should be on the dustier fringes of Adelaide, around Dry Creek, Wingfield, Bolivar and Gillman.

Now Federal Industry and Technology Minister, Senator Button, in many matters an uncomfortable realist, says this theme park city could actually be spread around the country. It is no longer a city but a kind of rash. The gravy train chugs along; the academics and the planners will be able to hold many seminars

in many exotic places for a long time to come. But increasingly it becomes clear that the MFP was no more than just another good idea at the time.

That is a typical example of the way in which the media in South Australia treats this sort of situation. I am afraid that the media here does not have much credibility. I have wondered several times when interstate why I have not been able to buy an Adelaide newspaper at news stands or news agencies, but the reason is that anyone seen in the eastern States with an Adelaide paper under their arm is regarded as a half-wit. Hence the lack of credibility the newspapers have in Adelaide.

While on that subject, we read in the papers with regular monotony about the low esteem in which politicians are held. This argument is perpetuated in the media and it is no wonder that people begin to think this way. I blame the media for the image that they give people such as politicians. The media perpetuates this sort of attitude amongst the public. People repeat what they read in the newspapers. Randall Ashbourne's article in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* referred to State MPs returning from their winter holiday.

This is another typical example of the misunderstanding or ignorance by journalists who write for some of our papers. I invite Randall Ashbourne any time he likes to come down to my electorate office and see what a backbencher does. I know that my colleagues on this side of the House work very hard also. He would find my car out the front of my electorate office on weekends and nights any time he chose. I object to this sort of garbage that the media puts around, that we do not do very much and that we are always on holidays.

The greens—not all of them but some of them—have voiced their opposition to the MFP project. They seem to be anti everything. They complain about the pollution in that area of Gillman, yet they oppose the very means of cleaning it up to a large extent. There is no Government that would be prepared to spend many millions of dollars to clean up an area that is polluted like the Gillman area and leave it as a swamp. If they were to spend that sort of money to clean it up, they would do it only in cooperation with a concept such as a development like the MFP. It is the opportunity of a lifetime to get the area cleaned up totally, and get this exciting twenty-first century development on line. I, too, have concerns about the polluted areas of the site and its surrounds, but I am 100 per cent confident that these matters can and will be addressed. I am also confident that, when widespread public consultation and information comes on stream, virtually all opposition will subside. As the Premier said yesterday in answer to my question in this House:

I can assure the honourable member that community consultation and involvement is absolutely fundamental to this whole proposal.

I feel sure that, despite all the knocking, the MFP will go ahead and will be an immensely successful venture, gradually evolving over the next 20 to 30 years.

His Excellency also referred to the planning review which is being undertaken. This important initiative, recently announced by the Premier, is opportune, especially given the MFP proposal, and hopefully it will address long-term problems and allow further development to proceed without creating more problems down the track. It will be a major tool in the evolution of the MFP, our suburbs and cities into the twenty-first century.

Another item referred to by His Excellency was the Marine Environment Protection Bill. This is an extremely important piece of legislation with added significance because of the MFP proposal in the Gillman and Port Adelaide area. I was pleased to see it introduced this afternoon. It was a

pity that it was withdrawn at the end of the autumn session because of the Opposition and because an unrealistic time-frame was insisted on by the Democrats. I had intended to speak at some length concerning this Bill but, because it has been introduced in the House again, I will leave it at that.

I refer also to crime prevention strategy. I take issue with a remark made by the the member for Bright the other night; in fact, I was absolutely disgusted with his contribution and the inference that Government members were not interested in crime prevention. In fact, he inferred that we actually condoned the situation involving the couple who were beaten up near the casino. It was a tragedy for that couple and to blame the Government is absolutely outrageous. I sympathise with those people, as do all members on this side of the House. It is absolute rot to think that members on this side are not concerned about the crime rate and violence in this city. We are vitally concerned about that and the remarks of the honourable member will do nothing to help the situation. I suggest that he go and speak to senior police in his area, liaise with them (as I do in my area) and find out the facts before he goes shooting off his mouth like he has done.

The Government has a lot of crime prevention strategies in place and Neighbourhood Watch is one of them, a very worthwhile concept, and I must pay tribute to my colleague the member for Albert Park, probably the one person who was most instrumental in introducing the Neighbourhood Watch concept in South Australia back in 1983. The honourable member deserves credit for raising the matter in this place and getting the project under way.

We also have more police per head of population than any other State in Australia, and an average 50 per cent increase in sentences for serious crime is another deterrent; and on more than 130 occasions appeals have been submitted to the courts by the Attorney-General against lenient sentences and early release of prisoners. So, what the member for Bright was espousing last Tuesday was absolute rot.

For some reason, Mr Deputy Speaker, the honourable member and his colleagues seem to think that Government members do not live in Adelaide; they live in some other place or on some other planet. They have to bear in mind that Government members are the same as members opposite who live in this beautiful city of ours. We have families growing up in this city, and we have ageing parents, friends and relatives and to suggest that we do not care about what happens to our own people is absolutely ridiculous. We care as much as Opposition members and it is time that we got together and tried to hammer out the solutions.

Obviously the reason for this sort of violence is something that is fairly deep-seated and we must, as a Government, and with the assistance of the Opposition hopefully, find the solution to the problem as to why these people do these sort of things. To suggest that providing more funds and having more policemen would solve the problem is absolutely ridiculous. We would need one policeman for every person in Adelaide to have any effect. I thought the honourable member made a disgraceful speech and I hope that in time he will learn more and know the ropes in this place.

Last Sunday, together with the Speaker of this House, I attended the opening of the Port Sizzler restaurant, the fifth Sizzler restaurant in South Australia, and notice was given at that opening that that number will soon increase to 10. Bearing in mind that there are 10 Sizzler restaurants in New South Wales with its population, this speaks very highly of the acceptance of and the need for this type of thing in South Australia. The restaurant is not a fast-food outlet; rather, it is a restaurant which places emphasis on high-quality food and high-quality service at low cost. This sort

of establishment is much needed in Port Adelaide, and what impressed me most was the fact that it employs 130 people. That is great because those people are virtually all local people. It is a beautiful place, and I wish David Harcourt, the Manager, and his staff well for the future.

In closing my contribution to the Address in Reply, I welcome, in his absence, the new member for Custance. I hope that he makes a real contribution to this place and that he has an enjoyable and satisfactory parliamentary career ahead of him. I support the motion.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I also support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, thank the Governor for his speech at the opening of the second session of the 47th Parliament. I also add my congratulations to those other members who have already spoken in relation to the Governor Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan for the dignity with which they have carried out their role. Every time I see the Governor and Lady Dunstan I am reminded of the value of tradition, and I have a sense of history going back to our colonial origins. I felt this particularly at the Queen's birthday celebrations. I noticed this also at the 10th birthday celebrations of the reopening of the Old Parliament House where the Governor officiated and indicated with his good humour at that time why he is so respected by so many South Australians. I sincerely hope that he enjoys his imminent retirement which I understand he will spend working on his golf handicap. I cannot think of a better way to retire.

I would also like to welcome the new member for Custance. I have known the honourable member for a number of years and know him as an extremely diligent worker. I know him as a man of intense personal honesty, and I look forward to his contribution to Parliament. If his maiden speech is an indication of the way he will go, I am sure we will have many valuable contributions from him. In welcoming the new member for Custance, I specifically draw attention to the previous member for Custance and now Senator John Olsen who is well known in this House and who led the Liberal Party for so many years with such distinction and with great personal effort. As we all know, he won 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote at the last State election.

Having mentioned a sense of history when I mentioned the Governor I, in fact, reviewed my maiden speech, which I guess is historical in the sense that it is only something in the past. My maiden speech emphasised the importance of the arts in society as a barometer of the encouragement of excellence. In particular, I looked at the Adelaide Festival of Arts, and I was pleased, having read the report of the most recent Adelaide Festival, to see the economic result, as I feel that it is a good indicator of the value to a community of a thriving artistic area.

As well as the larger things such as the Festival and the Fringe, many smaller venues are also worthy of commendation. I speak particularly of venues such as the Prospect Art Gallery in my electorate. I congratulate the Prospect City Council for its long-standing commitment to the arts and community art and on having such a gallery with its thriving effect on the community in the local government area.

Whilst on the subject of the arts, I would like to draw the attention of the members to the state of the art in Parliament House. I remind members that they represent the people and, in fact, that it is the people's Parliament House. In a building such as this two types of art are usually seen, and the first reflects the times in which the building was constructed. I guess, given the history of this building

with its two halves (one having been built in 1889 and the other in 1939), it would give us a good opportunity to see the two periods. However, it is difficult, of course, to get paintings from both those periods. That, of course, would be a static collection, and I am not sure that I believe that is the way we should go.

I would personally be in favour of the second type of art in a building such as this, namely, a continually changing and challenging collection of art which is at the growing edge of art at the time. I suggest this in order to improve the art in this House, not to surround ourselves, as members of Parliament, with works of art. It should be done first, to encourage the pursuit of excellence; secondly, as a solid indication that we as parliamentarians regard the values inherent in the production of works of art as important in society; and, thirdly, as I mentioned before, in order to improve the House of the people.

I am sure that we would all appreciate, when we bring our constituents here on tours, having the House improved. However, I believe that we ought not do this without taking professional advice, and I point out that professionals from the Art Gallery of South Australia would be happy to provide this advice. One of them recently pointed out to me that merely reframing some of our art work would be a good start. However, perhaps to avoid the accusation of elitism, I would like to look at another methodology for perhaps improving our collection of what can become, in fact, historical collections in the future, that is, I would like to look at photography. This is, indeed, a relatively new art form, and Australia is one of the first civilised countries to actually come of age since photography has been improved to the extent that it is today.

I believe that we should look at approaching commercial firms for sponsorship of a collection and I intend to write to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee about this matter. Already in this place we have a number of precedents for photographic collections. For those members who have not seen these photographs on the wall (because, I must confess, they are not in a particularly good state), we have magnificent photographs of the first National Australasian Convention held in 1891 when representatives from the States first discussed federation. As members know, New Zealand was a party to that convention. In particular—and this is the real relevance for this House—we have beautiful photographs of the Federal Convention held in this Chamber in 1897 at which people of such historical and political note as Kingston and Barton were present. That was a magnificent presage to our federation in the union of the States. On that occasion New Zealand did not attend and it has shown no interest in federation since 1891.

When the convention met in Adelaide in March 1897, 10 delegates from all the five States attended, but Queensland did not attend. That convention met for a little more than a month. It then had a break and held another session of four weeks, which was the greatest period in any of the debates, so we have played a very significant part in federation.

Given that the topic of federation has again been raised now, I believe that we should place importance on that collection. We have other photographs of the federal convention which was held in Sydney. We also have photographs of old parliamentarians who have taken part in the parliamentary trophy, that is, a shooting match between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. In 1888 the House of Assembly won that trophy 247 to 242. Unfortunately, I have to report to the House that in the following year the result was reversed. Those are the only two photographs we have of what presumably was an annual event.

Of course, we have photographs of the twenty-sixth Parliament and of members of the Legislative Council of the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth Parliaments. One photograph shows members of the House of Assembly in the thirty-seventh Parliament, which was elected in March 1962 and which included famous names—five Premiers. We have our own photographs, not all of which have been displayed, but I am sure that the member for Playford will soon be included.

Mr Quirke: Mine was in six months ago.

Dr ARMITAGE: I am not sure of the reason for the delay, but let us have a bipartisan approach to the hanging committee. South Australia has a number of great events leading up to the year 2000 and beyond and I believe that we should look at promoting these events more vigorously.

I stand on the front bench as a prime example of the old statement that in politics a week is a long time. I looked at the Governor's speech when he opened the previous session of Parliament on 8 February 1990. On that occasion the Governor indicated that his Government would put the basic priorities of Government at the forefront of all financial and administrative planning. The first of these priorities that he mentioned was health, so where was the practical evidence of this basic priority being put at the forefront of all financial and administrative planning in the previous session of Parliament? The answer is 'Nowhere'. Given my new responsibilities (and I recognise the task ahead and look forward to the challenge), I sought to locate in the Governor's speech opening this session directions or the methodology as to how this basic priority, as it was termed before, would be at the forefront. I was flabbergasted to find that an area such as the health budget, which accounts for 21 per cent of the total State budget, did not rate a single mention in the Governor's speech. In an urgency debate shortly afterwards, the Minister of Finance indicated as follows:

There are some things that this Government believes have to be maintained at a very high standard. We believe there are some areas in which we will not compromise. These areas include health.

He continues:

The Government will continue to fund these areas at a rate which we believe South Australia wants and which South Australia will appreciate.

I presume, in the absence of any mention of the health area in the Governor's speech, that this means that the Government believes that the *status quo* is appropriate for health. Presumably, this means that the waiting lists will remain as they are and, as of today, if someone rang the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to seek an ear, nose and throat outpatient appointment, they would have to wait until January 1991. These statistics do not refer only to glue ears—they relate to major things like hearing losses which have debilitating social effects.

Mr Meier: January 1991?

Dr ARMITAGE: Yes, January 1991. If someone rang to make an orthopaedics outpatient clinic appointment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, they would have to wait until 1 March 1991. And that is just for the appointment! Once the patient has seen a doctor, they can attend the clinic and go on to the operating waiting list.

An honourable member interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: That was done via a local doctor. Once this herculean task of getting onto the waiting lists for the clinic and for the operation is completed, that further unnecessary wait is incurred. If the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance believe that this is what 'South Australians want and appreciate', they are misinformed. Of course, this problem may not affect them or members opposite if

they are like many of their mates—the class best described as capitalist socialists who are immune to such distressing things as waiting lists, because they are privately insured. One should just ask the Prime Minister and his wife how long they waited for their recent and much publicised surgery.

The *status quo* is not good enough. In the absence of any mention in the Governor's speech about medicine, does this mean that the *status quo* is to remain in relation to country hospitals. Communities are potentially being denied acute services. Does it mean that, if doctors will not practise in towns without hospitals—and they will not—teachers will not go there, either? I presume this means that the *status quo* is acceptable, which indicates that whole country communities are at risk.

I do not believe that this *status quo* is good enough. Does the absence of any mention of the health area in the Governor's speech indicate that the *status quo* is acceptable in terms of deinstitutionalisation? If this is the case, the Government is ignoring the quite legitimate claims of people who, for years, have looked after their own disabled children at no cost to the State. This *status quo* is unacceptable.

Does the absence of any mention of health in the Governor's speech mean that the *status quo* is acceptable in terms of ambulance services, where volunteer numbers are grossly depleted, where there are huge financial overruns, and where the closure of stations is presaged because of financial constraints? This *status quo* is simply not good enough.

Does the absence of any mention of health in the Governor's speech mean that the *status quo* regarding capital expenditure is acceptable? I tell the Government that the *status quo* regarding the replacement of equipment is simply not good enough. South Australians deserve to be at the forefront of technology; our diagnostic equipment must be up to the standard that we continually hear will prevail in this world university (about which we have heard so much), and Technology Park. I applaud all those values but, if they are to be upheld in our institutions, they ought to apply to our hospitals. The *status quo* regarding capital expenditure is simply not good enough.

After all this, the South Australian Health Commission had the gall to arrange a meeting of diagnostic related groups attended by 80 clinicians, held in an Adelaide hotel and involving an afternoon seminar, afternoon tea and dinner at no cost. The priorities are wrong. However, it is not surprising that these priorities are wrong because they emanate from a Government that seeks to muddy the waters to the extent that we have seen from this Government. I would like to cite the 'hit list' which has previously been quoted. If this is not a classic muddying of the waters, I will 'go he for chasey'. I figure in one element of this hit list, because I seek the installation of a stop-go light at the Fitzroy Terrace-Main North Road corner.

No road work or line marking is necessary; no landscaping is involved—only one single red/green light and, I accept, maybe a little bit of electrical wiring. The cost in the Premier's document for that is \$200 000. I can nearly buy the homes that are affected for this amount of money. I suggest to the Minister of Transport: first, that this estimate is grossly extravagant for the work that I suggested his department should look at; secondly, if this is an example of costing in his department, it is no wonder transport is so costly; and, thirdly, if he wishes to give me the contract for \$100 000—half the price—I will do the work quickly and not only keep my constituents happy but also pocket plenty of change.

Mr Ferguson: You will mess up the traffic, but don't worry about that.

Dr ARMITAGE: Traffic would not be messed up one skerrick. In my maiden speech in this House I talked about the Adelaide electorate, and I again affirm my commitment to it. It is a unique electorate which contains many of the virtues of which South Australians are justifiably proud.

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: Absolutely. I remind the House when I talk about the virtues of the electorate of Adelaide that I talk about our parklands—those beautiful areas that have been described many times as the lungs of the city, and with the traffic and transport in Adelaide today we need more lungs. My first question in Parliament sought assurances that, if the 1998 Commonwealth Games bid was successful, there would be no infrastructure for athletics or other events in the parklands. I was pleased to receive that assurance, but I remind members opposite and others who may talk about the parklands that this is vital.

Mr Ferguson: They can put it down at the Grange Oval if they like. We will take it.

Dr ARMITAGE: As long as it is not in the parklands.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue his speech without assistance from the member for Henley Beach.

Dr ARMITAGE: The parklands presently have the spectre having over it of further disruption as a result of the Grand Prix. I openly declare, as I have to all my electors, that I am a fan of the Grand Prix but I believe the time during which the parklands are affected by the infrastructure ought to be grossly curtailed.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide does not need assistance from the member for Alexandra, either. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Dr ARMITAGE: Later I will bring to the focus of this House plans to ensure that the parklands are not alienated for any longer than is absolutely necessary. Another feature of the electorate of Adelaide is its built heritage which is becoming more and more in focus—and well it might. At present the central business district is having great difficulties because of increasing taxes and poor economic circumstances. The number of empty buildings is a great indicator of this. I note that the South Australian Government is one of the major tenants in taking up more and more of these empty buildings. I also note moves to improve the amenities of Hutt Street—one of our most Parisian areas. The North Terrace boulevard—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ARMITAGE: I am just coming to North Terrace. The North Terrace boulevard is one of our cultural tourist gems. In this day and age, when 'anti-tourism' is becoming so popular, this is a great virtue for our tourist industry, and I think is at present under sold. I congratulate Daniel Thomas, the Emeritus Director of the Art Gallery, on his fine contribution to art in South Australia. I ask the House to note that he is the only emeritus director of an art gallery in Australia.

I also emphasise the Zoo which is undertaking new programs, first, 'Take Away the Bars', with which I am sure every member of this House will empathise and, having spoken to the Director recently, I am told another program concerns adults being encouraged to go to the zoo, perhaps without their children, so that they can relax and look at the animals without the bars. The zoo has done magnificent work on the restaurant, where one can have a pleasant meal

outside in the Elder rotunda which was donated by Sir Thomas Elder.

What I am most pleased about in representing the electorate of Adelaide is the people. I am sure that all members know that this is what being a member of Parliament is all about. As I go around to senior citizen clubs, sporting groups, the district nurses, school councils, kindergartens, the Trees for Life group, local councils, and all such bodies, as all members would know only too well, I see the enormous involvement that constituents have with their own community. I admire them enormously as sincere, courageous and well-meaning community-minded people.

However, what distresses me is the fact that since I have come into this Parliament—a mere eight months ago—my constituents have been placed under more and more pressure and their lives have become more affected because of policy directions society is taking under State and Federal Labor Governments. As I mentioned before, I believe that this is unfair to these sincere, courageous and well-meaning community-minded people. I again indicate to my constituents that I look forward to further work on their behalf to give them more control over their own lives, which will allow them and their families greater dignity.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Today during Question Time, I suppose because I felt very strongly on the issue, I made an outburst concerning the death of one of my constituents. Whilst I offended the Standing Orders of this House, I make no apology for the fact that I made that outburst in the way I did.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That is no reflection at all, although the honourable member may try to construe that. I have personally apologised to the Speaker. I have a very strong feeling about road accidents, and indeed about the railway industry from whence I came. I am aware of the impact it has not only on the family but also on the crews involved in that particular area.

For members opposite to try to misconstrue that as an affront to the Speaker is inappropriate and I know that he knows the true position. I said that I would comment on the contribution of the member for Bright earlier today. I read carefully what the member for Bright had to say. His words—and I quote from *Hansard*—were:

It is a subject over which the Government has had its head in the sand for too long, that is, city violence.

That is part of the contribution he made on Tuesday night. Twice he made references in his contribution to 'under this Government', clearly implying that it was the fault of the Minister and/or this Government in relation to crime. I went to the library today and looked at the incidence of crime between 1979 and 1982. I will not read that information into *Hansard*, because I do not believe that any good would come from it, but I draw the attention of the honourable member who made the personal explanation to the incidence of crime between 1979 and 1982. At no time did I or any member of the then Opposition imply that crime was the responsibility of the Government of the day.

We did not blame it. I do not believe that there is any member in this House who would condone any incidence of crime—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Were you here then?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: Absolutely—I was here. I was on the receiving end of the member for Alexandra's friend, Mr Nigel Buick, and his filthy and disgusting ads. That is well and truly recorded in *Hansard*. Let me address some of the issues about which the member for Bright claims the Government has buried its head in the sand. I refer to criminal justice reform in South Australia, which has reflected five broad themes, as follows:

- a willingness to confront and deal with previously hidden problems such as sexual assault, child abuse and domestic violence;
- a greater effort to protect the public, especially those most at risk from crime;
- more concern for the rights and needs of victims;
- a determination to toughen prison sentences for serious and violent offences but to use alternatives to gaol where possible and appropriate;
- streamlining the criminal justice system so it is more accessible and less intimidating.

I now refer to policing powers, which have been extended in SA in a number of areas, including the Telecommunications (Interception) Act 1988 and the Listening Devices Act, which has been amended to allow the NCA as well as the South Australian police to use listening devices.

Following the recommendations of the Mitchell committee and the Australian Law Reform Commission, police powers to undertake investigations and to stop and search persons or vehicles suspected of involvement in offences have been reviewed and clarified. Police may also detain a person for questioning for four hours. The Firearms Act has also been amended. The Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles) Regulations have made it an offence to possess certain items. The Criminal Investigators (Extra Territorial Offences) Act also has been enacted to enable investigations to be pursued in other Australian jurisdictions.

I refer also to the Neighbourhood Watch scheme. All members of the House know that I have been deeply involved in that program. I refer also to a community policing program to stamp out the incidence of crime and vandalism in the community and to bring the community together to try to work as a cohesive force to attack not only the incidence of crime but in many ways the reason why we have crime in the community, and hence my reference in my contribution last night about addressing the issue.

Why do we have crime in the community? That is the issue. Is it because some of these kids were sexually, violently and physically abused when they were young? Did they see the violence in their own homes and believe that it is part and parcel of what is acceptable in the community? Those are indeed the sorts of issues about which I feel strongly. It is rather interesting—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed; it is exactly as my colleague says. The honourable member implies, whether deliberately or not (and I believe it was deliberate), that the crime rate is the fault of the Government and members on this side. It is that to which I took offence, and I make no apology for it. I challenge the honourable member to go through *Hansard* since 1979 up to the present time and count the number of contributions that I have made, both in Opposition and in Government, on law and order issues—

Mr Matthew interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: He's all mouth—what a clown! The fact of the matter is that, when the member opposite points to some of the initiatives that this Government and I have

been able to bring into effect, he will have something to talk about. The reality is that any person who was willing to address these issues in a pragmatic way would see the real situation. I reiterate my great sympathy for the person against whom violence was perpetrated—but the manner in which blame was implied, whether deliberately or otherwise, as the fault of this Government cannot be accepted.

No one can guarantee the safety of a person in the street. Neither I nor anyone else can guarantee a person's safety. That cannot be done anywhere in the world, yet that is what the honourable member implied. Certainly, it was a debased contribution, and I will never walk away from that statement. Therefore, I challenge the member to look at the Office of Crime Statistics information released by the Auditor-General. Further, leading up to the State election last year, the Premier invited the Leader of the Opposition to become involved in a coalition against crime. What has the Government received from the Leader of the Opposition—nothing!

Mr Oswald: Political!

Mr HAMILTON: One can always rely on the member for Morphet to get involved. Does he claim that the Police Commissioner is involved in a political stunt? Does he say that about Mr Rathman of the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, or Mr Whitrod from Victims of Crime, Ms Sue Vardon from the Department of Community Welfare, Mr Lovegrove from the UTLC or Mr Webster from the Youth Affairs Division, Department of Employment and TAFE, Dr Sutton from the Crime Prevention Policy Unit, Ms Ruby Hammond from the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and Mr Kidney from OARS?

Is he saying that they are politically motivated in this area? Judges and other people are involved in this particular field. I reiterate: I believe that the manner in which the member made his contribution last night did nothing to enhance the debate on law and order issues in this State. As the member for Bright would be well aware, two of his colleagues have commended me on my involvement in pursuing law and order issues in this State. He cannot deny that. The member for Bright well knows that the member for Fisher and the member for Hayward have commended me on my involvement in those particular areas. Indeed, one of them accompanied us to a conference in Melbourne on vandalism and graffiti.

There is no doubt that in relation to the member for Bright I have hit on a raw nerve with this issue. Let him have a look at the voluminous amount of stuff that this Government has put out in just the past few months in relation to these issues. Let him do a bit of work in relation to what the Government has done since it has been in office. If he is as intelligent as he says he is, he should know the truth and have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and apologise for using this forum for an unfounded attack on the Government. That is the reality. Laugh he might, but the stark reality is that his contribution was foolish, inane and did nothing. I say again: I think he is a coner.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Each day in this Parliament an hour or so is set aside for formal Question Time, an opportunity given to members on both sides of the House to raise questions relating to their district the State, or Government administration. Traditionally, that period has been provided in order to have on the record the formal answers to questions raised associated with the arenas I have mentioned. It may be only by coincidence, but in recent years since television cameras were allowed in the House of Assembly Chamber Question Time has progressively become a rabble.

It has become an opportunity for members on both sides of the House, including Ministers, simply to grandstand, waste the time of the House and destroy the useful purpose traditionally provided for by way of Question Time. In fact, as a result of these collective acts, many members are denied the opportunity to ask any questions at all.

The backbench members on this side of the House, like me, have questions that we believe are important and we seek to get them on the listings as is currently the arrangement. Because others in more senior positions in the respective Parties—and I suggest this applies on both sides of the House—think otherwise, all members really do not get an equal opportunity. It is probably reasonable that the respective Parties, both in Government and in Opposition, give proper priority to the executive and senior members to ask questions of State importance, and the like, with the rest of the members coming afterwards. However, in recent times there has been little time left afterwards.

I have been seeking to get a question on this listing for a day or two during this current session. Because I have been denied for the reasons that I have just touched on, I want to pose the question in this grievance debate. I just hope that the Minister of Marine will pick it up and answer me through the channels at his earliest convenience. The question is whether the Minister will reaffirm the State Government's long-standing commitment to the continuity of a regular sea freighting link between mainland South Australia and the port of Kingscote on Kangaroo Island. That commitment has been honoured by Governments of both persuasions since the phasing out of the Adelaide Steamship Company's involvement in that service many, many years ago.

I will support that question with a little bit of backup information. In other circumstances I would be seeking leave to explain but, without the encumbrance of that procedure, let me say that the Minister would be well aware of my personal observation of Mayor Morris's request to refrain from public comment about the *Island Seaway* during this calendar year. Almost without exception adherence to that effect has occurred. Her request was, 'to give the Government a go to get it right.' She said that at a meeting in Kingscote, the town of which she is mayor, in the presence of the Premier, the Minister, the shadow Minister at the time (Graham Ingerson), others and me late last year.

In light of the Minister's recently announced rescheduling of the ship, the dramatically increased linear foot space rates on the vessel and other proposed private sector services pending, rumours are rife that the life of the *Island Seaway* on the run to Port Lincoln is effectively over and its life on the run to Kingscote appears limited. The current rate hike that I have mentioned (I will provide more details in a moment) and the worst record of stoppage, mechanical breakdown and strike delay so far this year since the *Seaway's* commissioning in 1987 has further aggravated the uncertainty of future heavy freighting to and from the island port of Kingscote.

Most members present this evening were around in 1987 and they will recall that a space rate cost recovery system was adopted by the Government in order to try to recoup as much as possible of the operating costs of the *Island Seaway* in that Port Adelaide-Kingscote-Port Lincoln service. The rates adopted as a base or as a platform were those that had been inherited from the MV *Troubridge*, the predecessor vessel of the *Seaway*. We were told by the Government that an increase of the rate of the CPI would apply and that, each year, a further 10 per cent on CPI would be added. We were not invited to comment on that.

It was quickly pointed out to the Government, as it has been many times subsequently, that the multiplier effect of such a cost recovery policy would cause the ship to be out of reach of the community, that eventually it would price itself off the run and would become too expensive for the island consumers, in particular, to use. That policy has continued, with the disastrous effect that I have described over the past three years. Recently, on top of that policy, came this shock treatment as announced by the Minister.

The new rates for all cargo and empty returns on a linear foot basis from Adelaide to Kingscote have risen from \$8.70 to \$9.70, which is a substantially greater increase than the earlier mentioned disastrous cost recovery policy rate. From Kingscote to Port Lincoln, all cargo and empty returns on a per linear foot basis have increased from \$8.70 to \$12, representing an increase of almost 50 per cent.

The cost per linear foot basis for all cargo and empty returns on the run between Adelaide and Port Lincoln and return has risen from \$14.20 to \$28.30, again, almost a 100 per cent increase. In relation to the latter port service that I have mentioned, quite clearly the *Island Seaway* has priced itself out of existence. I doubt that, even on a contractual basis, the *Island Seaway* will in future be requested to go to Port Lincoln from Port Adelaide other than for the exercise of an empty trip. She is effectively out of business and has now been priced out of it by the Minister's announcement.

I want some answers and clarification from the Minister. Particularly, I want to know whether the Minister, on behalf of the Government, will reaffirm the Government's commitment to underwrite, guarantee or involve itself in a joint venture, if not a total operation of a regular freight service in the future for that community. I do not intend to suggest that the Government of South Australia should continue to own and operate its own freight link. That is not the purpose of my remarks at all. The purpose is for the Government to continue to guarantee that a freight service will apply to that community, an insurance so that, if it is taken over by a syndicate or a single private venturer or venturers, suddenly in their absence or for whatever reason our community at Kangaroo Island is not left floating without a sea-link service.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will address a matter that is of great concern to some of my constituents. As you, Sir, are aware, I have a country electorate, and I want to address the price of automotive gas in country centres. For some time now I have been concerned about the price differential in gas between the city and country areas. I wrote to both the main suppliers, Sagasco and Kleenheat, in order to ascertain the pricing structure of those organisations. Unfortunately, I received a reply from Sagasco only. According to Sagasco (and obviously it cannot speak for other companies), the base price is set by the Prices Surveillance Authority. Sagasco's purchase price ex Port Bonython has added to it the distribution costs to the retail site, a margin to cover cost of investment in storage, pipework and dispenser on the retail site, administration costs and a profit margin. At the end of that exercise, they say that the average price in Adelaide should be about 28c per litre, and about 33c per litre in the country.

My constituents, who have been following up this matter with me for some time, have obtained prices from various city and country areas, and it appears that nowhere in the city does the price of 28c per litre apply. It appears that in the city very heavy discounting applies and, on 1 July, the average price in the city was about 19.9c per litre. That is below the estimated price which Sagasco says should apply

in Adelaide, and well below the price at which it is sold in country areas such as Port Augusta. The cheapest price in Port Augusta was 33.7c per litre. As one can see, that is almost twice as much in the country as it is in the city.

This causes many problems for people in country areas. As members would be aware, they use heavy volumes of gas. Not only is it almost twice as expensive, but also, if they use it in vast volumes (as many people on the land do), it results in a very costly exercise compared with that in the city.

It seems to me that there must be another way to overcome this problem, in order to stop the big differential that exists between the country and the city. I find that not all people are happy with the pricing structure. In fact, Sagasco said that when the distributors give gas to the retailers they assume that only a profit margin will be put on. However, in fact, some of the retailers about whom I have information are not only charging a profit margin but also double dipping by charging a cost for the pipe work which, in fact, is put in by the distributor and is, therefore, already costed into the distributor's price.

This means that people in country areas are actually paying for that twice, so the profit margin of the retailer seems to be heavily inflated in that case. Why can it be discounted in Adelaide and not in country areas? As members are probably aware, the gas comes from Stony Point and travels past all those outlets that get the gas afterwards; it comes to Adelaide and is then transported back again. So, there is a double effort there which should not need to occur.

Why can that not be distributed *en route* to Adelaide? It leads to some conclusions about which I feel very strongly. There is, and continues to be, a very big differential between city and country in relation to prices. It also occurs in relation to petrol pricing, another issue about which I am becoming increasingly concerned. There is, and also continues to be heavy discounting of prices for auto gas in Adelaide, but this does not carry through to country areas.

Why can that not carry through to country areas? When this question was asked of Kleenheat by some of my constituents, the question was evaded. They did not offer any constructive comment. As the gas has to come past those country areas on its way to the city, why can it not be distributed *en route*? It raises many questions which need answering, and I will certainly follow this up with other gas companies to ascertain why the retailers are able to add on so much more than is being added on here in the city if, in fact, that is the case.

If they are making profits here in the city by charging 19.9c per litre, why is there a need for a charge of 33.7c and up to 34c a litre in country areas? In fact, some time ago I raised this matter in the House in a question to the Minister. At that time the gas price in Whyalla was approximately 16c a litre, while in Port Augusta, 75 kilometres away, it was 32c a litre—exactly double the price. Again, when Sagasco was questioned with regard to that pricing, it said (and I quote from its letter) that it could not understand how a retailer in a country area could be offering gas at 16c per litre.

I understand that the retailer who was offering the gas at that price was making a fairly good profit by doing so. It may be, in fact, that he was obtaining the gas direct from Stony Point, although I could not say whether that was the case. If that retailer could do it, why could other country centres not obtain gas direct from Stony Point instead of having to get it back from Adelaide after it had passed through their areas? That is of great concern to me.

As an additional anecdotal piece for the House, I spoke to my secretary this morning with regard to petrol pricing and was told that on the highway between Port Augusta and Adelaide one service station was now charging 71.9c per litre for petrol because of the problems in Kuwait. I just wonder how many other outlets in Adelaide, and perhaps in the country, will take the opportunity to put up prices at this very early stage for a necessary commodity. As one of the heavy users of petrol—

Mr Ferguson: We have not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach cannot share the adjournment debate with the member for Stuart. The member for Stuart has the floor.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This raises a whole range of concerns. There are people who are opportunists and who will take advantage of the fact that there will be a problem in the Middle East; they are already raising prices markedly up to 71.9c a litre. I wonder what that price will soar to in the coming weeks.

Those are the two issues I wish to raise tonight. I can assure members that I will follow up the differential in the price of gas with the companies concerned. I hope to achieve some sort of resolution, or instil some sort of sanity, in relation to the method of pricing for those sorts of commodities.

Motion carried.

At 5.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 August at 2 p.m.