

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 September 1990

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

ROAD TRANSPORT CHARGES

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That this House opposes the proposals of the Inter-State Commission relating to road transport charges and condemns them as being discriminatory against South Australia and in particular its country industries and residents and calls on the Minister of Transport to make the strongest possible representation to the Federal Government to ensure that South Australia is not disadvantaged.

The Inter-State Commission was established to rethink road charges. It has now come up with a proposal that will be extremely difficult for most transport operators to follow. I refer particularly to transport operators in country South Australia. It is my view that this scheme was implemented to try to overcome a problem in the eastern States, where the Governments of the day were trying to force general freight from the road back onto rail. In South Australia, where we do not have a rail system that could effectively take the place of the road transport system, it means that the whole of South Australia, and particularly country South Australia, will be paying for a problem that is ostensibly that of the eastern States.

On 9 August I sought from the Minister information as to what action the State Government was to take in relation to opposing the proposals of the Inter-State Commission. The Minister said that he was having a considered view of the proposals compiled and that he expected this to be released prior to the ATAC meeting. I understand that the ATAC meeting is tomorrow, but at this stage we do not have a considered Government reply to these proposals. The Minister went on to say that he was not unsympathetic towards the suggestions that had been put forward. We need to examine the proposals of the Inter-State Commission. Its main recommendations on road charges are:

1. A tonne per kilometre of road maintenance tax should be introduced. The tax should be paid in advance. All charges for articulated trucks will be levied on the trailer.
2. Six-axle articulated livestock trucks should pay 11.9c per kilometre, or according to the ISC, \$21 400 a year.
3. Three-axle rigid trucks should pay 5.1c per kilometre or, according to the ISC, \$3 000 per year.
4. Charge monitoring devices should be installed on every trailer. As an alternative, operators with several trailers per prime mover would have the option of paying \$28 560 for a transferable trailer licence.
5. State fuel taxes should be abolished and the Commonwealth tax on petrol increased by 5.1c a litre as compensation. (This recommendation is unlikely to be accepted, so livestock transporters would lose one of the few off-setting benefits in the ISC Report.)

Some of the criticisms that have been put forward of this proposal are:

1. Livestock transporters and our rural customers just can't afford to pay the massive increases being proposed by the Inter-State Commission. At a time when Australia needs exports as never before, why cripple the export oriented rural sector?
2. The ISC fails to take account of the fact that livestock transporters are only loaded for 44 per cent of the distance travelled, compared to 86 per cent for general freight operators. This alone should halve costs for livestock transporters.
3. The Inter-State Commission has also failed to take account of the fact that livestock transporters use significantly more fuel per kilometre than general freight operators. This means livestock transporters make a much greater contribution to the use of the roads.

On average, the Inter-State Commission reckoned that vehicles used 56 litres per 100 kilometres. But livestock transporters with six-axle articulated trucks commonly use between 67 and 73 litres per 100 kilometres and so pay between 20 per cent and 30 per cent more in fuel tax. Livestock transporters with road trains are even worse off as they use between 115 and 135 litres per 100 kilometres and pay more than twice as much in fuel tax.

4. Livestock transporters do not use city roads which contribute so much to the costs allocated to trucks by the Inter-State Commission. For the first time, the Inter-State Commission has tried to include atmospheric pollution, noise and congestion costs. None of these costs apply to livestock transporters to any real degree.

One could also question the basis for the commission attempting to include atmospheric pollution, noise and congestion as road transport costs, when any cost assessments have to be extremely arbitrary.

I want to read into the record a submission that was presented by one of my local transport operators, Quinn Transport Pty Ltd, as I believe it adequately sums up the concerns of that operator—and of most others. It is as follows:

The Federal Government appointed an Inter-State Commission to report on an optional way of cost recovery for the road transport industry. This has been done and the Federal Government released the report on 8 May for comments from the industry and others. Unfortunately, it took some time to be circulated and the industry had just become fully aware of its implications when submission or comments closed on 13 July 1990. Even more concerning is the fact that the commission has been disbanded and the Chairman is to give his conclusions or submissions by the end of July to the Federal Government for further action which may be implemented.

The cost increases that these recommendations, if implemented, will have on Rural Eyre Peninsula will, I believe, be catastrophic as all freight to and from Eyre Peninsula is committed to be moved in and out by road, and as there is no rail service, rail transport is not an option (the operation of the *Island Seaway* speaks for itself).

All general freight, from grocery items (all foodstuffs, drink, etc.) to components for all manufacturing industry (this will be a further disincentive for any industry to start up on Eyre Peninsula) such as machinery, cars, chemicals, agricultural requirements—the list is nearly endless—has to come in by road. Rural produce, that is, wool, livestock, grains, fish, meat, fertilisers (in transit store to store) etc. will incur extra freight costs as all are freighted from the Eyre Peninsula by road transport and the distance to transport the produce is quite large, that is, Cummins to Adelaide—650 kilometres.

As the proposed charges are based roughly on a fuel tax and a tonne kilometre charge, it stands to reason that Eyre Peninsula residents, through their long distances from markets and suppliers, are going to bear the greatest cost in South Australia if these charges are to be implemented.

There will also be a great possibility that some town or areas will lose their local carriers, or services will be restricted in some areas, due to the proposed up-front charges recommended. It still remains unclear as to what the recommendations are for smaller farm trucks and what will happen to the State Government primary producers concession rates.

If the recommendations are implemented, I believe that the proposed cost increases detailed in this report will be the absolute minimum rises as there will more than likely be other imposts that will be filtered into the system than we are led to believe.

In recent years, due to the low returns, labour costs, high plant and equipment prices, farmers have turned to carriers to shift their grain to local silos or grain terminals. With these proposed cost increase implications the whole internal grain cartage infrastructure (road) on Eyre Peninsula will have to be reviewed with an obvious increase in charges and freight rates and a possible decrease in services.

Mr Quinn goes on to list a number of situations in relation to various trucks. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a number of tables that give examples of the actual cost increases and provide comparisons between the previous cost and the proposed cost for articulated vehicles, that is, normal triaxle semitrailers and road trains.

The SPEAKER: Are the tables purely statistical?

Mr BLACKER: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Articulated Vehicle

Example 1:

Transporting general freight—1 350 km round trip

Configuration	Tare (Tonnes)	Payload (Tonnes)	Gross (Tonnes)
Prime mover (3 axle)	9	—	—
Trailer (3 axle)	7	26	42

Parameters

Distance: trip—1 350 km trip
annual—145 000 km p.a.

State fuel franchise rate—Zone 3—3.465c/L

State prime mover registration—\$2 443 p.a.

State commercial trailer fee (current)—\$150 p.a.

Fuel consumption rate—55L/100 km

Current Charge

Fuel impost: Zone 3

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fuel charge} &= \text{distance} \times \text{fuel consumption rate} \times \text{fuel charge rate} \\ &= 145\,000 \text{ km} \times 55\text{L}/100 \text{ km} \times (0.24136 \\ &\quad + \$0.03465)/\text{L} \\ &= 1\,450 \times 55 \times \$0.2760/\text{L} \\ &= \$22\,011 \end{aligned}$$

Registration

Prime mover	\$2 443
Trailer	\$ 150
	<u>\$2 593</u>

Total current charge—\$24 604

Proposed ISC Charge

Fuel impost:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fuel charge} &= \text{distance} \times \text{fuel consumption rate} \times \text{fuel charge rate} \\ &= 145\,000 \times 55\text{L}/100 \text{ km} \times 24.136\text{c}/\text{L} \\ &= 1\,350 \times 55 \times \$0.24136 \text{ (assumed State fuel franchise relinquished)} \\ &= \$19\,248 \end{aligned}$$

Mass Distance Charge

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mass distance charge} &= \text{distance} \times \text{charge rate} \\ &= 145\,000 \times \$0.0756 \\ &= \$10\,962 \end{aligned}$$

Note: Trailer distance based on prime mover distance for comparison purposes.

Mr BLACKER: These figures have been set out to draw a comparison between the present and the proposed cost. It is estimated that, if an interest factor is allowed on the up-front payments of \$30 210, a further charge of \$4 125 is to be added, making a total cost of \$34 335. In this instance, the unit would face an annual increase in charges of \$5 606 (or 5.6 per cent), and that is shown in the current freight rates table. If the interest factor is included, it represents an annual increase in the freight rate of \$9 731 (or 9.75 per

cent). I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* another small table identifying the freight rates from Adelaide to Cleve and return as applied to individual items.

The SPEAKER: Is that table purely statistical?**Mr BLACKER:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Freight Rates Table—Adelaide to Cleve and Return

Item	Current	5.6%	9.75%
	\$	Increase \$	Increase \$
Wool (per bale)	7.00	7.40	7.70
Bricks (per tonne)	35.00	37.00	38.40
205L drum (per drum)	12.50	13.20	13.70
Car tyre (per tyre)	2.50	2.65	2.75
Pine post (per post)	0.50	0.53	0.55
Pallet (1) (groceries)	60.00	63.50	66.00

Mr BLACKER: Freight will cost an extra 70c per bale of wool, another 25c per car tyre, another 5c for a pine post, etc. Mr Quinn identified further factors for consideration, as follows:

1. General freight has to have the back-up facilities of small delivery trucks and if costs rise for them the cost increases will have to be borne out by yet a further rise in freight rates.

2. With additional CPI cost increases a rise of between 12 and 18 per cent is a likely scenario.

3. As in the livestock transport industry basic similar problems with general freight exist in that the end cost has to be borne by the rural population of Eyre Peninsula who are being penalised by where they live.

4. These cost projections do not allow for extra ongoing costs such as:

(a) fitment of measuring devices (suggested \$1 000 per trailer); and

(b) additional clerical staff costs to administer a tonne kilometre or road maintenance tax.

5. I would be very concerned if the ISC proposal was accepted with regard to the inability to contain further increases.

6. I feel that substantial employment positions will be lost on Eyre Peninsula.

Having mentioned ordinary articulated trucks. I make reference to another road transport operator who has given details on a cost basis in a similar way to Mr Quinn. He has compared the costs for individual trucks. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* another table which lists the range of trucks and compares the existing cost with that proposed by the Inter-State Commission.

The SPEAKER: Is that table purely statistical?**Mr BLACKER:** Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Inter-State Commission (ISC) Road Use Charges and Vehicle Registration: A National Scheme

Summary of Charge Comparisons: Existing with ISC Proposed

Example:

	Gross (Tonnes)	Annual Distance (km)	Current* Charge \$	ISC Proposed \$	Annual Increase (Decrease) \$	Increase (Decrease)/ Payload \$	CTAC‡ 2c/Litre inc/(dfc) \$
A. Articulated							
1. Interstate General (6 axle)	42.0	185 000	27 933	41 437	13 504	n.a.	(3 757)
2. Interstate General (6 axle)	42.0	100 000	16 203	22 398	6 195	n.a.	(3 135)
3. Interstate Car Carrier (5 axle)	33.0	232 000	37 527	27 438	(5 089)	(\$6.50/car)	(2 816)
4. (a) Interstate Agricultural (6 axle)	34.0	260 000	43 931	36 408	(7 523)	(4.7c/10 kg)	(5 442)
(b) Interstate General	42.5	260 000	43 931	60 336	16 405	n.a.	(5 442)
5. Interstate Agricultural (6 axle)	37.0	260 000	44 706	44 069	(637)	(48c/tonne)	(5 483)
6. Intrastate Grain (6 axle)	42.0	200 000	32 475	41 187	8 712	20c/tonne	(4 248)
7. Intrastate Cattle (6 axle)	42.0	100 000	18 261	21 197	2 936	40c/hd	(3 494)
8. Interstate Parcel (6 axle)	42.5	300 000	44 687	54 348	9 661	\$10/tonne	(5 483)
B. B doubles							
1. Petrol Tanker	63.05	200 000	27 477	44 220	16 743	0.146 c/L	(4 477)
2. General Freight	57.0	205 000	38 533	39 821	1 288	n.a.	(5 314)

	Gross (Tonnes)	Annual Distance (km)	Current* Charge \$	ISC Proposed \$	Annual Increase (Decrease) \$	Increase (Decrease)/ Payload \$	CTAC‡ 2c/Litre inc/(dfc) \$
C. Road Train†							
1. General (triple)	114.7	210 000	54 184	110 280	56 096	\$11/tonne	(8 080)
2. Grain (double)	75.0	160 000	37 070	55 859	18 789	\$0.77/tonne	(5 707)

n.a. Not available.

* Based on Zone 3 State franchise fee.

† ISC have stated that they are reviewing charges for road trains.

‡ CTAC proposal is that mass-distance charges be replaced with a general fuel (petrol-diesel) excise equivalent of 2c/L.

Mr BLACKER: It appears that, for a double road train operating on Eyre Peninsula, the annual increase will be approximately \$18 789 per vehicle. In the north, where triple road trains are used for stock haulage, the annual increase will be \$56 096. From that observation, it is clear that the cost of living for all country people will increase.

I mentioned Mr Quinn's figures in respect of the cost of an articulated vehicle. I now draw a similar comparison for a double road train. I will also supply figures on all ranges and configurations of trucks including B doubles and full road trains. Shortly, I will seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* other statistical information which will draw a comparison between the details concerned.

The example I quote is for a double road train, which relates to the local scene, operating a 50 tonne grain payload on the Cowell to Port Lincoln run and travelling 160 000 kilometres per annum. The table identifies the prime mover, the various axles, the parameters, the current charge and the proposed increased charge, and gives a fee comparison to which I will refer shortly. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is the table of purely a statistical nature?

Mr BLACKER: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Road Train

Example 2:

Double trailer road train operating 50 tonne grain payload on Cowell-Port Lincoln and travelling 160 000 km p.a.

A. Configuration

	Tare (tonnes)	Payload (tonnes)	Gross (tonnes)
Prime mover	10.0	—	10.0
1st trailer (3 axle)	6.0	24.0	30.0
2nd trailer (3 axle)	6.0	26.0	32.0
Dolly	3.0	—	3.0
			<u>35.0</u>
			75.0

B. Parameters

Distance: trip—330 km

annual—160 000 km p.a.

Commonwealth diesel excise rate—24.136c/L

State fuel franchise rate—Zone 3—3.465c/L

State prime mover registration fee (current)—\$2 516 p.a.

State commercial trailer fee (current) × 2—\$300 p.a.

State dolly fee—\$33 p.a.

State permit fee—\$1 100 p.a.

Fuel consumption—75L/100 km

C. Current Charge

(1) Fuel impost:

Zone 3 (i.e. assumes all fuel purchased in Zone 3)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fuel charge} &= \text{distance} \times \text{fuel consumption rate} \times \text{fuel} \\ &\quad \text{charge rate} \\ &= 160\,000 \text{ km} \times 75\text{L}/100 \text{ km} \times (\$0.24136 + \\ &\quad \$0.03465)/\text{L} \\ &= 1\,600 \times 75 \times \$0.2760/\text{L} \\ &= \$33\,121 \end{aligned}$$

(2) Registration:

prime mover	\$2 516
trailer	\$ 300
dolly	\$ 33
permit fee	\$1 100
	<u>\$3 949</u>

D. Proposed ISC Charge

(Note: ISC have stated that they are reviewing charges for road trains, given the size of the proposed increases.)

(1) Fuel impost:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fuel charge} &= \text{distance} \times \text{fuel consumption rate} \times \text{fuel} \\ &\quad \text{charge rate} \\ &= 160\,000 \text{ km} \times 75\text{L}/100 \text{ km} \times \\ &\quad \$24.136\text{c}/\text{L} \\ &= 1\,600 \times 75 \times \$0.24136 \\ &= \$28\,963 \end{aligned}$$

(2) Mass distance charge:

$$\text{Mass distance charge} = \text{distance} \times \text{charge rate}$$

$$\text{Trailer 1} = 160\,000 \times \$0.0522$$

$$= \$8\,352$$

$$\text{Trailer 2} = 160\,000 \times \$0.1159$$

$$= \$18\,544$$

(Note: (i) trailer 2 rate based on 5 axle dog trailer rate;
(ii) distance based on prime mover distance for comparison purposes;
(iii) assumes State permit fee would abolished.)

$$\text{Total Proposed Charge} = \$55\,859$$

E. Fee Comparison

Based on the parameters and assumptions made, the operator in this instance would face an annual increase in charges (fuel and registration) in the order of \$18 789.

On the basis of 485 trips (Cowell-Port Lincoln 330 km round trip), the increases would represent an additional \$39/trip. On a payload of 50 tonnes this would represent an additional cost of around \$0.77/tonne.

Mr BLACKER: I appreciate the latitude the House has given to me in this instance because it is difficult to relate number by number and item by item the complexities of this particular issue. In drawing a comparison in relation to a road train based on the parameters and the assumptions made, which are the actual operating parameters used by operators in my area, in this instance, this operator would face an annual increase in charges for fuel and registration of about \$18 789. On the basis of 485 trips between Cowell and Port Lincoln—a 330 kilometre round trip—the increase would represent an additional \$39 per trip and, on a payload of 50 tonnes, this would represent an additional cost of about 70c a tonne.

I have rushed rather hurriedly through some of the details involved, but I have raised them in this way because of my concern with the commitment that the Minister of Transport may give to the Federal Minister, and the damage that could well be done to South Australia in general. I repeat what I said earlier: there is no doubt in my mind that the Inter-State Commission has embarked on a system to overcome a problem that applies in the eastern States. In so doing, it will saddle South Australia, and probably Western Australia and the rest of Australia, with increased costs and increased transport difficulties, because there is no doubt in the world that many people will not be able to survive.

I will relate the figures I have just quoted to the example of a certain transport operator. As his name has been supplied to me, I am sure he will not mind my using it. I refer to Jim Llewellyn of Llewellyn Transport, who owns seven double road trains and has contracted to cart grain from the road serviced silos to Port Lincoln. These contractors are not allowed to operate in competition with rail; it is arbitrarily stated that they cannot operate in direct compe-

tition with rail serviced silos. Furthermore, they have to operate on a designated route as determined by the Highways Department. So, they are strictly controlled and the maintenance of their trucks is very much under control. The surface area of the brakes is double that of a normal semitrailer, and generally the safety standards are far in excess of those required for any other vehicle on the road. Mr Llewellyn, who owns seven road trains and four triaxle semitrailers, is facing an account, if this proposal goes through, of some \$645 000.

That is an upfront charge which has to be found immediately this system is introduced. There has been a Government statement to the effect 'We will ease back on that and charges can be paid on a quarterly basis.' However, it is an impossible task for any contractor to find \$645 000 upfront, and I would venture to say that no bank would lend Mr Llewellyn or anyone else who applied for more than \$500 000 or, in this case, \$645 000 as an advance for Government charges. So, we have a very serious situation concerning this contractor and also Mr Rodney Quinn and his firm. He jointly carts grain and is probably one of the larger stock carriers. Where do these people stand presently when they contract for the cartage of grain to Co-operative Bulk Handling on a three year term? Must they allow for these extra charges, or do other competitors tender on the basis that they will not pay those fees?

I refer not only to these transport operators but to Co-operative Bulk Handling which, in turn, is comprised of the farmers of the area, who are just dangling on a string as they do not know where they are at and what their costs of production will be because of the freight components that will be included. This is a very serious matter, but it has not been raised previously except by the member for Mount Gambier during his Address in Reply contribution. Likewise, he represents a number of heavy transport operators who use Mount Gambier as a base, and similarly they would be affected.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I acknowledge that in the South-East would be the biggest concentration of road hauliers in the State, because they provide a service between Melbourne and Adelaide. In this case, while I support the comments of the member for Mount Gambier, I also defend the rights and interests of my constituents. I refer not only to those transport operators; there is a scaling down factor. The cost per kilometre is less for a small truck operator as it is based on fewer kilometres travelled per year. Thus the bigger the transport operator, the more heavily he is penalised. I appreciate the time constraints and I acknowledge and thank the Opposition Whip for the courtesy extended me in allowing me to proceed this morning. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MORIALTA CONSERVATION PARK

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

That this House notes the failure of the Government to manage effectively the Morialta Conservation Park, commends the work of volunteers in caring for the park and urges consideration of Morialta as a pilot project to establish whether the park can be managed more effectively and economically for a three year trial period under contract to the private sector in cooperation with the volunteers.

Five years ago this motion would have embodied what was then considered to be a very radical suggestion. Today, I believe that the suggestion is by no means radical: it is practical and could be implemented almost immediately,

and I urge the Government to consider and adopt it. The history of the Morialta Conservation Park during the time I have represented the District of Coles appears to me to be one of more than a decade of neglect and indifference. Further, in the case of the present Minister and her predecessor, it is one of almost hostility to the needs of the park and to those residents surrounding it.

Nothing can better demonstrate that than a litany, or a program, of events that have occurred since the Government of South Australia placed an advertisement inviting public participation in the development of the management plan for Morialta Conservation Park. This occurred under the Liberal Government in August 1981. In the following month, the Morialta Residents Association made a submission regarding objectives for the park, outlining 22 recommendations to improve its management.

In March 1983, presumably after considering those recommendations, the National Parks and Wildlife Service produced a booklet entitled 'Key Proposals for the Development of the Gorge', involving major construction within the park prior to the preparation of the management plan. In that same month, tenders were called for earthworks and clearing, despite the fact that no planning had been undertaken. The following month the association wrote to the Director criticising the proposals as grossly inappropriate and condemning construction in advance of planning. It was definitely a cart before the horse operation. As a result of a deputation to the Minister and the Director, assurances were given that the March proposals would be dropped, that the creek banks would be laid back in accordance with the recommendations of the association and that no more car parks would be introduced.

In May of that year the Stradbroke Road car park was developed; it was grossly over-scaled and inappropriately landscaped. The association protested to the NPWS and there was an admission that the car park was unfortunate. In October 1983 the residents association commented on the draft plan, criticising the lack of management directives to preserve the natural character of the park and the fact that there was too much accent on development and no action on the extensive creek-filling that had taken place. From then on we go to 1984, with further complaints, and to 1989, again with further complaints, and still no management plan has been adopted. I suggest that almost 10 years have passed and it is time to admit that the National Parks and Wildlife Service, under this Government, has had its opportunity to do the right thing. It has forgone that opportunity, and the opportunity should now be given to the private sector—working under contract to the Government and with volunteers—to manage the park effectively.

What a different picture we see when we look at the work of the volunteers. Friends of Morialta Park was established in the early 1980s. I stress that the opportunity for friends groups to give voluntary assistance in national parks was an initiative of my colleague the member for Heysen, who was then Minister for Environment and Planning. It was following the election of a Labor Government that the Friends of Morialta Park association was established. That association comprises about 30 people of whom a dozen or so are actively involved in work in the park. One member of the association, Mr Keiran Brewer, supplies all the plant material, which he prepares by propagation. It is as a result of Mr Brewer's efforts and those of Mr Graham and Mrs Raelene Churchett that a policy of revegetation, which takes account of the total ecological needs of the park for vegetation replacement, not only trees but with understorey, is being implemented. It is also as a result of the efforts of the Friends of Morialta Park that Pembroke school has

adopted the valley in the park as a four-year commitment to community service. The students of Pembroke school, under the direction of Graham and Raelene Churchett, are to be commended for their work in planting in and caring for the valley.

I am told that the initiative for this came originally from Mr Russell Bath, who is the ranger for the Loftia district. In any event, we see there a very happy combination of volunteers working with park rangers and young people to care for the park. It is impossible for me, without directing questions to the Minister in the Estimates Committees, to determine what the actual budget is for Morialta Park because the budget is for the Loftia district.

I might add that, despite the fact that the total park area in South Australia has increased from 6.7 million hectares in 1985-86 to 17.6 million hectares in the current year, the budgets over that period have remained virtually static in terms of real term increases. The budget proposed for 1990-91 for the flora, fauna and park management section of the National Parks and Wildlife Service is \$3.1 million. They are expected to administer that vast area of the State—virtually 17 million hectares of the State (South Australia comprises approximately 100 million hectares, so it is convenient to work out percentages in this State)—with 287 full-time equivalents. Clearly, it is an impossible task. Clearly, too, we have to attempt it in the most cost-effective fashion possible.

When looking at the broad objectives and goals outlined in the Program Estimates, it is interesting to see that one of the objectives is to refine systems of concession management of Government-owned property leased within reserves throughout the State. Of course, we all know what the Government means by that: it means leasing a few hundred hectares of one of our most precious parks to an interstate tourist developer for what I consider to be a totally inappropriate, large-scale tourism accommodation project in the form of a four-star hotel.

What I have in mind is to lease out under contract the management of parks. Morialta is the ideal park with which to commence a trial project. It is comparatively near the city. It already has in place a well-developed, highly experienced and very valuable group of volunteers. It is of a size which makes it appropriate for a trial, and it is obviously in an area where it can be closely watched not only by the service but also by the very dedicated group of residents and users of the park who love it dearly and want to see it maintained properly.

I have before me a letter from the Morialta Residents Association which states:

Volunteers have done excellent work in propagating the right range of plant species for Morialta.

They pay tribute to the work of the volunteers. When my colleagues and I were in the North of the State recently in the Flinders Ranges National Park, we were appalled at the extent of noxious weeds and, more particularly I think, at the extent of feral animals.

Dr Armitage: There are feral goats everywhere.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: There are feral goats everywhere. Feral cats do not even bother to run away: they just sit by the roadside looking at the cars as they go past.

An honourable member: Rabbits.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Rabbits were loping in all directions. We were struck by contrast with the total lack of feral animals on an adjoining property, Arkaba Station, which is country that is not dissimilar. It is range country with very steep ridges and equally as difficult to manage as the Flinders Ranges National Park in terms of

vermin control; yet it has been done. In fact, the owner of Arkaba Station, Mr Dean Rasheed, recently won an Ibis Award for his remarkable efforts to control rabbits in that extraordinarily rough country, thus setting an example which the national parks could well follow.

I would guarantee that the cost effectiveness of what the Rasheed family has done on Arkaba Station could be used as a model for the Flinders Ranges National Park. Acknowledging that the Morialta Gorge is in some respects equally as steep, it is clear that rabbits and feral animals could be controlled in that park by contractors working under contract to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. As far as I can see, there is nothing whatever in the National Parks and Wildlife Act to prevent that occurring. Indeed, if the Government can do what it has done in the Flinders Ranges National Park, under the auspices of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, it could certainly let out to private contract appropriate environmental management of Morialta Park.

In order to identify some of the ways in which the present management is inappropriate, I will read extracts from a submission from the Morialta Residents Association commenting on some of their concerns with the present management. They note that the base of First Falls, which is a major feature of Morialta Gorge, has been sadly degraded. The waterfall may now be more accessible, but it is not nearly so worth the journey. They note that there is a lack of rabbit control, that many truckloads of leaf mulch were brought into the park for the gorge, leaf mulch being a material which notoriously carries seeds from a multitude of plant varieties, including pests such as olives, and that this practice has continued for some time, despite advice that the material should not be introduced.

When commenting on fire tracks, the association notes that tracks run straight up steep slopes or ridge lines rather than traverse across slopes. Maintenance, so, called, with a bulldozer has in places caused so much damage and erosion that fire vehicles can no longer use the tracks and they have had to be closed, which is a totally counter-productive, costly and wasteful exercise. The association makes the point that no private person would be able to get away with such destructive action on the hill's face as the National Parks and Wildlife Service is inflicting on the higher slopes of Morialta Park.

In the car park on Stradbroke Road, bitumen rubble from adjacent road works was imported to construct artificial mounds—a development entirely unsympathetic to the nature of the park. Despite the stated agreement to the principle of laying back the banks of creeks, the service has acted in the opposite way. There has been a continual process of creek bank filling, which is not only unsightly but also dangerous, and that has been occurring over the past 20 years.

In short, there is an urgent need in the Morialta Conservation Park to rectify the mistakes of the past, to clean up and to make good. Where funds are lacking, work should be limited to necessary protection and control, not to the establishment of additional man-made structures which create an urban feeling in what should be a nature conservation park. Rugged bushland of the quality of Morialta, located so close to the centre of the city, is a priceless asset, and it deserves nothing less than the best treatment.

I do not believe that the Government has given Morialta the best treatment. I believe that, in the hands of the right contractors, working in a close and cooperative way with the volunteers who have demonstrated their expertise, commitment and knowledge of park management and of nature conservation, we could achieve a much better result for much less cost. I urge the Government to adopt the proposal.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to accept the offer from the Burlock Group of Companies to conduct an environmental impact statement for the proposed Marino Rocks marina, or in the event of any other company proposing a marina development at Marino Rocks, that an EIS be required before approval is given for the project to proceed to construction stage.

On 13 December 1989, I attended, together with former Liberal Leader, John Olsen, the annual luncheon of the Boat Owners Association at the Sailmasters Tavern at North Haven. The guest speaker at that luncheon was Mr Tony Vaughan, project director for the proposed Marino Rocks Marina for the Burlock Group of Companies. I have no doubt that the Minister for Environment and Planning would recall the luncheon, as she also was present.

After the formal proceedings of the luncheon were finalised, I took the opportunity to discuss certain aspects of the marina development with Mr Vaughan. I put it to Mr Vaughan that if his company was really serious about a marina development at Marino Rocks, if indeed it had the financial backing for the project, and if it truly believed that the project would pass any environment test, it should offer to do an EIS.

Mr Vaughan was astounded. He replied, 'But the Government doesn't want one—it says that an EIS isn't necessary.' I replied, 'That is irrelevant.' The fact is that his company, the developer, would be paying for an EIS, so if he wanted one, he could do one. The Government's stand was and still is irrelevant as to whether or not an EIS can be done. If the Government orders that an EIS has to be done, obviously he has to do one but, if it does not, he can still do one. It is up to him; his company would be paying for it.

I put to Mr Vaughan that the public want, and indeed demand, an EIS for any marina development proposed for Marino Rocks. Just because the Government refused to listen to the will of the public was no reason that the developer should do the same—no reason for him to sink to the same level. Mr Vaughan indicated that he found my proposal interesting and would think about it further. A number of events occurred after those discussions between Mr Vaughan and me that made the Burlock Group of Companies think a little harder about my EIS proposal.

On 20 February 1990 I presented to this House 749 signatures on a petition regarding the proposed marina development at Marino Rocks. Those petitioners prayed that this House would recognise Marino Rocks as an important natural resource for the people of South Australia and take action to prevent alteration and elimination of access to the foreshore and the destruction of the hills face zone. The petitioners called for detailed information of the proposed project to be made public and also for an environmental impact statement to be prepared.

On the same day that I was given the petition, I was also given a further document with 285 signatures which clearly expressed a view but which was not in a format that could be presented to this House as a petition. The signatories to that document stated:

We, the undersigned, respectfully request the State Government of South Australia to proceed no further with the Marino Rocks Marina until there is a commitment to a full environmental impact study on this project.

These 285 signatures, added to the 749 on the petition that I presented to this House, represent a total of 1 034 people who have signed documents to express their concern about the Marino Rocks Marina development and to call on the State Government to prepare an environmental impact statement—1 034 signatures collected in a period of just a few weeks.

I wish to outline briefly the scenarios that have led to such strong expressions of concern from this number of residents of South Australia, most of whom live in my electorate. With much fanfare, as members may recall, in a joint statement by the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning, on 20 September 1989 the State Government released details of a marina housing development at Marino Rocks. The statement had obviously been hastily cobbled together near the eve of the State election in a desperate bid to portray South Australia somehow as a State for development projects.

The public was told that, amongst other things, the project would include a new easterly connector road (which would improve access to the coast for local residents and result in less traffic on Cove Road) and approximately 1 000 housing units near the marina and east of Cove Road. The Government announced that, in order to accommodate this housing development, changes to the hills face zone would be involved. An area of 90 hectares of hills face zone was to be further reclassified to be used for the housing component.

A further 43 hectares of hills face zone was to be zoned public open space between the residential areas. In their joint news release, the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning said:

No EIS would be required, as the environmental questions had already been answered in the marina site study.

What I have always found interesting is that the marina site study referred to by the Premier and by the Minister is, in fact, a document entitled 'Marina Site Suitability Study for the Coast between Port Gawler and Cape Jervis', which was prepared for the Minister for Environment and Planning by the Marina Assessment Advisory Committee in June 1988.

That report identified four sites—Marino Rocks, Wirrina, the Old Maslin quarry and Mutton Cove—as preferred marina sites. In relation to the Marino Rocks site, the report also states:

There is already a requirement for an EIS to be prepared for a marina development at this site. It is not likely that that requirement would change.

But it seems that the requirement has changed, according to the Government, and it quotes this report as being the reason why no EIS has been prepared. That is, obviously, twisted logic, and when I encounter examples of twisted logic I go to the heart of the matter and speak to some of the staff in the departments who might be prepared informally to express their concerns. When I did that, the Minister's staff did express their concerns to me over the Government's stance. Some of those involved with the preparation of that report are absolutely horrified at the way in which the Government has twisted the logic that they put in that report. Many of them are demoralised over

what has happened, but they cannot go public because they are servants of the Government.

The residents and the Minister's staff are not the only ones unhappy about the Government's stance over an EIS for the Marino Rocks marina. The City of Marion is not happy, either. Indeed, in the *Southern Times Messenger* of 28 March 1990, an article (paid for by the City of Marion) was published. The article appeared as part of a regular news feature by the City of Marion known as 'Marion News and Views', and was headed 'Council keeps pressure on.' That article states in part:

Marion council's call for an EIS on the proposed Marino Rocks marina development has effectively been quashed by the Environment and Planning Minister, Susan Lenehan. In a letter to council last month, Ms Lenehan indicated the Government was unwilling to undertake an EIS because it wanted to make a final decision without undue delay and unnecessary duplication. Marion had earlier asked the Government to defer a supplementary development plan for the proposed marina and residential development at Marino pending an EIS in order to understand its implications more fully.

Marion council wants an EIS to be done, and the residents want one. To ascertain the strength of feeling of residents, I distributed a survey to 4 487 households, comprising all of Hallett Cove and Marino, as well as part of Kingston Park. I received an overwhelming response to the survey and, of the respondents, 78 per cent want an EIS to be done, 60 per cent expressed concern about the development of the hills face zone land and 78 per cent said that, if the project went ahead, it is absolutely essential that a public boat ramp and access be provided.

The collation of the surveys was completed at the end of July of this year. I advised Mr Vaughan of the Burlock Group of Companies of the trend in the survey response in early July, and again suggested that his company publicly offer to undertake an EIS. On 25 July 1990, Mr Vaughan revealed via the *Guardian Messenger* newspaper:

Burlock was intending to approach Environment and Planning Minister Susan Lenehan with an offer to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in the area.

Mr Vaughan said his company's EIS offer was in response to a public perception that an EIS was the better method for addressing environmental concerns. Marion council and the marina response group have welcomed the proposed EIS.

I, too, welcome that offer from the Burlock group of companies and commend them for finally offering to do an EIS. I have detailed on previous occasions in this place numerous concerns about including those highlighted in a Government report. The report, entitled 'Geological features of significance at the Marino Rocks proposed marina site and recommendations for their preservation', is a geological survey document prepared by Dr W.V. Preiss for the Department of Mines and Energy.

The report identifies 12 points of geological interest located within the proposed development site. In part, the report investigated the problem of sediment discharge into the marina and came to the conclusion that, with the construction of a breakwater at this site, sediment from stormwater run-off would accumulate and the marina might silt up. It also found that the pollution of the marina by rubbish carried by floodwaters might be an additional problem.

The difficulty is that we now have not one, but two potential marinas for Marino Rocks. The Westcliff site is now up for sale and the agent responsible for selling it is promoting it as a potential marina and housing site. The advertisement for the site hails it as:

The Development Opportunity of a Lifetime
Potential marina and housing site at Marino Rocks, Adelaide.
An unrivalled stretch of glorious sun-blessed South Australian coastline.

Tenders for the site close tomorrow. At the same time, the

Burlock proposal has been scaled down and moved some 250 metres further north along the coastline. The Minister for Environment and Planning does not know which site she now favours. Clearly, the whole issue of a marina at Marino Rocks has become a fiasco. The next chapter unfolds tomorrow after tenders for the Westcliff site close.

This House will clearly hear much more about proposed marina developments at Marino Rocks, but this time the Government finally has the chance to get it right for a change. If it favours the Burlock proposal, that company is ready and waiting to do an EIS. If it favours a new proposal that emanates from the new owners of the Westcliff site, whoever they may be, the Government clearly, in accordance with the wishes of the people, must require an EIS for that proposal. I commend the motion to the House.

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

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House urges the Government to immediately instigate work to alleviate traffic congestion at Morphett/Diagonal Roads and the Noarlunga railway line intersection.

I have moved this motion because it is important not only to the electors of Hayward but to all of those electors who live in the southern and south-western suburbs of Adelaide. The motion relates to traffic movements through the south-western and southern suburbs, which this Government is now developing at places like Seaford. I draw the attention of the House to *Hansard* (12 April 1989) where, in response to this issue which was raised by me in the *News* of that day, Mrs Appleby, the then member for Hayward, asked the Minister of Transport the following question:

Will the Minister of Transport ensure that every priority is given to relieving the delays experienced by road traffic at Oaklands level crossing? The remedial maintenance work undertaken following the Minister's inspection on site on 24 November 1988 has improved the smoothness of the crossing but there remains the same delay factor . . . Given the present situation, the additional facilities to serve the community—such as the Westfield office tower, Marion Civic Centre and development on the previous Oaklands education site—are being argued as reasons for additional pressure on the Oaklands crossing and feeder roads, which generate an intolerable situation for commuters.

As the member representing that electorate at the time, Mrs Appleby, quite rightly asked the Government about this matter. She went on to explain the question and received a fairly detailed reply from the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Gavin Keneally. I will not quote the whole of the Minister's reply, but he concluded:

The Government and the Highways Department see this as a matter of high priority. In fact, it is now equal to any other level crossing in Adelaide in terms of adverse effect on road traffic and the Government will consider placing that in our construction timetable.

I would emphasise the fact that the Minister went on to say:

I hope that, when the new Minister of Transport is announced within the next few weeks, he or she will be able to make a statement about this matter at a time not too many weeks or months ahead.

It is not 12 April 1989—it is September 1990, and the silence from the Government benches has been deafening. Nothing in the capital works program suggests that grade separation will in fact take place this year at this crossing and I am therefore forced to ask in this House whether the Minister's statement was not a sop to the electors of Hayward in view of the fact that in April an election was

pending and nothing has been done since. I believe that that is a legitimate question for the electors of Hayward and many other South Australian electors to ask because, if Ministers come into this place and give undertakings and commitments which they do not honour, how much can South Australians rely on their word on other matters?

In the past, too often we have seen the same callous disregard for the electors. A Minister will come into this place, thank members on either side of the House for their interest in a question and give a placatory answer, and then nothing will be done. In terms of the capital works program of this budget, I note that the Adam Street/Park Terrace/Manton Street-Hawker Street overpass has been completed and was opened yesterday.

An honourable member: Splendid work!

Mr BRINDAL: It is very splendid work. One wonders why for so many years the area had weeds growing on it and the Government left it completely idle. Although its gestation period has been long, we applaud the fact that the overpass has finally been opened, and we hope that it will serve the people of Adelaide well.

I also note that it is proposed to construct a 2.6 kilometre road extension, 'including bridge under railway and other bridge works', on Salisbury Highway/Commercial Road/Leslie McIntyre Avenue. I would be interested to establish when that second bridge was promulgated and the works started, because I note that the estimated cost is \$16.7 million and the expenditure during this financial year is to be \$7 million. That leads me to wonder whether that Salisbury Highway bridge was in fact scheduled for development and commenced during the previous financial year. That would be very interesting indeed, because that would mean that, having told the electors through their legitimate elected representative and through this House that, in terms of needs, the Oaklands level crossing was equal with the needs of any crossing, they then turned around, as usual, and started to construct a major roadworks in the northern suburbs, again ignoring the south-western and southern suburbs, as this Government is so callously wont to do. I must record my amazement at this situation, because two of the Government's most notable Ministers have electorates in the south. I refer to the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Deputy Premier. It is amazing that this Government can continue almost unfettered to pour money into the north and totally disregard the electors in the south-western and southern suburbs.

This is not a matter for political politicking; it is a matter of serious import which, I hope, the Government will consider seriously. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table which is of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

	Personal Injury	Property Damage	Total
1989			
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (North)	—	11	27 536
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (South)	—	8	13 700
Diagonal and Dunrobin Roads	—	0	0
Diagonal and Prunus/Edgmont	—	2	3 200
Diagonal and Prunus/Sturm	—	2	6 200
Rail Crossing	1	0	9 000
Diagonal Road/Dunrobin Road/Prunus Street	1	3	21 500
	2	26	81 136

	Personal Injury	Property Damage	Total
1988			
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (North)	2	4	6 725
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (South)	—	4	8 050
Diagonal and Dunrobin Roads	—	4	5 500
Diagonal and Prunus/Edgmont	1	1	10 100
Diagonal and Prunus/Sturm	1	1	13 500
Rail Crossing	—	3	3 850
Diagonal Road/Dunrobin Road/Prunus Street	—	1	1 096
	4	18	48 821
1987			
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (North)	—	12	11 070
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (South)	—	7	9 350
Diagonal and Dunrobin Roads	—	7	12 800
Diagonal and Prunus/Edgmont	—	3	8 500
Diagonal and Prunus/Sturm	—	2	3 700
Rail Crossing	—	2	2 150
Diagonal Road/Dunrobin Road/Prunus Street	—	1	4 000
	0	34	51 570
1986			
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (North)	2	7	14 900
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (South)	1	6	6 300
Diagonal and Dunrobin Roads	1	1	8 300
Diagonal and Prunus/Edgmont	—	1	600
Diagonal and Prunus/Sturm	—	0	0
Rail Crossing	—	1	500
Diagonal Road/Dunrobin Road/Prunus Street	1	3	6 200
	5	19	36 800
1986-1989			
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (North)	4	34	60 231
Diagonal and Morphett Roads (South)	1	25	37 400
Diagonal and Dunrobin Roads	1	12	26 600
Diagonal and Prunus/Edgmont	1	7	22 400
Diagonal and Prunus/Sturm	1	5	23 400
Rail Crossing	1	6	15 500
Diagonal Road/Dunrobin Road/Prunus Street	2	8	32 796
	11	97	218 327

Mr BRINDAL: Since I know that the member for Napier has a burning interest in the source of such documents, I can tell him that this statistical table came from the Department of Road Transport. It sets out details of personal injuries and property damage suffered by individuals involved in road accidents at the intersections referred to, over the period 1986 to 1989. At this stage, statistics are not available for 1990, but my advice is that they are continuing to worsen, despite the remedial action to which I referred earlier in my speech.

To summarise the statistical table: from 1986 to 1989 there were 11 personal injuries and 97 cases of property damage—in all totalling \$218 327. This is a serious situation in relation to the number of traffic accidents that occur at these intersections. These statistics of the Department of Road Transport only relate to accidents where damage exceeded \$600, so the true number of incidents and the true value of damage is likely to exceed more than \$250 000.

These figures are escalating dramatically year by year, both in the number of incidents and the costs involved. It will not be long before someone is killed on these roads. When that occurs I will stand up in this House and level the blame where it is due. It is not only me who has alerted the Government to this problem; so has the former Labor member for this electorate. If the Government, as it so often chooses to do, does nothing and ignores this problem then let it wear the consequences of that action. The Minister of Transport, in promulgating the difference between a .05 and a .08 blood alcohol level, has been very lucid in pointing out that one death on South Australian roads is one death too many.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: As I said, the Minister, when talking about whether or not we should change from a .08 to a .05 blood alcohol level, has been very lucid in pointing out that, if this change prevents just one death on South Australian roads, it will be worthwhile. That is true and if we can prevent deaths on our roads by doing what I am asking the House to endorse, I believe the Government should seriously consider the proposition.

I am disappointed that the Minister is not in this Chamber to hear my comments, but I am sure that if he were here he would be treating the matter more seriously than some of the members on the Government back bench. I commend the motion to the House.

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

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House examine the economic, environmental, social and cultural impact of the proposed multifunction polis and examine and make public all commitments so far entered into by the Government, all costs to be incurred by the Government and the specific timetable proposed for development of the project.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 543.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

To strike out all words after 'House' and insert the following:

'welcomes the opportunities created by having Adelaide nominated as the site for the multifunction polis and notes the approval of the Commonwealth Government for the next stage of the project, involving a detailed environmental assessment of the Gillman site, an estimate of the infrastructure costs of the project and the methods of financing them, an investigation of potential business opportunities, an assessment of the impact on the social fabric of Adelaide and South Australia, and a collaborative community consultation program between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments. This House supports the work of the management group chaired by Mr Ross Adler, and looks forward to the publication of its report.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I have been listening to what I presume is an alternative motion to the one on the Notice Paper. In those circumstances I would assume it would be more appropriate for the member for Price to move it as a private member's motion—rather than putting it under the guise of an amendment to an existing motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair does not uphold the point of order. If the amendment is relevant to the motion before the House, it may be moved. It is up to the House to determine the fate of the amendment and the motion.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, can an amendment negate a motion?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is not of the view that this amendment attempts to do that.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is quite clear in the view that the amendment is perfectly in order. It is up to the House to determine the fate of the amendment. The member for Price.

Mr De LAINE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This MFP project is a very exciting one and is of massive proportions. It is the biggest and most innovative project ever undertaken in the history of Australia. In one respect it is strange the way that history repeats itself. Looking back 150 years, to the 1830s and 1840s, Port Adelaide evolved to reflect the needs of the people in that community.

The city of Port Adelaide and the surrounding area grew to serve the people, very successfully, for the next 100 years. It is only in the past 50 years or so that any major upgrading has been carried out in the Port Adelaide region to keep pace with modern requirements. The MFP is a concept of villages or suburbs for the twenty-first century, and it will serve the people of South Australia for possibly the next 100 years. The difference between the MFP project and the establishment of Port Adelaide as the basis of the colony of South Australia in the 1830s is that the MFP will gradually evolve in a planned and orderly manner. Most importantly, it will be environmentally sound.

The member for Coles was critical of the minimal amount of debate in the House on the MFP, and she is quite right in that respect. However, what has there been to debate during these very early stages? It is still a concept and it could not be debated openly until the bid was won. It is certainly a very exciting and innovative concept, but it is only a concept. Members opposite must realise that the MFP cannot be established in a few months. It is a big and involved project, and it will evolve over many years, according to the needs of the people of the twenty-first century.

It is not true to say that the MFP project has been shrouded in secrecy, which was another criticism of the honourable member. Until the site nomination was made, there was very little about which to consult. It is a series of concepts and ideas, and those ideas require further work, which will occur in the current phase of the project. It is not true to say that South Australia won the project by default when other States pulled out. All States competed furiously over several years, and the fact that Queensland was unable to satisfy one of the basic conditions of the bid was symptomatic of that State's failure to do the work necessary in order to win the project. In that respect, South Australia came up with the best proposition, the best set of submissions, and, ultimately, won the bid for this exciting, innovative project. On 23 August, the member for Coles said:

It is barely a week ago that I asked the Premier who, if anyone, had been engaged or would be engaged to handle what is obviously a massive public relations exercise in an attempt to sell this project to the people of South Australia. The Premier's innocent reply was that he did not know whether any consultants had been engaged.

The Premier did not know about the appointment of a public relations consultant to the MFP Adelaide unit—indeed, consultants have not been appointed yet. The objective of the proposed appointment is to enable the unit to get advice on the content of press releases, further information material, and generally handle the public relations side of the MFP unit. The appointment of public relations consultants is not related to the community consultation process.

Another criticism of the honourable member concerned the State's submission, which did not suggest that 80 per cent of public funding for the project is to come from overseas. That suggestion may have been made in one of the early feasibility study reports but it certainly was not made in the final submission. The estimate of \$1.2 billion for infrastructure costs is an estimate only and, as the honourable member said, it is clear that not all of these funds could come from taxpayers. The question of what constitutes a realistic estimate will be investigated during the next phase of the project. I quote from the honourable member's speech in relation to the social impact on the fabric of South Australia as follows:

There is no doubt whatsoever that the project will have profound effects upon the economic, political, social, environmental and cultural life of this State. It is impossible to foresee that a one-tenth increase in the population of this city will not affect Adelaide, and Adelaide as the centre of this State, in a major way.

The 10 per cent increase in the population of this State will affect Adelaide—of course it will—and the Government's submission acknowledges this very fact. We are going into the twenty-first century and changes must come. When we look back at history, we see places throughout the world which, in their time, were world leaders, but they became complacent, thinking there was no need for further change, that they were the ultimate and would go on forever. I refer to Egypt, Greece, Rome, Babylon and the Incas as just a few examples. We all know what happened to those civilisations: they looked inward, did not see any need for change, resisted change and paid the ultimate price of dying as major civilisations which led the world.

I can say the same thing in relation to members of the Liberal Party, not only members of this House but people to whom I speak in the community who are Liberal oriented. There are some quite nice people amongst them, as are a lot of members opposite, but their thinking is not progressive. In fact, these people are still thinking in the 1949 era, and that is one reason why the Liberal Party is no longer a serious force in the political arena of Australia and why in most States its members serve on the Opposition benches.

Of course, there will be changes to the fabric of South Australia, and these must come because it will be a different century and anything that does not change will fall into obscurity and die. That was a very valid point made by the honourable member and it is certainly backed up by the Government's submission. In relation to the suspension of laws in order to accommodate the setting up of the MFP, the honourable member said:

... we have Governments agreeing with Governments of other countries that our laws can be suspended to facilitate the wishes of that other country, but no-one at this stage in the Parliament knows to what extent and to what degree those principles have been agreed upon.

The South Australian Government has not agreed—I repeat 'has not agreed'—with any other Government to suspend laws in the manner suggested by the honourable member. So, that argument goes out the window as a furore: no such agreement has been reached. I refer to another passage from the honourable member's speech in relation to the \$1.2 billion of Australian funds that it will be necessary to pump into the MFP project, as follows:

Australia nonetheless still has to provide, according to the submission, \$1.2 billion of Australian funds.

It is clear that not all those funds would come from the taxpayers—undoubtedly, some would come from private enterprise. But it is unrealistic to suggest that that kind of money could be made available. Indeed, I suggest that, if that kind of money could be made available, it should be spent on similar goals throughout this country—on urban renewal, on technological

research and transfer, on economic and environmental development, and on a whole range of things that this country needs.

It is not the intention of the Government to channel funds earmarked for developments elsewhere in the State to the area north of Adelaide. As long as the MFP is in line with the Government's objectives for development of the area, there is nothing wrong with concentrating its efforts there. In relation to environmental problems at Gillman, the honourable member said:

For those members who are interested in the broad impact of the contaminated site at Gillman, we should all be aware that that site is heavily polluted. Its ponding basin serves as a primitive filtration system for much of the northern regions stormwater. Barkers Inlet, which is extremely vulnerable to any development on the site, is a major spawning ground and nursery for many varieties of fish, prawns and crustaceans in the Adelaide coastal region.

The Government makes no secret of the fact that there are pollution and environmental problems at Gillman. We all know that, but investigatory work undertaken at the site so far has not found any problem that cannot be managed or solved. The issue of environmental sensitivity will be dealt with in the current phase of the project.

There are two principal environmental issues, first, the MFP site itself. To allay fears of heavy pollution in the area, further tests will be carried out to make sure that all environmental problems can be solved or managed. The second issue relates to the fish nurseries and mangrove swamp areas. We all know the extreme and vital importance of this area for the fishing industry of South Australia. These areas must be preserved. Work will be done during the next phase to devise means by which protection can be guaranteed, and I reiterate 'guaranteed'. It is a major component of the MFP concept.

The member for Coles raised a question about consultants to handle the MFP project. Many specialist consultants will be appointed later in the project covering a whole range of areas including engineering, environment, marine, industry, technology, etc. These specialist consultants will be appointed at the right time and will be given a brief of looking into and following up all these vitally important areas for the ongoing development and evolution of the project.

The project coordinator, Mr Colin Neave, told me several weeks ago, in relation to a point made by the honourable member about the percentage of Japanese involvement in the MFP program, that the Japanese had conveyed to him that they did not wish to have too big a percentage involvement in the MFP. They were conscious of people's attitudes and wanted as many other countries as possible to participate. The more countries the better, as far as the Japanese are concerned. I guess the major incentive to the Japanese wanting the participation of as many other countries as possible is that it will give the Japanese a link to the rest of the world in many areas including communications, technology, research, development, and so on.

While the member for Coles has great difficulty in understanding the State's submission, the joint steering committee said it was by far the best of any of the States' submissions, and most observers have congratulated the Government and the Premier on the quality of the submission, rather than criticising it. It is well known that the sheer professionalism of the Government and the Premier is the main reason we won the bid for the MFP in the first place.

The submission refers to town meetings, which would enable residents of the villages to have a say in the way the MFP will be run and operated. There is no intention to exclude local government from this process, as has been alluded to by the honourable member. The question of governance is a major issue which, again, will be dealt with in the next phase of the project. The current situation of

the project, which the member for Coles has ignored, involves amongst other things a true feasibility study in respect of the site suggested as a focus for the MFP activities at Gillman. That feasibility study will involve investigations as to which part of the land suggested as the site can be built on, which part of the land can be built on subject to various conditions being satisfied—for example, soil testing, engineering works, etc.—and which part of the land cannot be built on under any circumstances and therefore should remain as open parkland or put to some other use.

The second part is a community consultation program. The panelists nominated to conduct the community consultation program advertised in the weekend press of 1 and 2 September 1990 for expressions of interest from groups and individuals who intended to make submissions to the panel on the project. The community consultation program will continue until early next year. It is proposed that an interim report be produced by the end of this year. In answer to the honourable member's criticism, there will be plenty of time for public debate and debate here in this House. I certainly look forward to the debate in this place. I have only one sadness and that is, because of the immense size and scope of the project, completion of which will take many years, I will not be in this place to see it to fruition. In fact, I might not even be here; I might even be dead by then. Nevertheless, I will be watching the project with interest from its eventual commencement—in the not too distant future—and for as long as possible.

In conclusion, I would like to pay tribute to Mr Ross Adler, the Chairman of the management group, and I commend him for his efforts to this stage of the program. He is doing a magnificent job and we certainly look forward to his report later this year. As I said, the MFP is an exciting, innovative and far-reaching concept, and I feel quite confident that it will go ahead, it will be extremely successful, it will give South Australia a terrific boost and it will put us to the forefront on the world scene. I hope that the Opposition will get behind this great project and support it.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

COASTAL SAND DUNES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That this House urges the Government to ensure the restoration and preservation of the coastal sand dunes at Somerton Park.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 544.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is with great pleasure that I enter this debate and it is refreshing to see that a member of the Opposition has been prepared to look at the question of the western metropolitan beaches. This issue has not had an extensive airing in this House.

Mr Oswald: Your predecessor never raised it.

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Morphett interjects and, I believe, he may be feeling a little dissatisfied with the statement I have just made. I acknowledge that from time to time he has outlined in this House his ideas about how the western metropolitan beaches should be improved and, indeed, preserved. I would be interested, in due course, to hear his comments on the proposed new marina in his territory. He might be surprised to know that I may agree with some of his ideas.

However, I return to the proposition put forward by the member for Hayward regarding the preservation of our beaches. It is a great pity that we have arrived at a situation where our western metropolitan beaches are man-managed.

It is a criticism of the foresight of the pioneers in the western area that we have arrived at this point. I have had the opportunity to study beach management in other areas, and I went to New Zealand on a study tour specifically to investigate the situation.

I was pleasantly surprised by, for example, beach management at Christchurch, New Zealand, where the far-sightedness of the original settlers allowed the maintenance of the sand dunes in that area—something that we did not take the opportunity to do in our early years.

I am an enthusiastic member of the Henley Beach Historical Society, and I have had the opportunity to study the early history of settlement along the western beach front. I am afraid that the mistakes were predicted, but the problem was that the colony of South Australia, and then later on the State of South Australia, was mainly in conservative hands, who encouraged entrepreneurs—particularly land speculators—to build on our coastal sand dunes.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I thank the member for Alexandra for his comments, but I am feeling very fit and well. I thank him for tendering those solicitations to me.

We got to the stage when the sand dunes and the primary sand dunes were used for the profit of land speculators, whereas the Governments of the day—and I said that they were conservative Governments—should have taken the opportunity to ensure that those sand dunes were left alone and not built on. I believe the member for Hayward actually mentioned this in his dissertation to the House, and I believe he was correct in his observations. It was unfortunate that that sort of thinking persevered even to the last decade, because I believe that it was unfortunate that the sand hills at Tennyson were built on by the West Lakes developers, and that they were allowed to take over the land.

Mr Hamilton: Save Our Sand Dunes.

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Albert Park reminds me of the Save Our Sand Dunes campaign which operated within his electorate and in which I believe he took a prominent part; I remember it well. However, the problem was that the land in that area was subject to an indenture that had been entered into more than a decade ago before the member for Albert Park was elected to this place and he did not, therefore, have an opportunity to provide an input in that decision making. So, we continue to make mistakes in relation to the preservation of our western beaches.

I would like to pay a tribute to the present Minister for Environment and Planning for the changes that have been made recently in relation to the carting of sand. I am sure that every member in the western metropolitan beach area has had complaints from time to time about the carting of sand, and the absolute nuisance value of that carting in relation to the movement and speed of trucks, the cutting up of local council roads by those trucks, and the general nuisance that they cause by passing usually quiet domestic households. The solution that has been provided by our current Minister for Environment and Planning has been very much appreciated; that is to say, a sand barge is now being used. The sand is being mined and transported by barge and pumped onto the beaches.

This is not a new proposal. It was put forward many years ago in Surfers Paradise, where they made the unfortunate mistake of putting multi-storey buildings on the sand dunes. This method, which was devised in Queensland, has been taken up in South Australia and it has been successful.

The member for Hayward mentioned the northward drift of sand. The sand dunes in his electorate are of vital impor-

tance to the Henley, West Beach, Grange and Tennyson areas because otherwise we would be unable to maintain those beaches. Those beaches are some of the best in the world. I have had the opportunity to travel overseas. I have seen the Italian Riviera, Brighton beach in the United Kingdom, beaches in the Greek islands, and so forth, and none of them compares with the cleanliness and safety of our beaches, particularly at Henley Beach, which is the closest beach to the city. I hope that the investment that a succession of South Australian Governments has made towards maintaining and keeping those beaches in their present state will pay off in due course with visitors who are prepared to spend money in the area.

There has been an enlightened attitude in recent years to the maintenance of the sand dunes. It has been a fairly recent discovery that the sand on the metropolitan beaches is a finite product. I agree with the member for Hayward that the sand is many thousands of years old. Early pioneers, and even people of recent vintage, used to think that sand was a renewable resource and, because of that, they could do whatever they liked with it. They brought their trailers and buckboards down to the beaches, filled them up with sand, took it to their gardens and reshaped them and, in doing so, denuded our beach fronts. It was not until rocks and shale began to appear on our beach fronts that a study was made and we discovered that the sand on our western beach fronts was a finite product and that we were running out of it. The State was involved in considerable expense in finding other areas where sand might be mined for use on our beach fronts, so that they could be maintained in their present state.

I come to the nub of the member for Hayward's proposition. I have already extended my congratulations to him on drawing this matter to the attention of the House. However, we on this side of the Chamber have difficulty in being able to accept the proposition that he has put before us, because the majority of the dunes at Somerton are on land owned by Minda Incorporated and, as such, are outside the control of the Coast Protection Board or the City of Brighton. If the Coast Protection Board were impelled to purchase that land, that would use up the whole of the board's budget not only for this financial year but for quite a number of future financial years.

As the member for Hayward has pointed out, it is not unusual now for entrepreneurs and, indeed, other people to be paying up to \$1 million for one of those sites right at the coastal face, and I can readily understand how that sort of price is now being paid for that sort of property. Indeed, even in my own constituency of Henley Beach, it is not unusual now for those beach front homes to be bringing as much as \$500 000. Indeed, the old Sven Kallin House in Henley Beach has recently been sold for that sum, \$500 000, and entrepreneurs are paying unusually high sums for the land along the beach front. The reason for this is the downturn in the central business district and entrepreneurs are looking for somewhere to put their money, so they are snapping up the beach front land and paying what we consider to be astronomical prices for it.

Mr Quirke: And the quality of good representation.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, I agree with the member for Playford, that the representation in the area is of very high quality. That may well be one of the reasons why there are so many people entering or wishing to enter that electorate.

The other point that I must make is that this investment is sending the valuations in the area over the moon and I have the problem—and I am sure the member for Hayward has the same problem—that people who have lived in this area for 30, 40 or 50 years and who are living in retirement

in their own homes in this area, now find that the cost of not only council and water rates, but also sometimes of land tax, is gradually forcing them out of the area in which they have chosen to live for most of their lives. This problem is not peculiar to Adelaide. In some areas, such as New South Wales—

Mr S.J. Baker: What about the Bannan Government's taxation policies?

Mr FERGUSON: I do not know about that; the Greiner Government is having the same problem. I contacted the people in Sydney who were living around the waterfront and, in that city, it is not unusual for one house to bring \$40 million. If those people are near the waterfront, even in the working-class areas such as Balmain, valuations are going over the moon and this is forcing out working-class people who have been in that area for decades. It is a problem for the Greiner Government and it is certainly a problem for me in Henley Beach.

Despite the fact that the State Government has been unable to purchase the sand dunes in the Minda area, it has been able to assist to the extent that some fencing to control access to protect the existing vegetation has been undertaken by the council, with grants from the Coast Protection Board. This has been reasonably successful. Not only that, but also Minda has requested a meeting with representatives from the City of Brighton and the Department of Environment and Planning to assist future management options and the department will be making every effort to ensure the preservation and retention of the dunes and their accompanying vegetation.

So, the local member may have had more success than he thought. Whatever the representations he has been making, both to Minda Home and to the department, in a sense they have been successful. I do not think that members on this side of the House will be able to comply with the proposition the honourable member has put forward. I do not think that the Government would be able to purchase that land, because of its value. However, the proposition has been worthwhile and we still have to consider our position in this matter. By bringing it to the attention of the House, the honourable member has scored some success.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House congratulates the Government and the Attorney-General for the ongoing implementation of crime prevention strategies including the broad-based 'Coalition Against Crime' and data mapping projects and, further, this House congratulates the Government for involving non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in its fight against crime.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 548.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

To strike out all words after 'that' and insert:

This House applauds the contribution of non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in the implementation of crime prevention strategies, but acknowledges that it is not a substitute for the proper policing of the community and that they must work with the police in order to do this effectively, and calls on the Government to consider subsidising the Neighbourhood Watch Association dollar for dollar so that the organisation can better play the part expected of it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order: bearing in mind your very comprehensive answer—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My point of order is that the amendment moved by the member for Morphet completely negates the motion we have before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already ruled that the amendment moved previously was in order, and I am sure that, when we study this one, we will find the same.

Mr FERGUSON: May I ask: has the honourable member provided, as is the usual custom, a statement in writing with his proposed amendment?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure that the honourable member will provide a copy in the normal course.

Mr OSWALD: When members examine the amendment, they will find that it does not completely negate the other motion, because it acknowledges the work put in by the non-government groups. It applauds the work of the non-government groups. All I am saying in this amendment is that more emphasis must be given to the funding of the Neighbourhood Watch committees. That is the point I should like to make in the few minutes available to me.

I do not want to take away from any of the good work done by my friend and colleague who sits opposite me—from time to time—and who supports me at great length in this House. I would certainly not detract from the work he has done, because I understand that he had much to do with initiating Neighbourhood Watch in this State. My friend and colleague over there must be given credit where credit is due.

An honourable member: Who are you talking about?

Mr OSWALD: The member for Albert Park, of course—the honourable member who helps me along the way whenever he has the opportunity. The Neighbourhood Watch scheme, in the opinion of the Opposition, is in trouble because of this inability to provide additional funding after that first year of operation. The Government receives sponsorship from the Commercial Union group to the tune of \$400 000 a year. The Commercial Union group pays this to the police, and the police then allocate moneys to the new Neighbourhood Watch groups as they are set up. That initial funding helps them for the first 12 months.

Then the funding is discontinued and we see a decline in enthusiasm from those groups. We have about 270 Neighbourhood Watch groups and programs in place now. The balance sheet put out by the Neighbourhood Watch Association indicates that it generates only \$5 400 through fund-raising activities. I believe, and I hope all members would accept, that the fund-raising initiatives of Neighbourhood Watch committees are limited and that they need assistance from the Government in fund-raising.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Let me finish, because time is running out and I want to have this on the record. We have about 184 Neighbourhood Watch programs, and 24 Rural Watch programs are on the waiting list, so it is not as though the program has peaked. We are also looking at introducing City Watch, Hospital Watch, Transit Watch and School Watch, all of which will require ongoing funding and all of which will be at risk if, after 12 months of initial funding, moneys are withdrawn. An attempt was made to obtain additional funds for the committees in question through the Attorney-General, but that request was flatly refused. I understand that requests were also made to the Minister of Emergency Services, but that they were declined.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Doubtless, for certain good reasons that the Government will tell us about. However, my advice is that the funds have not been forthcoming, and hence I have moved my amendment to the commendable motion moved

by my friend opposite from Albert Park. The amendment asks the Government at least to consider subsidising the association on a one-to-one basis. The amendment should not cause the Government too much difficulty because, as I stated earlier, the association's 1990 balance sheet indicates that it expects to carry out its task this year by raising just \$5 400 of its own funds.

We are looking at a very small contribution, but it would be seen by the public and the Neighbourhood Watch organisations as providing ongoing support. The House should remember that the \$400 000 that goes to Neighbourhood Watch to help the various organisations is insurance company money. The Government is not putting any money into Neighbourhood Watch. Certainly, it is paying the salaries of the police officers involved but, in concluding my remarks, I seek a subsidy on a one-to-one basis for the association so that when the 12 months expires at least some additional money would be available. It is a fact of life that organisers find it difficult to keep fund-raising going.

If enthusiasm drops off, the mandate of the group to maintain a security watch in a district also drops off and then the Neighbourhood Watch objectives will diminish. I ask all members to support my amendment, as it does not detract from the substantive motion, which is in support of Neighbourhood Watch and the organisations within it. The amendment merely says that we would like the Government to consider a one-for-one subsidy for the Neighbourhood Watch Association to assist it in carrying out the worthwhile tasks for which we all applaud it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER secured the adjournment of the debate.

VANDALISM AND GRAFFITI

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House enjoins the Government to initiate specific programs to effectively reduce the incidence of vandalism and graffiti in our community and that the House believes that all sections of the community including the Local Government Association be involved with the Government to formulate position strategies to address these two issues.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 550.)

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In concluding my remarks on this motion moved by the member for Albert Park, as I indicated when I spoke previously, I fully support any steps which will assist in reducing the incidence of vandalism and graffiti in our community. When I spoke previously, I mentioned that we need to look at both the long and short-term strategies. Just concluding those points, I believe that we need to assist groups working with young people, such as the scouts, the guides, CFS, surf lifesaving, St John, and so on, because the more young people we can get into those worthwhile organisations the less likely it is that they will offend and engage in anti-social behaviour.

Similarly, we should assist and encourage community groups such as Lions, Rotary, the Kiwanis, JCs and Apex in their endeavours to assist young people in providing challenges for them to participate in constructive and productive activities. I have been pleased to discover that the police (and this fact was reinforced the other night by Inspector Marshman from the Darlington station) have made an effort to take young people who are at risk of offending to camps at Echunga, for example.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Where?

Mr SUCH: Echunga.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Why Echunga?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It is right on the border of my electorate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher.

Mr SUCH: I do not think that the honourable member is in any danger; I believe that he can handle himself quite well. The police provide positive and stimulating activities for young people, particularly boys but also girls. I commend the police for their efforts in this regard which have involved, for example, abseiling and other activities that are useful in providing active participation, a challenge and some excitement in a way that is not harmful to the rest of the community.

As is suggested in this motion, I believe that local government should be involved in consulting with young people. I further believe that local government spends a large amount of money and resources especially on catering for the older members of the community, which is a worthwhile expenditure. Local councils also spend a large amount of money catering for very young children in relation to playground facilities and such things, but I do not believe that councils have done or are doing enough to cater for the needs of teenagers. I am pleased to note that some councils are now moving more strongly in that area and are consulting with young people to establish their needs and interests.

I am pleased to note also that interstate councils (and these have been mentioned by the member for Albert Park) have undertaken positive programs, for example, Knox council in Victoria and Gosnells in Western Australia; and, locally, my own council, Mitcham council, of which I am still a member, is also moving in that direction of involving young people in positive activities. Some of these potential activities include bus shelter painting, which I believe can lead ultimately to the STA being involved, for instance, in an 'adopt-a-bus-shelter', 'adopt-a-rail-station' program. In conclusion, I support and commend this motion, and I will do anything I can to assist in achieving its aim.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House—

- (a) agrees with part I of the resolution of the Legislative Council for the appointment of a joint select committee on parliamentary privilege;
- (b) concurs with the proposal for the committee to be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament; and
- (c) concurs with the proposal to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but that they be excluded when the joint select committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 551.)

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I rise briefly to indicate the Government's support for the thrust of this motion. In Opposition in 1979 to 1982 the Labor Party was keen on this matter and there is no reason to change our mind now. The only thing that normally worries people has been taken into account by the motion and that is the fact that at times a committee will need to meet privately and to consider evidence in private. I understand that the House of Assembly representation on

this committee has been decided, and I see no reason why this matter cannot come to a speedy conclusion.

Motion carried.

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

That this House be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee and that the members to represent the House of Assembly on the committee be the Hons B.C. Eastick and N.T. Peterson and Mr Groom.

Motion carried.

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

PETITION: ST PAUL'S CHURCH

A petition signed by 1 439 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prevent the demolition of St Paul's Church, Pulteney Street, was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WILPENA RESORT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I wish to advise the House that the Minister for Environment and Planning will today give notice of a Bill for an Act to facilitate the development of the Wilpena Resort and associated infrastructure. In 1983 the plan of management for the Flinders Ranges National Park noted the desirability of adding the adjacent Wilpena Station Pastoral Lease to the park as a site for the location of visitor and interpretation facilities. The station had been used for over 130 years as an agricultural and grazing property.

In 1985 the Government purchased the Wilpena Station. The purchase was made in order to relocate the existing resort which was unsatisfactorily sited at the entrance to the Pound. In line with the 1983 plan of management, the area was added to the Flinders Ranges National Park in 1988 as the Government believed that this was the best means of ensuring strict management control.

The Government believes that the Wilpena project is crucial to the effective management of the Flinders Ranges National Park, and to the control of visitors and their impact on the Flinders Ranges. It will allow quality facilities to be provided to the ever increasing number of visitors to the area in a way that manages the environmental impact of those visitors. The project will also allow the closure and rehabilitation of the existing resort and camp site astride Wilpena Creek in the Wilpena Pound entrance area.

The project has successfully completed a prescribed planning process and an environmental impact assessment that included wide community input and discussion. The Government's planning process for the project has been the subject of court action by opponents of the developments. The validity of the Government's approach has been endorsed by the South Australian Supreme Court. Opponents, however, have continued the action on further appeal to the High Court on a technical planning question. The same opponents have foreshadowed to the Government possible further litigation in relation to new issues they now want explored concerning the development and associated infrastructure.

While the courts have not ruled against the project the continuing uncertainty associated with current and proposed court action is damaging confidence in the project and investment in South Australia. The Government has received strong representations from local government and the Aboriginal community urging that the project proceed forthwith. The Government believes that the project will allow for the rectification of long standing and worsening environmental problems and will also provide a major boost to the region and to the State's economy.

The Minister of Tourism has already announced the Government's support for the provision of a new airport at Hawker and the undergrounding of a section of the proposed power line to the project. These will be encompassed by the proposed legislation but will remain subject to the established environmental impact assessment procedures. The Wilpena project has been the subject of discussion and debate for some time. I am also aware that the Opposition has had the project under consideration by a special committee. Consequently, I hope that the legislation can be dealt with in a bipartisan manner and I have asked the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Tourism to consult with the Opposition on the form of the legislation before it is introduced in the House.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: You are an environmental vandal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles will come to order.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ENVIRONMENTAL LEVY

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I refer to the question of common effluent oxidation ponds on the flood plains of the Murray River. There has been a misunderstanding on this issue, for which I apologise to the member for Chaffey. My reply to the question from the member for Chaffey was that the environmental levy would not be used to fund the removal of the effluent oxidation ponds from the flood plains of the Murray River. I also indicated that the Engineering and Water Supply Department would be prepared to provide expertise in working with local government to ensure that, eventually, these effluent lagoons are removed from the flood plain. My reply to the House was correct. It was not proposed that levy funds be used to fund capital works associated with the removal of the common effluent ponds.

My department is already assisting councils with the collection of information on the quantity and quality of effluent from these schemes with a view to developing satisfactory disposal options. The cost of alternative disposal arrangements is not yet known. My colleague the member for Albert Park was advised in August that the program of expenditure on environmental projects was still under consideration, and that the cost of this assistance would be included under the program. To date no charges for technical assistance have been made against the environmental program as these are being met from within normal departmental funding. I repeat that there is no intention to fund from the levy capital works associated with the removal of these lagoons.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park) brought up the sixty-first report of the Public Accounts Committee on accountability

of statutory authorities, Government companies and non-government organisations in receipt of Government funding.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I advise that any questions for the Minister of Transport should be directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm that SAFA faces a loss of almost \$21.5 million on the issue of deferred annuities which the Federal Treasurer deems to be an attempt to exploit Federal tax loopholes in what was effectively a tax avoidance scheme?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly will not confirm that SAFA is under any obligation for what is in effect a tax avoidance scheme. To the contrary, I point out that SAFA ensures that transactions it enters into are totally within the law. It ascertains, to the extent that that is possible, the taxability of any new financing instruments undertaken; and legal opinions are provided and all the other appropriate tests are made in relation to any of those matters. So, I resent the innuendo in the question and the way in which it is phrased.

As to the particular matter that the Leader raised, I will provide a detailed report for him but I understand that it has already been referred to in the SAFA report. I make this point clear: any market operation financing authority such as SAFA—this applies to those in all the States and at all levels—undertakes a very wide range of transactions. The taxability or the tax basis of any of those transactions is ascertained to the greatest degree possible prior to its entering into any such transactions.

In some cases there have not been any definitive rulings given by the Tax Office. One must wait for a time before they can be appropriately assessed. In those instances, the anticipation of a tax ruling that may be unfavourable must be given some weight and provision must be made for it. That is the way in which SAFA operates, and that is the way in which every other financial institution in the country operates.

CROWN LANDS ACT

Mr HERON (Peake): My question is directed to the Minister of Lands. Is the Government considering a major revision of the Crown Lands Act and, if so, what is the intention in that regard?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Government is considering a major revision of the Crown Lands Act, and I am sure that all members of this Parliament will welcome such an announcement. Over the past 10 years, a substantial amount of work has been completed on a review of the land tenure legislation administered through the Department of Lands. In fact, this work has been consolidated into a document and draws on the public responses to the Green Paper on a consolidated Crown land conservation and management Bill issued in 1987.

The proposed revision of the Crown Lands Act 1929 is intended to achieve the following: first, the streamlining of administrative processes with consequent efficiencies in

service provision; secondly, recognition that land management is achieved more effectively through other recent and proposed statutes (and I refer to some of the legislation that has been passed in this Parliament in the past 12 months); thirdly, the elimination of legislative duplication; and, finally, the modernisation of decision-making processes to reflect community expectations for public sector accountability in the management and administration of Crown land.

I am delighted to inform the honourable member that, following Cabinet approval earlier this week, I intend to release for public comment a Green Paper on proposals for a new Crown Lands Act. I encourage comment from interested members of the community whose tenancy and other Crown land dealings are likely to be affected by these proposed improvements.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier been advised of the dispute between the State Bank and the SGIC which has resulted in the State Bank transferring to the Queensland QBE Insurance Group all its house and contents insurance business worth \$9 million annually in premiums, and will he say what matters are in dispute?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been advised that the State Bank is using QBE rather than SGIC. That decision was made on a purely commercial basis. Obviously, there have been intensive discussions between SGIC and the State Bank, and that was the State Bank's conclusion. This indicates, and proves quite clearly, that the State Bank is able to operate on its commercial charter not subject to direction by the Treasurer or Government of the State. That is embodied in the Act, and it is interesting that a question such as this should be asked with the innuendo that the Government should have intervened to ensure that this did not happen whereas in fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Sorry, Mr Speaker—the honourable member just asked the question. Well, if that was just a question, he could have written me a letter or button-holed me in the corridor. If he was just asking the question, I am not quite sure why he wasted the time of his colleagues by putting such a question in parliamentary time. So, if he was just asking the question he has wasted our time; if he was doing more than that, which I suspect he was, I simply make the point that this is an example of the Opposition trying to have it both ways. The fact is that under the Act the State Bank board and its management are required to act commercially and in the interests of the bank and its shareholders, that is, the community of South Australia. That they do without interference from the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BANKRUPTCIES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether many South Australians are voluntarily filing for bankruptcy because they are being sent to jail? On page 4 of the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, 10 January 1989, in an article under the heading 'SA Debtors Choose Bankruptcy to Jail', a statement attributed to Ms Phillipa Smith was printed suggesting that many South Australians are voluntarily filing

for bankruptcy because they are afraid of being sent to jail. The same article revealed that South Australia is the only State where people can still be imprisoned for failing to pay their debts. It was alleged that many people were filing bankruptcy petitions without exploring other options.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: I thank the honourable member for his most interesting and important question. It is true: there are a large number of South Australians, other than those involved in incorporated bodies, who are filing for bankruptcy as individuals. Whilst we do not have statistics available on the reasons behind those individuals taking that course of action, I can advise the House that I have received from the Department of Correctional Services statistics on the number of individuals imprisoned for unsatisfied judgment summonses. These statistics provide six-monthly breakdowns of individuals imprisoned and show no clear trend in the numbers. There was an increase from the second half of 1984 to the first half of 1985, but since then the number of imprisonments has shown no clear trend. I seek the leave of the House to insert in *Hansard* a table of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Unsatisfied Judgment Summons Imprisonments

Time period	Male	Female	Total
H2 84	13	1	14
H1 85	30	4	34
H2 85	26	6	32
H1 86	23	6	29
H2 86	30	2	32
H1 87	29	0	29
H2 87	28	7	35
H1 88	34	5	39
H2 88	24	12	36
H1 89	21	5	26
H2 89	23	3	26

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: Over the 5½ year period for which statistics are available 332 individuals have been imprisoned, an average of just over 60 per year. Of those imprisoned 15.4 per cent were female, 9.6 per cent were Aboriginal and 54.5 per cent were listed as either unemployed, student, pensioner or home duties. Just over 62 per cent of these prisoners were aged 30 or more compared with 34 per cent of all admissions to our prisons. The high numbers of individuals listed as unemployed, students, pensioners or home duties would suggest that the number of self-employed business people involved may not be large. However, I am unable to comment on the 'fear factor' and its effect on their filing for bankruptcy.

WILPENA DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. On whose authority was a penalty of \$50 000 for the destruction of Aboriginal sites of significance waived to allow the Ophix Wilpena project to proceed? What was the nature of this site destruction, who was responsible and when did it occur? I have in my possession the minutes of a meeting between representatives of Ophix and various State and Federal Government departments involved in this project. Those minutes attribute a comment to an office of the Minister's department; it is stated:

The community leaders have waived the penalty, under South Australian Government legislation, of \$50 000 for the destruction of sites of significance in order for the project to proceed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question; the issue he has raised is obviously very serious and something I must examine in some detail.

I will be very pleased to take the matter with my department if he is prepared to provide me with the information, and I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics employment and unemployment figures for South Australia?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There has been a rise in unemployment, which grew from 7.2 per cent in July to 8.2 per cent in August. Of course, that would disappoint all members of this House. There are a number of other facts revealed in the latest ABS statistics. During the same period employment grew by 400. Indeed, the number of people in jobs rose from 666 500 in July to 666 900 in August, that growth being primarily in part-time employment. It should be pointed out that average employment in South Australia in the quarter to August 1990 grew by 10 900, or 1.7 per cent, compared with the same quarter last year. Nevertheless there has been a rise in unemployment, which is of concern, and I think it needs to be put into context both nationally and within the State.

As I said, South Australia's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose from 7.2 per cent to 8.2 per cent and that rise is largely due to the high seasonally adjusted participation rate recorded since these surveys were introduced. Of course, as all members would realise, that indicates that people are still confident of gaining a job in this State and total employment has remained stable. Significantly, the increase in the unemployment rate is not due to a fall in employment. The rise in employment in South Australia is in contrast to significant declines in employment at the national level. If the South Australian participation rate had remained constant in August at 63 per cent, rather than rising to 63.7 per cent, the unemployment rate would also have remained constant at about 7.2 per cent.

But let us make this perfectly clear. Despite the continued slowdown in the national economy and the easing of monetary policy over recent months, it appears inevitable that unemployment will rise both nationally and in South Australia over the remainder of 1990, and that will be of concern to all of us. However, the extent of such rises over the medium term will be determined largely by a number of developments at the national and international level, such as, obviously, our export growth potential, our inflation rate and, of course, the Middle East crisis. So, it appears that we will see a softening of our unemployment position in South Australia, but we hope that it will be in the short term and that we will see a recovery next year. However, I think it is true to say that the economy has continued to slow in response to the Federal Government's tight monetary policy and that this has led to a slump in domestic spending, which has caught up with a number of our important industries here in South Australia. Of particular concern has been the rise in unemployment rates for 15 to 19-year-olds.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Following the Minister's undertaking to the House yesterday to seek a report on the awarding of the latest contract for the supply of motor vehicles to the State Government, will he ask the

Minister of State Services to provide information on the resale value of Government vehicles and, in particular, to confirm that, last financial year, the Government made an average profit of \$3 488 on each Holden Commodore Berlina it sold, compared with a loss of \$181 on each Falcon XF GL it sold, and that Commodores were the only vehicles on which a profit was made?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yesterday, I indicated that I would refer this matter to my colleague, the Minister of State Services. I understand that about now she should have made a ministerial statement in another place. That statement will be repeated in this place at the end of Question Time by the Minister responsible for those matters in this House, the Minister of Housing and Construction.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy consider the augmentation of power needs of isolated places, as well as other suitable locations, by the generation of electricity by wind power? Coober Pedy is at this moment, I understand, having its power supply augmented by a trial provision of wind power. Should it be possible to use this in other areas, taxpayers' resources may be saved by delaying or abandoning a future new power station.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In the first instance, I will refer specifically to the wind generator proposed at Coober Pedy. It is a demonstration project and the interesting thing about it is that it is nearly financially viable. It will not take a very large rise in the cost of diesel fuel for it to become a financially viable operation, which will be profitable. That has been the Government's intention in most of the work we have done in the alternative energy sector. It seems to me that, if we can show that there are areas in which alternative power will be cost effective, it may well be that private enterprise and various other organisations will want to take this up whereas, if it is merely something that demonstrates that it is possible to generate power from alternative sources, we have not achieved much, because that has already been done in many places all over the globe. I must add that the figures that were done on this were prior to the latest Middle East crisis, so it may therefore be a much shorter period than we originally thought before the Coober Pedy wind energy project becomes financially viable.

Certainly, over the 30 years during which we expect such a mill to be in place, we will expect to make a profit on it. It is one of the things that gives us the possibility of a niche market, because it seems to me that there are many places all over the globe (especially in the so-called developing world) where electricity grid power is not available and, to have a generator (diesel or gas based) with a co-generation project, say, heating water for the local hospital, and with a windmill attached to lower the overall cost of the project, may well be the kind of energy block that will be very useful for a very large proportion of the people who live in those parts of the world that are not serviced by mains electricity from a national or state grid.

Mr Lewis: Provided the wind blows.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Provided, of course, the wind blows. The Opposition shadow Minister makes the point that we cannot rely purely on alternative energy, because if we do there will often be quite crucial periods when power will not be available. For that to be so, as I have indicated, this project must be cost effective, which is what we are setting out to try to show that it will be.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPECTACLE SCHEME

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health confirm that the Government has made major changes to the South Australian spectacle scheme which will result in pensioners having to pay \$60 for bifocals (the most common need for the pensioner age group) compared with \$36 previously, and \$37.50 for single vision lenses compared with \$29 previously? If so, why were these decisions, which have led to increased charges of up to 67 per cent for pensioners, not explained clearly in the budget papers and passed off by the Minister in a budget day press statement as representing only 'a slightly larger contribution' by pensioners towards the total cost of their spectacles?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will have to remind myself of the exact details of the scheme I would not want to swear to the exact amount. Certainly, I can confirm that there has been a reallocation of priorities to provide that pensioners will have to contribute more than they did previously. The Government feels in the context of the budget that that was a reasonable reallocation, particularly in light of the amount that some people are prepared to spend on frames which, of course, are outside the scheme.

Obviously, in making this reallocation, we freed up money to go into areas of considerable need, such as the announcements that have been made in relation to assistance to people with intellectual disability. I have never made any secret of the fact that the initiatives that I have announced in the health budget have been financed by way of reallocation. I have never made any secret of that fact because, of course, that is what Governments are into these days.

There are no additional resources available for any of these things. Surely the honourable member has listened often enough to the Premier in this House to know exactly what budgetary situation we face, along with the rest of the States. I believe that, in real terms, there has been a very slight increase in my budget, so any new initiatives must be funded from existing initiatives. I believe that, by doing what we have done, we have got the balance right.

ABORIGINAL LINK-UP SERVICE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister of Family and Community Services. Will he advise the House on the establishment of the Aboriginal Link-Up Service? On occasion, through my electorate office, I have been requested by Aboriginal constituents who were adopted at an early age to assist them in obtaining information about their natural parents and families. It has been put to me by those constituents that a service to assist Aborigines in their inquiries is long overdue.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is referring to the Aboriginal Link-up Scheme. The scheme, which has been launched, is an attempt to try to put Aboriginal people in contact with information about their kinship and their families. There are one or two obvious reasons for this. First, birth records in the last century and in the early years of this century were often fairly cursory in relation to information about white Anglo-Saxons.

Given some of the prevailing attitudes that existed amongst the white community towards Aboriginal people in those days, one can hardly be surprised that often the attitude towards bilateral information about Aboriginal information was casual, to put the very best construction one could possibly put on it. So often this information was not properly stored and I am told that there is probably in bottom

drawers all over the place a lot of information that needs to be collated.

Secondly, this is a response to amendments to the adoption legislation taken through Parliament in very recent years. The adoption legislation, subject to the veto that is placed on it, actually encourages people to seek out their ancestry and to get additional information. Also, given the rather hotch-potch arrangements that existed in relation to adoption of Aboriginal children in the earlier years of this century, one can understand the reasons why this is often very difficult indeed.

There was a period in which Aboriginal children were not available for adoption. There was a period in which it was the norm for Aboriginal children to be adopted by white couples as, indeed, it is the norm these days that Aboriginal children available for adoption should be adopted by people of their own race and, where possible, their own kin. However, it will not just suddenly happen. It is necessary that the information be properly collated so that, where it is proper, given the veto, that where it be accessed, that can occur.

I understand that preliminary work under the scheme has already resulted in eight successful link-ups and one would assume that, since success breeds success, there will be many demands for this service and one would hope that it will be very successful. It is already being hailed around Australia. I have a pamphlet on the scheme which I can make available to the honourable member and other members who are interested.

PLANNING ACT

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Has it been recommended that the Minister for Environment and Planning exercise section 50 of the Planning Act or some other section of that Act in order to freeze development in some, most or all of the Mount Lofty Ranges region and, if so:

1. Does she propose to uphold that recommendation?
2. When does she propose to take such action?
3. Why?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in planning matters and, of course, in the Mount Lofty Ranges. As members would know, the Mount Lofty Ranges review has been underway for some time and, in fact, the member for Heysen referred to the Roder report last night in one of his speeches.

I inform the honourable member that I am awaiting the final recommendations of the report of the Mount Lofty Ranges review. Of course, I will follow normal procedure and present it to Cabinet, whereupon my Cabinet colleagues will decide whether or not the recommendations should be adopted. If Cabinet gives its approval, I will be delighted to make any announcement that relates to the recommendations in the Mount Lofty Ranges review.

TOXIC ALGAE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): As the Minister for Environment and Planning was represented at the recently convened Murray Valley League, will she say whether contingency plans have been developed for the control of toxic algae and for the provision of alternative water supplies for those areas at risk from algal blooms? Last summer, toxic blue-green algae was isolated from Lakes Victoria, Alexandrina and Albert, and use of lakes water was restricted

for up to three months from January to April 1990. This required the provision of an alternative water supply for Milang and Strathalbyn and a change of operating strategy for Lake Victoria.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for raising this important matter, involving toxic algae in the Murray River. As members would be aware, last summer saw the occurrence of toxic algae in a number of water supplies and recreation lakes in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It has now been recognised as a major water quality issue and, as recently as last Friday, I presented a paper to the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council suggesting that, in my view, toxic algae is as serious an issue as is salinity for the downstream States. That position was acknowledged and recognised by John Kerin, who is Chair of the ministerial council, and by Ministers from Victoria and New South Wales.

The Murray-Darling Basin Commission has established a working group to consider methods of controlling algal blooms in the Murray Darling Basin through the control of nutrient limits. I am sure that members of the House understand that toxic algal blooms are caused by an overabundance of the nutrients phosphorus and nitrogen.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department has been working with officers from other water supply authorities in the country, the Department of Agriculture (I acknowledge the support of my ministerial colleague the Minister of Agriculture in this matter) and the Department of Health. These studies have assisted the departments in planning for future occurrences. I remind the House that, as well as taking short-term precautionary measures, we must really attack this problem in the medium to long term to prevent nutrients entering the Murray River in the first place.

Monitoring of water bodies along the Murray River will be intensified during the coming summer of 1990-91, and a cooperative study of toxic algae in the Murray-Darling Basin which is being undertaken by the CSIRO and the Centre for Water Treatment and Research will commence later this year. To answer the second part of the honourable member's question, I advise that contingency plans have now been developed for the control of toxic algae and for the provision of alternative water supplies for those areas at risk from algal blooms. I am sure that the member for Alexandra will welcome this announcement because part of the problem that South Australia experienced last year occurred in his electorate.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction confirm that the lowest acceptable tender for the entertainment centre project exceeded the Government's original budget estimate by 9 per cent and will he explain why the Premier's Department has budgeted for a completion cost of \$47.7 million? I have in my possession an extract from Sacon's biannual report for the period January to June this year which draws attention to the fact that the lowest acceptable tender for the project exceeded the original budget estimate by 9 per cent.

I also refer to page 165 of the Auditor-General's Report which, in its comments on the capital transactions of the Premier's Department, identifies 'building construction costs for the entertainment centre of \$47.7 million'—\$7 million more than the approval figure given by the Public Works Committee which, I emphasise, was expressed in February 1991 dollars to account for inflation during the construction period. I understand that, if the budget blow-out had been

shown at 10 per cent rather than 9 per cent, the project would have been referred back to the Public Works Committee. The figures given above avoid that possibility.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In answer to a question the other day, I outlined to the House the background of the tender process. I emphasised that the estimate put before the Public Works Committee—\$40.7 million plus or minus 10 per cent—was accepted by that committee. When the tenders were finally approved, the figure presented was \$44.7 million, as my colleague the former Minister would acknowledge. It is quite clear that that was and is the accepted process. I suggested to the Leader of the Opposition that he does not understand the process used by the Public Works Committee. It is very clear that, in commenting in that radio interview, he exhibited ignorance, because he argued that we were \$4 million above the tender price. The final tender price which was accepted and approved by Cabinet was \$44.7 million.

Mr D.S. Baker: Fixed price.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Fixed price indeed—and it means just that. As we acknowledge, anything above that price would be for additional services, and I outlined in my statement—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Obviously, members opposite do not understand what 'fixed price' means. It is not a blow-out.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The only blow-out in this place is the member for Bragg.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am still waiting for that apology two years on. The additional expenditure is also to the services required under fire safety standards, which were not standards when the original tender was accepted. That is part of it, and additional seating is being provided in the Entertainment Centre. Additional goods have been supplied above the estimate of \$44.7 million, which takes it over \$45 million.

As I have said, and it is on the *Hansard* record, the document makes the process very clear, and it has been properly followed. I stress again that the Entertainment Centre is an excellent project and I congratulate the contractors (Jennings) and the supervisors and staff on the site, because the project is not only within budget but also slightly ahead of time, based on the current work program. I have had the opportunity to look at the site on a couple of occasions, and I would say that it is a brilliant facility and it is value for dollar compared with other entertainment centres in this country. It will be a magnificent facility of which all South Australians will be very proud.

DIABETES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health outline to the House the services and programs available for people suffering from diabetes who live in the Port Pirie area? In a recent article in the *Port Pirie Recorder*, concern was expressed that the Port Pirie area has an extraordinarily high proportion of diabetes sufferers compared with the national average.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Because the honourable member was good enough to give me an indication a couple of days ago that she would ask this question, I have some information. I can confirm that the Port Pirie region has a higher than average incidence of diabetes sufferers. Whether

it is extraordinarily high is another matter, but certainly it is higher than average.

Education services are important to diabetes sufferers learning how to manage their diabetes and so reduce or delay the occurrence of any complications. Briefly, the services are as follows. The Port Pirie Regional Health Service Inc. employs a full-time diabetes educator. This position has been increased from a .6 FTE position. A further .4 FTE diabetes educator is employed at the Laura Hospital in the Mid North region. Foot care is obviously an important issue for sufferers of diabetes, and podiatry services are well provided in the Port Pirie region by three podiatrists. Diabetes sufferers require regular meals, weight control and a diet low in sugar and simple carbohydrates. The Port Pirie Regional Health Service has experienced difficulty attracting a dietician and at present dietetic advice in the form of telephone advice is provided by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We would like to improve on that situation, but that will not happen until someone has been attracted to that position.

A diabetic support group meets at the hospital monthly to provide support education and advice to sufferers and their families. The Port Pirie Regional Health Service has a visiting ophthalmologist. This specialist is supportive of the diabetic support group having conducted education sessions under its auspices. An annual screening program is conducted in Port Pirie with the support of the Apex service club. The diabetic support group and the Regional Health Service have formed close links with Heartbeat. Finally, community awareness projects are also undertaken with the diabetes educator appearing regularly on the regional media promoting activities and the importance of early diagnosis of diabetes and prevention of complications. That represents a fairly reasonable spread of facilities. If there are ways in which we can improve the service we will do so, and I look forward to further fruitful discussions with the honourable member on this matter.

AUSTRALIAN CRICKET ACADEMY

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. What action has the Government taken to ensure that the Australian Cricket Academy remains based in South Australia following recent statements made by the new Director of the Australian Institute of Sports (Robert De Castella) that 'there always has to be a chance that the academy could move'. Concern has been expressed to me that the well-known State cricketer, Darren Lehmann, is going to Victoria and that David Hookes, who has been sacked, could well be lost to New South Wales.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and I know of his genuine concern about this issue, which is exhibited by his strong support for the Commonwealth Games bid and by his membership of the bid committee. I know, having worked with him on that committee, of his genuine commitment to sport in this State. I sincerely join with him in expressing concern about any thought of the academy being moved from Adelaide.

We have had discussions and discussions are currently under way with the Australian institute regarding finalisation of budgets. Of course, we are having discussions with the various sponsors who are involved. As I understand, the discussions are progressing well and I hope that very shortly there will be an announcement by the Australian Sports Commission and the Australian institute regarding the continuation of the academy here in Adelaide. Indeed, I think that, as the honourable member mentioned, the

dismissal of our former State captain, David Hookes, has probably unsettled the environment a little, and Darren Lehmann's going would also cause concern. We will be doing everything in our power to ensure that the academy stays here.

There has also been some discussion about cricket not continuing under the institute program. I would be very surprised if that were true, and I believe that that rumour shall be put to death quickly. In fact, it is a very important part of the academy program and I certainly hope that the Federal authorities make serious submissions to continue the program at the academy and, of course, to continue it here in South Australia. I can assure the honourable member that I will be doing everything in my power, and I am sure that, given his statement, that will be a bipartisan approach to the Australian Institute of Sport, the Australian Sports Commission and, of course, the ACB, to ensure that we retain the academy in Adelaide.

DWARF OATS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Has the Minister of Agriculture decided whether to release for commercial use the new high-yielding dwarf oat variety code named CC/2134? What reasons might delay its commercial release? A recent *Stock Journal* article reported that trials in the South-East have shown promising results from the new oat variety, which was bred by the Department of Agriculture. That report said the new variety was resistant to cereal cyst nematode and haydie damage.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Spence for his question; it is certainly an interesting and significant question, as the new variety offers lots of potential to cereal growers in South Australia. At this stage we anticipate that there should be commercial production of the CC/2134 variety of oats in 1992. The reason why it is seemingly that far away—in fact, it is not a very long time—is what must be done with respect to preparation of new varieties. Indeed, it is worthwhile noting that, when this variety is finally released for commercial production in 1992, it will have been only nine years from the time it was first bred, subsequently tested, and commercialised. So that is a relatively short period when one considers all the processes that must be undertaken. As the honourable member notes, this variety does seem to have a great deal of potential.

It is resistant and tolerant to cereal cyst nematode; it is a semi-dwarf type plant; it is very high yielding, and it has good feed grain quality. It is worth noting that the two previous varieties that have been popular recently—'Wallaroo' and 'Marloo' (CC/2134)—are showing yield levels some 25 to 30 per cent higher than those previous varieties, and that is certainly very promising for those farmers who choose to use it. One of the down sides is that it will be, as with other varieties, susceptible to stem rust. This variety has been derived from a complex cross-breeding between a sister line to 'Wallaroo', a breeder's line derived from a Danish wild oat and 'Echidna', a high yielding, semi-dwarf but cereal cyst nematode susceptible variety.

Since it was identified in yield trials, it has been multiplied rapidly: first, in September 1989, at the irrigated bird-proof nursery at Northfield research laboratories; then in the winter 1989 it was multiplied at the Turretfield research centre; and then, in the summer of 1990, it was multiplied under irrigation at Bordertown by Mr Jeff Arney, who is known to many members in this place and is well respected for his work with the Advisory Board of Agriculture. In

winter 1990, it was again grown at Turretfield and Kybybolite research centres and at Birdwood under contract, and a total of 15 hectares has produced about 30 tonnes. So, the process is now that variety registration will be sought in autumn of 1991, provided the results of the 15 experiments under way this year continue the pattern shown in 1988 and 1989 tests. Seed would be supplied to specialist cereal seed growers in winter 1991, and that would enable commercial production in 1992. So, this project, which has been jointly funded by the State Government and the Wheat Research Committee of South Australia, offers great promise for the oat industry in South Australia.

WILPENA DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): When the Premier provides the information I sought last week about why Ayers Finnis Limited, the merchant bank which is financing the Ophix development at Wilpena, was created in August 1989 as part of a series of company arrangements which resulted in the original subsidiary of the State Bank becoming a holding company, will he also explain why Ayers Finnis Limited was originally located at 55 Grenfell Street, the same address as the Department of Environment and Planning, rather than at the State Bank, and say whether this was to enable convenient access to Ophix Limited, which has an office located in the same building?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly do that. I know that the honourable member has a conspiracy theory mentality about this whole area, and it does not do her justice, just as I think she is very wrong in her interpretation of what is intended as part of the Wilpena development. While the concerns she has raised about that and her opposition have been quite consistent and clearly stated, I think it is a little unfair to translate that opposition to a project which she opposes on environmental grounds to a pursuit of the company concerned in this way. It is possibly a fine conspiracy theory, but I will certainly ascertain that information for the honourable member.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction explain the reported decrease in the number of people waiting to live in trust homes and say what impact the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement will have on the trust's waiting list, given the decrease in funding to this State under the new agreement?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Gilles for his question. He obviously has a very relevant interest in this whole issue. He has a number of Housing Trust tenants in his electorate and I am sure that they also are interested in this matter. Many of them may wish to transfer in time and, of course, waiting lists are a very significant factor in any arrangements involving trust tenancies. To some people, it obviously comes as a surprise to see that our waiting list has decreased from 30 June 1989 to 30 June 1990, by 852 (from 42 143 to 41 291).

One has to reflect on what we as a Government have achieved over the past eight years. It is fundamental to the supply of housing that it be provided by the Housing Trust. Obviously, that was a conscious decision of this Government during that time. During that period, we have added 16 000 new dwellings to the stock. I am indebted, as are all members, to my predecessor, the member for Napier, who made a very significant contribution to our housing stock,

which now comprises approximately 62 000 housing units, although, of course, as at 30 June we still have 41 291 people on the waiting list.

By supplying an increasing number of new units to the community (in the order of 2 000 new units per annum), we were starting to see a drop in the waiting list. At peak, I think we reached about 3 150 new Housing Trust units in one year. The Housing Trust has constructed approximately 100 000 dwellings since 1936, providing housing to one out of every five South Australians. Our current stock runs at about 12 per cent, but it is important to note that the CSHA will have a very important impact on that.

As most members will be aware, we have suffered a major cut to our funding base, which will lead to a reduction in supply. We anticipate around 1 200 new units being added to our stock this year. Unfortunately, I have to predict that in 1991-92 our supply will be around the 700 mark, which will significantly reduce our growth factor and, I expect, add to our waiting list. Of course, we are doing other things to ameliorate that situation.

Our program for cooperative housing, shared equity purchase, sales, and indexed capital loans through the HomeStart program will assist to take some of those people off the waiting list as they move to their own housing. Finally, I must say that the CSHA will have some impact which, initially, will be detrimental, as we will not be able to make up the lost ground because of the programs we have been following over the past few years. However, as a Government, we will do everything we can to address that by looking at innovative ways of providing both public and affordable housing for our community. That has to be our program over the next few years.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Is the Minister of Housing and Construction satisfied with practices followed by the Housing Trust to ensure that tenants receiving concessional rents are not cheating the system and, if so, does he reject public statements by the member for Napier and his immediate ministerial predecessor that the trust is going about this 'the wrong way' because its officers are asking tenants questions about their personal lives?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I noted the comments by the member for Napier in the local media and, as a consequence, asked for an immediate report on the processes followed by the Housing Trust to ensure honesty in the system, from the point of view not only of tenants but of ensuring that that system is honest and publicly accountable. We have to ensure that the system is accountable not only to the tenants but to taxpayers generally, and that is a very important part of the whole process. As a consequence of the article which appeared in the local media, I asked the Housing Trust for a full report on the system. When I have that, I will be happy to report back to the honourable member and to the House.

BARKING DOGS

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Will the Minister give consideration to legislating for independent arbitrators to be used to resolve problems involving neighbours' dogs? There are instances where dogs being left

unattended for long periods cause a nuisance to neighbours through incessant barking.

At the moment council inspectors who investigate a complaint find that for a variety of reasons some neighbours are not prepared to give evidence in support of complaints. If the complainant is the only neighbour who is prepared to give evidence, no action is taken. It has been suggested to me that an independent arbitrator paid for by the objector should be able to decide the issue.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have sought some advice from my colleague the Minister of Local Government in another place on the question of using independent arbitrators to resolve problems with dogs. This matter has not previously been considered. The Minister has referred the matter to the Dog Advisory Committee for consideration.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know that members opposite find this amusing, but they are barking up different trees at the moment in respect of their various leadership problems. They are trying to keep a leash on the aspirations of the member for Bragg. The Minister is aware that some councils do take the approach outlined by the honourable member and will not take action on a single complaint, although that is perhaps an undesirable approach. Section 49 of the Dog Control Act clearly provides:

The occupier of any premises where a dog is kept . . . who . . . permits that dog . . . to be or become a nuisance shall be guilty of an offence . . .

Members opposite would be aware that subsection 49 (2) provides:

A dog shall be taken to be a nuisance . . . if it creates a noise, by barking . . . which persistently occurs or continues to such a degree . . . that it unreasonably interferes with the peace—

a bit like the member for Bragg barking after the Leader's job—

comfort or convenience of any person in any other premises.

Under such circumstances authorised officers of councils should take the appropriate action. I want to make perfectly clear to members opposite that, should the Dog Advisory Committee recommend in favour of the use of independent arbitrators, the Minister will give consideration to necessary amendments to the Dog Control Act.

Interestingly, neighbourhood mediation services probably fulfil a similar role at present, albeit without legislative support. I commend the member for Price. I think what he is proposing is not just a first in this State, not just a first in this nation but a world first on this very difficult issue of disputes over barking dogs.

MEAT IMPORTATION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Does the Minister of Agriculture believe that Australia should allow the importation of any chicken or pig meat because of the effect this will have on producers and, if so, what action is he taking to protect the South Australian industry from the possible ravages of disease which can wipe out a shed of poultry within days or, in the case of the pig industry, the introduction of diseases which seriously affect pig breeding in addition to the effects of many other potential diseases to both poultry and pigs?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I must say that I have no specific information on any changes that may be in place with respect to the importation of chicken meat into Australia; I will obtain a detailed report on that matter. With respect to pig meat, there certainly has been a change in the arrangements for its importation. It is now possible for pig meat to be imported into this country from countries that have

been identified as having certain pig diseases that can cause problems, particularly Canadian pig meat.

The advice of the Department of Agriculture—and it is supported by agriculture departments around the country—is that there is no risk of transmission of disease from imported pig meat into the pig industry in this country. I can only go on the technical advice that I have received from the department that there is no known occurrence of it happening. A significant part of the evidence to support that is that I understand that New Zealand has allowed the importation of pig meat for many years from Canada without any risk ever having been shown to the pig industry within that country.

However, I will obtain a detailed technical report on this matter for the honourable member, because it is certainly a matter that I know has been of concern to the pig industry in this State. However, as I understand it, the pig industry feels that the technical protocols do meet the protections that it feels need to be met. I will provide a more detailed report later.

RACECOURSE AMBULANCES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether sufficient first aid (in particular, ambulances) is available for jockeys riding at all barrier trials at Cheltenham and other racecourses in South Australia? On Tuesday, Ballarat hoop Darren Murphy fell from his mount, Anchor and Hope, in an unofficial barrier trial at Flemington. Murphy, who suffered a broken pelvis, a dislocated hip, two cracked ribs and a gashed hand, had to wait half an hour for an ambulance to arrive from a Melbourne hospital because ambulances do not stand by at unofficial barrier trials in Victoria. The President of the Victorian Jockeys Association (Pat Hyland) was reported as saying that the difference between official and unofficial barrier trials was not clear to him.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his concern about this issue, Cheltenham racecourse being located in his electorate. He is very fortunate that it has been remodelled, and the work done by the SAJC and the Racecourse Development Board in rejuvenating that facility is magnificent. The SAJC is responsible for the administration of barrier trials and the provision of services. I am advised by the SAJC that the St John Ambulance is always in attendance at all official barrier trials. If the ambulance is diverted through an emergency to another location, the trials are delayed until the return of that ambulance.

A casualty room is always available and its associated facilities are open at all times during trials conducted at Cheltenham. A veterinary surgeon and a horse ambulance are in attendance and medical centres are close to both Morphettville and Cheltenham, being the major tracks used for trials in South Australia. With regard to track work, I advise that a qualified medical sister is also in attendance each morning. The SAJC has its own ambulance available each morning, as well. Veterinary surgeons are on call and telephone facilities are available in the stalls areas to call St John if needed.

Every possible precaution is taken to ensure the safety of both the rider and the horse. Past performance in South Australia has shown that our record is probably second to none, and I know that members who are keen supporters of this industry will acknowledge that. In addition, the SAJC has installed solar lighting facilities at Morphettville for early morning track work and, although a number of horses

are based at Cheltenham, most are based at Morphettville. All aspects of safety have been covered.

This may be the last opportunity I have to ask members to join with me in paying tribute to and acknowledging the work of Mr Malcolm Fricker, who is Chairman of the SAJC. He is soon to retire and, on behalf of members of this House, I thank him for his contribution to racing in this State. It is fair to say that relations between the racing industry and the Government have been excellent during his chairmanship and I look forward to continuing that relationship with the new Chairman of the SAJC. I wish Mr Fricker and his family continued good health and success. I am sure that he will continue to support the industry and that we will see him at those events over which the SAJC has major control and at other community activities. I acknowledge his work with the SAJC and in the community.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn to Wednesday 10 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pipelines Authority Act 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA) owns, operates and maintains the Moomba to Adelaide natural gas pipeline and associated facilities, through which it transports and sells natural gas purchased at the Moomba treatment plant. As it is likely that interstate sources of gas will be required to supplement gas supplies from the South Australian sector of the Cooper Basin, it is desirable for PASA to be involved in pipelines which might cross State borders. However, PASA's Act most likely limits its pipeline activities to within South Australia.

This Bill seeks to amend PASA's principal Act in such a way as to ensure that PASA is able to acquire, construct and operate pipelines for conveying petroleum (as defined under the Act) to, from or within South Australia either solely or as a joint venturer.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the long title of the principal Act. The amendment strikes out the phrase 'in South Australia'.

Clause 4 amends section 10 of the principal Act which refers to powers of the Pipelines Authority. Section 10 (1) (a) is amended by striking out 'for conveying petroleum or any derivative thereof within this State and petroleum storage facilities connected therewith' and substituting 'for conveying petroleum or its derivatives to, from or within this State or petroleum storage facilities connected with any such

pipeline'. A further amendment to section 10 (1) is to strike out paragraph (b) and substitute with paragraphs (b) and (ba). These provisions refer to the acquisition of any pipeline or petroleum storage facility connected with such pipeline by the State, which conveys petroleum to, from or within the State. Further, the authority has the power to hold, maintain, develop and operate a pipeline or petroleum storage facility in which it has an interest or which is under the authority's control.

The existing paragraph (c) of section 10 (1) is also to be substituted with a new provision which refers to the authority's power to dispose of any pipeline or petroleum storage facility or interests in any pipeline or petroleum storage facility within its control. A further provision in relation to the authority's power to convey and deliver petroleum through any pipeline under its control that is contained within paragraph (ca).

Paragraph (e) of section 10 (1) is also to be repealed and a consequential amendment to paragraph (b) of section 10 (2) is therefore required to strike out the reference to that paragraph. A further amendment to section 10 is the insertion of subsection (1a) which provides that the powers conferred on the authority by subsection (1) may be exercised within or outside the State.

Clause 5 amends section 10aa of the principal Act by striking out of paragraph (c) of subsection (1) a qualification placed on type of body corporate in which the authority may acquire, hold or deal with shares, debentures or other interests.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a statement on behalf of my colleague in another place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: A question was asked yesterday by the member for Bragg about Australia's vehicle manufacturers supplying vehicles to the State Government for the next two-year period. As every honourable member would know, every State in Australia has abolished State purchasing preferences. Instead, all Governments give preference to goods manufactured in Australia. State Supply buys vehicles from the five manufacturers—GMH, Mitsubishi, Ford, Nissan and Toyota.

The State Government will spend nearly \$75 million on its fleet of about 4 700 vehicles, varying in size from small cars like the Ford Laser, to the Mitsubishi Magna, the Holden Commodore and the Toyota commercial vehicles. This contract expires in August 1992. No one car manufacturer could supply the varying range of vehicles required for all the differing requirements of Government departments and statutory authorities. GMH Ltd offered Nova and Barina for small, sedan, hatchback and notchback categories; Apollo sedan and station sedan in the medium category; VN Commodore for large sedan and station wagon categories; and Calais, Statesman and Caprice for the executive sedan category.

After extensive negotiations with tenderers had taken place, the State Supply Board considered the revised offers of all Australian manufacturers, taking into account purchase price, estimated resale prices, life cycle costing and technical acceptability. The board also considered statistical information relating to the estimated overall market share for

each manufacturer of the South Australian Government passenger fleet for the next two years, including police patrol vehicles. The board noted that even though GMH would not be successful in the whole of this contract, it would still gain an equitable market share of total Government vehicle business. This is due mainly to its current contract with the South Australian Police Department for the supply of Commodore patrol vehicles which expires in June 1992 (estimated at 730 units).

GMH did not submit a tender for either the panel van or the utility. Ford was the sole tenderer for these vehicles. GMH was successful with the Calais vehicle in the executive sedan category. In the case of the VN Commodore, the board considered that in relation to offers from Ford and Nissan the Holden was more expensive, after taking into consideration purchase price, estimated resale prices, whole of life costs and technical acceptability. In the case of other vehicle classes, the tendered prices from GMH were also higher. In general, its prices were 3 to 5 per cent higher than those of the recommended tenderers. GMH was given substantial opportunity to offer competitive prices during the negotiation phase of the tendering process. If vehicles had been selected in all the classes it tendered, the extra cost to the taxpayer over the two-year period of the contract would have been \$1.1 million.

The breakdown of the market share for the five car manufacturers is as follows: Toyota, 18.75 per cent (\$15.9 million share); Ford, 31.1 per cent (\$26 million share); Mitsubishi, 11.6 per cent (\$9.9 million share); Nissan, 19.8 per cent (\$16.8 million share); and GMH, 18.7 per cent (\$15.9 million share). It is absolute nonsense to suggest that the State Government is turning its back on South Australia's two vehicle manufacturers. As stated, GMH supplies all the vehicles for the police, which are Commodores. Manufacturers need to stand on their merits and compete, and State Supply must look for the best price to ensure it is getting the best value for the taxpayer's dollar.

We should not buy a particular vehicle just because it is made in South Australia, when it may not fit the requirements of the users or may be more expensive than other similar Australian-made vehicles. What the Opposition fails to realise is that the reintroduction of State preference agreements would mean our car manufacturers would have access only to the small market of the South Australian Government fleet. South Australia produces nearly 30 per cent of the country's vehicles, but we do not have 30 per cent of the requirements of Governments around the country.

By abolishing State preference agreements, our car manufacturers have access to the total market of all Governments in Australia. All Governments give fair access to producers in every part of the country, and this means better opportunities for South Australian industry, which also supplies 40 per cent of the nation's automotive components.

On this issue, the left hand of the Opposition does not seem to know what the right hand is doing. On the one hand, the Opposition Leader in his budget reply speech says a Liberal Government would implement comprehensive contracting out and competitive tendering to achieve savings. On the other hand, the member for Bragg is objecting to State Supply getting the best value for the taxpayer's dollar by competitive tendering. He is also objecting to the fact that State Supply is operating on a commercial basis, and saving for the taxpayers of this State by charging those who use the service of Government contracts. Was not the Opposition Leader talking the other day about 'the bottom line of economic efficiency and taxpayer benefit'?

State Services is bringing in an up-front commission to cover the costs of contract administration. At present, Government agencies are charged an annual fixed fee by State Supply for access to Government supplies contracts covering a range of items. This is inequitable, because every fee does not reflect the level of usage by the agencies involved. The \$50 commission for motor vehicles is aimed at achieving a more equitable allocation of costs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore that. The member for Murray-Malle has spoken again. The supposed 'up-front' commission, which is in fact paid quarterly, based on the actual supply of vehicles, was included in the price of the vehicles, and suppliers were given the option of increasing their tendering prices to compensate. This follows the lead of the Commonwealth and Tasmanian Governments, which have already introduced such a system, and other State Governments are expected to follow suit in the near future.

GMH was the only supplier to raise any objections to this charge, and in fact some of the other manufacturers have chosen to absorb this cost, thus providing further savings for the taxpayer. It is true that Mitsubishi is supplying only half the number of vehicles it supplied for the previous contract. Last time Mitsubishi tendered both the Colt and the Magna, but the Colt is no longer produced and therefore its market share has been affected accordingly.

The member for Bragg also claimed that the Government wanted a guarantee that prices for the cars would not rise during the two-year period of the contract. This is simply not true. The contract allows prices to vary in accordance with the supplier's retail price list. It is the discount rate applicable to the retail price which is fixed for the period of the contract. May I suggest that the next time the member for Bragg attempts to enlighten us on the car industry he gets his facts straight first.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.
(Continued from 5 September. Page 698.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I cannot but respond to the inanities that I have just heard from the Minister of Recreation and Sport—as he calls himself, and I know the name is appropriate. In this case the argument presented is so illogical and shot through with accounting inconsistencies as to be worthy of some comment, even without the necessity for further research. Clearly the Minister does not understand that the course the Government has chosen is costing the South Australian taxpayers money. The course the Opposition is advocating, based on recent historical accounting evidence that was provided to this House today by the Opposition during Question Time, would, indeed, not only save but make money for the South Australian taxpayer.

Why on earth the Government cannot see the good sense of ensuring, where possible, that the taxpayers get value for money is beyond me. Just because the purchase price of each vehicle happens to be in the relative class more competitive for one vehicle than another does not mean that the bottom line at the end of the day, once the vehicle's useful life to the Government is served, is that the taxpayer will be better off. In fact, the table provided for the *Hansard* record today clearly shows the contrary.

The other thing I want to say about vehicles today, quite apart from the remarks I have made that show that the Government is incapable of responsible economic decisions,

is that the Government is still doing nothing at all to provide incentives to the automobile manufacturers in this State to produce automobiles with primary fuel tanks that hold gas. The Government should provide incentives instead of making this initiative an add-on expense to the motorist who wishes to use a commonsense approach to the reduction of greenhouse emissions and other photochemical smog emissions that can come from automobiles that are run on liquid fossil fuels. I would have thought that a sensible policy for the Government to advance would be a payroll tax remission on the proportion of payroll that is used in the installation of primary fuel tanks on motor cars, where those fuel tanks hold gas and not liquid fuels. No attempt had been made in any other way, but this is a simple measure that the Opposition would take. There are other things that could be done in that direction. I will leave that topic altogether now.

An honourable member: What would Bert Kelly say about that?

Mr LEWIS: He would say, 'The member for Murray-Mallee has yet again got it right.' Let me now turn to another matter under the responsibilities I have on behalf of my colleagues under the general heading of energy, that is, the provision of electricity to the general public in South Australia by a monopoly supplier. It is a pity, of course, that the Government does not hasten in terms of micro-economic reform in that general arena. The noises it is making sound encouraging, but action cannot be seen. It is like watching concrete set.

In the course of the remarks that the Governor was compelled to make on behalf of the Government when he opened the Parliament, he said:

A further significant step in the restructuring of electricity tariffs was taken on 1 July this year to assist our industrial sector to become more competitive.

Hear, hear! I just wish that it was more true than rhetorical. The Governor went on to say:

On average, this has meant no increase in tariffs for industrial, general purpose and farm customers while off-peak users may benefit from a 7.25 per cent reduction in rates.

They may benefit, but there is no increase. Yawn! That is hardly a major breakthrough or a statement of great moment. We already know that the trust has been overmanned for years and that the Government was giving the management a hard time in terms of the reforms it was seeking to introduce. However, my concern is that, contrary to what the Government would have us believe, in another statement which looks at the costs to South Australian householders, it is pleasing to note that an undertaking to hold the price of electricity below the consumer price index is being achieved, with a 22 per cent fall in real terms over the past five years. That just does not square with the facts. The facts are that since 1982 (we will just go back to the point when this Government came to office) the average domestic power bill in South Australia has increased by 92 per cent to \$499.10.

Members opposite may look amazed and surprised as to how I could come to such a conclusion with such certainty. It is quite simple. I read this last year at about this time in none other than the Auditor-General's Report. Of course, I have not had the time to this point to discover what comment has been made in the Auditor-General's Report this year. Notwithstanding that, there was an ETSA submission to Cabinet to reduce the cost of industrial power, but Cabinet rejected that. Moreover, in the remarks to which I have just referred and those which I have just quoted, everyone was promised a power cut as of 1 July. Where is it? What is the Government doing? Why does it make such promises that it never intends to keep? Is it simply to create the

impression that it cares, to give the impression to the general public that it is doing something about those parts of its responsibilities that the general public have indicated they are worried about?

Let us take another example of the Government's tub thumping, trying to create an impression. Another area for which I am in part responsible is the manner in which we utilise the recreation facilities, indeed, all the facilities, that are provided to us by that grand river, the Murray. The Government has a report that was commissioned by the Government and the three district councils in the lower Murray: Mannum, Murray Bridge and Meningie. It is called the Gray report. The councils have paid their bit and they have their reports, but the Government will not release it. The public cannot get at the information it contains, and guess why? It is because the recommendations in it are fairly damning of the Government's indifference in policy areas where it should have, and said it would have, taken effective action in the past.

I do not have time to develop the arguments relative to that, but I just wish the Government would keep its word when it tells the public what it intends to do. Let us look now at the way in which it has affected, or at least shown its indifference to, some of the people I represent and, indeed, probably all the people. I refer to the budget and the Social Justice Strategy 1990-91. What a laugh! Financial Information Paper No. 4 it is called: it should be called 'misinformation paper', more like.

I have looked everywhere for some instance where the Government has provided reasonable recognition of the locational disadvantages of people living outside the metropolitan area. I came upon this topic 'South Australian Perspective' (page 8) and then (page 9) we see, under 3.3, 'Locational Disadvantage'. That entire topic is devoted to an analysis of what goes on in the metropolitan area. Every child who goes to school in the metropolitan area has access to free public transport, and pensioners have access to the public transport at privileged fare rates. I do not begrudge them that. I just ask why the people who live in Murray-Mallee and elsewhere in rural South Australia should go on paying taxes to provide that sort of service to people in the metropolitan area—the people who vote for the Government—when, in fact, they get nothing in return? Indeed, they get not only no services but insults: that is about all they get.

Mr Speaker, did you know that, in my electorate now, there are no public transport facilities available for school-children to take when they please, to go where they please at no cost to themselves or their parents? Perhaps, that is a good thing; I am not advocating that there should be such services. In fact, I would be disappointed if the Government attempted such a lunatic approach. However, the one thing that I am annoyed about is that the Government has decided, through the Minister of Education, simply to prevent children from going to the school of their choice by having them kicked off school buses that go to one school and making them travel further to the end route of another school bus to go to a school the Government has directed they shall attend, rather than to the school they would choose to attend.

Of course, if there was a State border involved, we could go for the Minister under the section we knocked him off on, section 11a, backed up by section 92 of the Australian Constitution, but there is no border involved. I am very annoyed to find that the Minister persists in 1990 with this archaic attitude of denying freedom of choice. There is no social justice for country people and to put out a budget

document that says there is a social justice strategy and to pretend that it is relevant is nonsense.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): The closure of a school is always fair game for criticism by an Opposition. I acknowledge that. What is not fair game is to be blatantly dishonest in the presentation of facts surrounding the closure of the school. Indeed, I make that accusation against the shadow Minister of Education, Mr Rob Lucas. He issued a press release—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: This is the forum for debate on these issues. He issued a press release yesterday in which he said:

The State Opposition today slammed the Bannon Government for breaking a promise regarding Payneham Primary School's future. Liberal shadow Minister of Education, Rob Lucas, said the Labor member for Hartley, Terry Groom, had assured the school and parents on good advice that Payneham would not close, provided student enrolments did not fall below 100. He said the Education Minister, Mr Crafter, must explain who told Mr Groom that Payneham Primary would not close while it retained the minimum of 100 students. That advice must have come from either the Minister or senior officers in his department. Mr Groom is a responsible member and would not mislead his electorate.

As I said last night, only that last phrase is accurate. One can see the tactic that the shadow Minister of Education is employing. He starts off with an assertion that I have misled the school, that I have been dishonest in my approach to this matter, and he then tries to get at the present Minister of Education, the member for Norwood, and rope him in on some allegation of misleading the school community and irresponsibility.

I know that he got this information from a member of the school council. The information was not reliable. Without checking the reliability or the sources or the facts, Mr Lucas immediately went into print, trying to play politics with a very serious local community problem. As I understand it, after he had issued a press release, Mr Lucas's office, or he, spent a lot of time trying to verify the accuracy of the press release, and could not do that. He was promptly told that the information was inaccurate. And it is not accurate. In 1984, the Payneham Primary School was earmarked for closure because enrolments for that year were to stand at 196. They actually improved slightly in 1984 as the year went on.

As a consequence of that report, which was made available for the school, my intervention in conjunction with the school community resulted in the school remaining open. At that time the Education Minister, the present member for Ramsey (Hon. Lynn Arnold) indicated in general terms that, if a primary school experienced consistent yearly intakes of below 100, it would have to be seriously considered for closure. That was a broad generalisation and it was never intended to exclude other factors.

In the Estimates Committee in 1986 this matter was again raised. I wrote a letter to the Payneham Primary School Council on 31 October 1986. The letter states:

Dear Secretary,

Recently in the Estimates Committee of Parliament, questions were asked of the Minister of Education with regard to the criteria for school closures. The previous Minister of Education had indicated that if school enrolments consistently fell below 100 the continued viability of the school would have to be looked at.

The current Minister of Education made further comments on this matter and I am enclosing herewith the *Hansard* report containing the Minister's answer. You will note from the answer that there is no hard and fast rule. There are currently schools in the metropolitan area with fewer than 50 students but that each requires a separate decision to be taken with regard to the particular circumstances of the school.

The *Hansard* report of 8 October 1986 (page 383, Estimates Committees) shows an answer to a question from the mem-

ber for Coles following up on something I had asked the Minister. The Minister of Education in answer to a question about whether a school would face closure if enrolments fell below 100, stated:

... it was never the policy of the previous Minister or the Government. It may have been a benchmark that someone used about viability of schools, but, to my knowledge, there has never been formulated a specific policy that became the policy of the Government on this matter. Of course, if that were the rule, many schools, particularly in the country, would be closed down. That is the simple explanation of the matter. Obviously one needs to consider some benchmarks or some assessment in terms of the viability of a school and its ability to serve the community, but there are no hard and fast rules.

I have religiously attended all school council meetings of the schools in my electorate. At those meetings I have dealt accurately with issues of school closures and I have provided school councils with information concerning that matter, in this instance the Payneham Primary School. There was consequently no basis whatsoever for the shadow Minister of Education, Mr Rob Lucas, to release what is quite patently a dishonest press release.

The fact of the matter is that it is a very serious problem for the local school community. As I indicated, in 1984 enrolments totalled 196. Some years before, in 1976, enrolments at the school totalled 637. It was predicted that in 1984 they would drop alarmingly, to somewhere between 120 and 150. Regrettably, that prediction has proved accurate. I believe that school communities will not fall for cheap political tricks. They are much more sophisticated than in years gone by; they want better value for the education dollar; and they will ensure that Governments deliver a more effective and efficient education dollar to ensure that their children's education is enhanced and improved.

As local member, I have always been responsive to the wishes of my local community. A public meeting on this matter is to be held at the school tonight. I know the school community well and know that these people will properly assess the facts. There are problems, but I believe that the school community will deal with these problems responsibly. At the commencement of next year, there will be only five reception year students, although there will be a bit of an increase as the year goes on. There will be only seven students in year 6 and 12 students in year 7.

In general terms, I know all the parents and all the school councillors, and I know that at heart everyone has the interest of better education for their children, over and above cheap political stunts. It is essential that schools provide viable educational programs and a wide and full range of educational experiences, so that children can learn languages, take part in drama, make up sporting teams, and that there is a viable school community behind the school. It costs about \$500 000 to keep open a primary school with an enrolment of, say, between 100 and 200, and Governments must be responsible. I believe that Payneham Primary School has a very good case. There is some development and growth in the area, and I am sure that the position will be assessed alongside all the other factors.

In conclusion, the shadow Minister of Education (Rob Lucas), notwithstanding the fact that he has been made aware of the untruthfulness of the press release he issued, has never taken any interest in the school, although he has lived in the area. He has never been down there to find out how it is getting on, but he comes in over the top, relying on some distorted and wrong information going back six years. Not only did he get the time frame mixed up; he thought that the person concerned was talking about some recent advice. In his haste to make political capital out of a serious problem for a local community, he got the time frame mixed up—he was six years out of date and he had

the wrong Minister. Of course, the honourable thing for the shadow Minister is to apologise and say that he is sorry for going in head first and making a botch of it.

I can now understand why Martin Cameron left. I have no doubt that the shadow Minister of Education was less than honest in his dealings with Martin Cameron. Martin Cameron, as we all know, was replaced as number one on the Legislative Council ticket, despite the fact that the present shadow Minister was a protégé of Mr Cameron. Not only did he take that number one spot but he took his job in the Upper House—less than honest in his dealings.

I openly acknowledge that it is fair game—it is quite fair game—to criticise a school closure and ask for a proper examination of all the facts. We would do that if we were in Opposition, and rightly so. But it is not fair game to be dishonest in your approach and dishonest about the presentation of the facts all to make cheap political capital out of a very serious local school problem.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In addressing this debate, I am pleased to be following the member for Hartley since I particularly want to draw to the attention of members in this place the condition of education in South Australia. In prefacing my remarks I have little doubt that, whatever the rights or wrongs of the case outlined by the member for Hartley, the shadow Minister of our Party in another place acted with integrity and honesty towards the facts as he knew them. I listened very carefully to the explanation given by the member for Hartley last night and again in this Chamber today, and understood him to say last night quite clearly, as he said today, that he first provided the advice the shadow Minister said he had provided in 1984. The only point of variation between them is how long that advice seems to have been sustained in the minds of those to whom it was provided.

From speaking to the shadow Minister, I believe that he believes that that advice was circulated within the community as late as January this year. Whether it came from the honourable member (as he assures us it did not; and I have no reason to doubt his word), nevertheless it happens that rumours circulate in school communities and are given credence. Someone heard the honourable member say it six years ago: they believe it still to be the case, so it is repeated in the name of the honourable member. If that were a failing of the shadow Minister, it would be an honest failure.

There are many more heinous problems in our education system than the issue raised by the member for Hartley although, central to it, is the closure of a school. Who said what and when they said it is peripheral to the fact that a school is closing. A school with an enrolment of just under 100 is closing, and I am given to understand that the enrolment will rise to 107 or 108 in the early part of next year.

We must examine some of the points made by the member for Hartley. In recent years in Adelaide there have been schools with enrolments of fewer than 50, and other schools closed which have had enrolments of more than 100. One must wonder for what reason these schools are closed and how there could be a sound educational argument to close a school of one size in one area, when that argument is not applicable to a school of a different size in a different area.

In this context, I should like to draw members' attention to one of the great traditions of Australian education—the one teacher rural school. I have read in the writings on the history of education in Australia great praise for that form of education. Indeed, it has been said that at a time when Australia really was the clever country and the lucky country, something our Prime Minister is again trying to make

us—albeit somewhat futilely by his policies—many students in our education system were educated in small, one teacher schools.

Those small, one teacher primary schools were the backbone of the education system of this nation and served us well. They have now become unfashionable—not for educational reasons but for economic reasons. What we have to ask ourselves is the argument the Minister himself puts forward in this place: whether social issues such as education are about more than dollars and cents.

I put that before the House, because when we are talking about school closures we should not just be talking about dollars and cents but about sound educational policies and what is best for the future of South Australia and Australia. If that were the only thing wrong with education in South Australia, I would be truly grateful. We can look at the deterioration of schools as a capital resource. One need go no further than the budget papers or visit schools in one's electorate to see that schools are a diminishing capital resource. Many of them have not been adequately painted; many were carpeted 20 years ago and the carpets are wearing out to the point where they are dangerous and the department cannot afford to replace them; and many of them have holes in their gutters and are generally falling to pieces.

This Government is behind in its maintenance program for those schools—and scandalously so. Those schools are a diminishing capital resource. I might not be a businessman or an economist, but I know that it is false economics to have something which is valuable but let it run down to the point where it is worth nothing. I put that forward as an argument that stands negatively towards our education system.

The deterioration of the levels of instruction are not only a matter of concern to me but also to every teacher in South Australia. While most of us will applaud the Government's efforts in mainstreaming people who are differently abled, it is argued by many teachers in this State that that is at a cost. It is at a cost to those who, while not being differently abled, are what traditionally might be called the slow learners in our schools.

I point out that, in putting back into schools those who are differently abled and those who need high levels of specialised instruction, that specialised instruction has been gained at the expense of those who have been called our slow learners. I ask members opposite, when visiting schools in their electorates, to put that question to the principals and staff of those schools and ask them in the spirit that those children who are slow learners are not receiving adequate help. Those children go through the system and then we have the very problem that we have now with adult literacy. The system misses them and they diminish the quality of our society.

That factor was brought home to me when I was principal of the Cook school. I spoke about this to someone who became a great friend of mine. He is a great bushman and a great character and about my age, so that makes him 39 or 40. In talking to him I discovered that he could neither read nor write. I was appalled because I really did not believe that people who are fortunate enough to have grown up in a nation such as Australia after the war could slip through the net and be illiterate. Yet this person was. It was partly the product of his upbringing but it was also partly a product of the system that let him slip through. I feel less for it and I think Australia should feel less for it. I acknowledge that at that stage there was probably a Liberal Government in South Australia. Nevertheless, that does not make it right.

The Minister has defended departmental committees over the past few days by saying that we need them and that it is right and proper that parents should be involved. I, for one, agree that parents should be involved in departmental committees, but I ask the Minister to come to this place and tell us honestly and accurately the composition of these committees. Most comprise middle level bureaucrats, some teachers and, if we are lucky, a token parent.

So, for the Minister to come in and say that committees exist for parents to be involved in our education system is inaccurate and, in fact, I think it tends towards being dishonest. I say that with considered thought. Ask any parent in any school. I acknowledge that it is perhaps not the Government so much as the profession which is still worried about genuinely involving parents. They really do not want a parent to ask too many questions and to really become involved in the education process because it might make it difficult for them. I could and should go on about the deterioration in the general morale of teachers and principals in our society but time will not permit. We had and still should have a wonderful education system. The reason we do not have that is due to many factors—and some of them are beyond the control of the Government. However, the current malaise in the teaching profession and the current critical shortage of those who should be training to be our teachers is to be—

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am pleased to be speaking in this grievance debate today because I am, indeed, grieved at the budget process as a result of the overt inaccuracies in the budget papers. I believe that the budget is the most important document put on public record, but I do not believe that it ought to be a public relations document. I refer to page eight of the budget speech 1990-91 delivered on (and I ask members in the House to note this) 23 August 1990. It states:

During 1990-91 the new 120 bed hospital will be opened at Noarlunga.

I remind members that it was 23 August when the Premier said that. This creates the impression that all is well with the Noarlunga Hospital and with the health system in general. I accept that a lot is well, but the problems simply cannot be swept under the carpet by platitudes. On 4 September—eight working days later—a ministerial statement by the Minister of Health in this House stated:

Initiative moneys advanced in the 1990-91 budget amount to \$1.8 million which will allow 40 beds out of a total of 120 to be opened in late April 1991.

What a comedown and what an indictment of the budget process and of the Premier's budget speech. I believe that the Minister of Health ought to be ashamed and, indeed, he must be embarrassed to have had to bring down, within 12 days, such a statement in contradiction of the Treasurer's budget speech.

Surely, the Premier could not have been ignorant of this situation when he brought down the budget as the Treasurer. Surely, he must have known that out of 120 beds only 40 were to be opened. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the budget speech of the Premier was a deliberate attempt to muddy the water, to put the Opposition off the scent and to hoodwink South Australians. As I indicated previously, I grieve for the budget process. The information provided by the Government to this House, the House of the people, ought to be correct. As I indicated before, this is a very important public document; it ought not be a public relations document.

I now move to another instance where the budget process has quite clearly been utilised to create a public relations exercise for the Government while glossing over difficulties for South Australians. I refer to a question which I asked the Minister of Health earlier today. I indicate to members that with changes that have occurred in the South Australian spectacle scheme, perhaps better known as the pensioner glasses scheme, pensioners will now have to contribute \$60 for their own bifocals compared with \$36 previously. This \$24 increase, which is a mere 67 per cent, is (according to reports I have received from optometrists) enough to make pensioners—when applying for new bifocals to allow them decent quality of life—burst into tears and admit that they are unable to afford new glasses.

This is perpetrated by a Government that prides itself on its social justice strategy. What a joke! This is a dreadful situation for pensioners. I point out that in the budget process no mention was made of this and it was certainly not clearly explained at all in the budget papers. However, what do we find in a press release from the Minister of Health on budget day? He says that there will be 'a slightly larger contribution' by pensioners towards the total cost of their spectacles.

It is a dreadful situation for pensioners and, unfortunately, the Minister of Health appears not to care because, in answer to my question asking him to confirm these details (of which I remind the purveyors of social justice in this community), the Minister of Health, the man directly responsible for this plan, told the House:

I will have to remind myself of the exact details of the scheme. I would not want to swear to the exact amount.

Let me tell the Minister of Health and members opposite that every single pensioner who goes in to get a new pair of bifocals will be able to tell him the exact details of the scheme. Pensioners would be delighted to inform the Minister that he has increased the cost of their glasses by 67 per cent. I remind members that this is on top of the much vaunted Federal Government scheme to make pensioners pay \$2.50 up front for their pharmaceuticals. I cannot understand either of these plans. I cannot understand how they can be brought into the public arena by a Party which professes social justice.

If one looks at the social justice strategy, one realises just how much the Labor Party really cares about social justice. It is a much vaunted strategy but it is nothing more than jargon for income redistribution, from those who work hard and ought to have a buck at the end of the day to other people. This social justice strategy rates its own special document among the budget papers, printed at taxpayers' expense. How does this social justice strategy perform? As a PR job, it gets a credit, but certainly not a distinction. It is only just above the pass mark because it is neatly presented and there are no spelling errors. However, how does it go matching reality with rhetoric? It is a dismal failure.

Page 17 of the social justice strategy advises:

Agencies were encouraged to develop proposals consistent with the overall strategic direction which were innovative, and demonstrated features such as . . . multi-faceted approaches to improving residents' quality of life . . . community safety . . . and innovative approaches to health and welfare provisions.

Tell that to the pensioners who cannot afford bifocals. Tell that to the pensioners who do not have \$2.50 to pay for their pharmaceuticals.

Mr Gunn: They cannot pay for accommodation when they come to Adelaide for specialised treatment.

Dr ARMITAGE: Absolutely. Does this address, as the document says, the distribution of services across the State? Patently not, except in a retrograde way. This document is inaccurate, as are many of the budget papers. It is shallow

and it will be perceived as such by the community. In general, the budget is disappointing. In my view, it is absolutely transparent in its aim and, as such, the people will see through it. However, my main reason in grieving on the budget process is that the facts presented in the budget simply do not add up.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to note grievances on the Appropriation Bill because we are dealing with the expenditure of well in excess of \$5 billion of taxpayers' money. Members of Parliament have a clear necessity to address themselves to those matters which are of concern to them. Whether the Government agrees is another matter. The matters of concern to me are similar to those expressed by the member for Adelaide. This week I have been contacted by concerned constituents who live a long way from Adelaide and who have been informed that the isolated patients' assistance program, which has operated for some years—first, on a Federal level and, secondly, on a State level—has been considerably altered. It will mean that many isolated people will be denied access to the arrangements that assist them in gaining essential medical treatment.

A decent society should be judged by how it treats the underprivileged, the sick and the elderly. Our priorities should be such that the elderly, having given service to the community all their life, have access to proper medical facilities in their declining years. People living in isolated communities face many difficulties. Some of the constituents who have contacted me this week have very poor sight. Some are widows or widowers and they have difficulty travelling to Adelaide for medical treatment. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Minister of Health will examine this matter carefully and will review it more compassionately. I am not one of those people who believe that we should look after every need raised with the Government by the community. We must carefully analyse our priorities.

Another matter that has caused me a great deal of concern in recent times is the ability of people in the private sector to develop projects, improve their facilities or carry out essential development work for the welfare of the people of this State. It is an undeniable fact that, if we are to continue to have a successful economy, we must have development, because development creates more jobs, more income and better services. Therefore, it creates a more stable community. Unfortunately, in recent years, all sorts of groups have sprung up in the community, some under the banner of Government, some funded by Government bureaucracies and others funded at the behest of local pressure groups, whose sole intention—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: And a few with a touch of green.

Mr GUNN: Yes, there are the dark greens, the middle greens and the pale greens. They rank in that order, from extreme cranks to moderate cranks to concerned and responsible elements in society. That is how they rank. If we are not very careful, we will have in place such bureaucratic nonsense and humbug that no adequate development will take place.

It is time the Planning and Development Act was completely overturned and rewritten into a simple, understandable, workable document. It should not be labelled the 'development' Act because it is really an anti-development Act. It is absolute nonsense that, if someone takes objection, the local authority has to pay to go to court to defend the action when it may not be involved, because it is not the

developer. However, any irresponsible crank can lodge an objection and the council is up for considerable costs. That is outrageous and it should be done away with immediately. Professional groups delight in causing this sort of disruption to ongoing development.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: And, in the meantime, the development is set aside.

Mr GUNN: That is right. The developer gets sick of it and says, 'What am I doing in this place?' South Australia has a large number of conservation parks and national parks. The parks have been set aside for the benefit and enjoyment of the community and there is an increasing demand from the public to visit them, to camp in them and to generally enjoy the surroundings. I have no problem with that whatsoever but I sincerely hope that there is a substantial amount of money in this budget to upgrade the facilities, to ensure that there is proper supervision, adequate bushfire control, that they are adequately fenced, that there is a proper system of well sign-posted roads and that the parks are in a position to be good neighbours to adjoining landholders.

I believe that, because these parks have been set aside for the enjoyment of the community, there should be development in them so that the community can participate. It is no good talking nonsense, saying that, because the title of a piece of land has been altered, developers cannot build a hotel, a camping site, a caravan park, a chalet development—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: An aerodrome.

Mr GUNN: —or an aerodrome. I do not hold with that view. The parks are for the people of South Australia and for those who want to visit South Australia. We should provide the facilities to encourage and enhance that process. The suggestion that these areas of land should be out of bounds to everyone except a few irrational greens who think they are for their benefit is outrageous. This Parliament will have to take very firm action.

I support the Government's initiative today to legislate in relation to a particular development, because the Government must provide the lead in solving these problems. It must stand up to these groups instead of listening and trying to appease them all the time. The Government must say, 'Enough is enough. The time has come when the welfare of the people of this State must be put first. Let's get on with it.' It must say whether it wants a development or it does not; it should not try to ride two horses and end up falling on the barbed wire fence. The time has come.

I have two or three concerns about the development at Wilpena. First, I would be very disappointed and angry if the existing operators were not given the fair treatment they deserve. They pioneered the tourist industry in the Flinders Ranges and should be treated properly. It is necessary for the Government to take positive action. If the environmental movement is successful in stopping the Wilpena development, it will then attempt to stop every tourist development in the Flinders Ranges. Every tourist development will come under attack, whether at Arkaba, Blinman or anywhere else where there is a need for alternative forms of accommodation.

Anyone who knows anything about the Flinders Ranges and the northern Flinders Ranges knows that that area is recognised internationally as one which people want to visit. There is an urgent need to upgrade the Balcanoona airstrip so that people can use the excellent facilities provided by the Sprigg family at Arkaroola. If the Government does not take action, any further development in the area will be curtailed and it will be virtually impossible for that large section of the community that wants to visit those areas to

go there. These irrational people who are trying to stop development in agricultural areas and mining development are fools and should be treated as such, because this country was built on the agricultural and mining industries and they ought to be encouraged.

A question was asked in the House today in relation to my district. I think it could have been better worded, but perhaps we would have been better off if it had not been asked, because I do not think that action will serve any useful purpose. If there is a problem in that area, there are other ways to handle it. I know the people involved in this particular exercise.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What was it about?

Mr GUNN: It was in relation to so-called sacred sites in certain areas. I am of the view that it is wise to treat these sorts of sensitive matters with a great deal of caution. I have always been a particularly cautious person and I continue to be that way.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You were taught to be cautious.

Mr GUNN: Yes, I was taught to be cautious. In conclusion, I believe that the Government has a responsibility to look after the needs of all people involved in the tourist industry in the Flinders Ranges.

Mr De LAINE (Price): In the brief time allotted to me this evening I want to touch on an area of utmost concern to me and to my electorate of Price, given its social makeup, that is, housing. There is no question that housing is by far the most important area of need; it is more important than employment and almost any other service. Especially in this sort of weather, people have to have a roof over their head.

The recent changes to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funding arrangements are making life very difficult for the State Government and the South Australian Housing Trust to sustain public housing programs at levels which this State enjoyed prior to 1984. In the seven-year period prior to 1988-89, 2 700 new housing units were built each year. For 1990-91, the projected figure is 1 350 dwellings, including cooperatives. This figure consists of a target of up to 1 000 construction commencements, approximately 100 purchases of housing stock and the housing cooperative program provision of up to 300 units for social housing. This annual addition to public housing stock is expected to decline further in the years ahead because of these unfortunate changes to the funding arrangements under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. In other words, I think the emphasis will change from the Housing Trust's providing a public housing service to its providing a welfare housing service.

In the past, the South Australian Government has done more than any other Government in Australia in the area of public housing. It has put every cent of grant and loan moneys into public housing, but now, because of these changes in funding arrangements, those funds will be cut back to a *per capita* basis which is, of course, fair in most States but a real problem for South Australia, a State that has done the right thing in the past. However, a State like Queensland, to give one example, which has not done the right thing in the past, now has the benefit of massive injections of funding, which is very beneficial to the recently elected Goss Labor Government.

In answer to a question during Question Time today, the Minister of Housing said that since the inception of the Housing Trust in 1936 approximately 100 000 houses have been built for the Housing Trust in South Australia. In terms of assistance to people, this means that approximately 20 per cent of South Australians have benefited from the public housing programs either in rental accommodation or

home purchase. It has been a significant contribution to the people of this State over many years.

South Australia has a higher than average level of public housing; in fact, 12 per cent of the housing stock in South Australia is public housing, against a national average of only 5 per cent. Currently in South Australia the Housing Trust manages approximately 63 000 dwellings but, unfortunately, at this stage about 42 000 people are on the waiting list for public housing. I suppose it is pleasing that the figure has dropped from 45 000 a couple of years ago. This is a step in the right direction, but a significant number of people are still waiting for accommodation and this is a problem for the Government.

In most areas of my electorate of Price the waiting time for new applicants is between 5½ and six years—a considerable wait. It is interesting to note that in 1977-78, 52.1 per cent of new tenants were employed whereas today the employment rate of new tenants has decreased to 26 per cent. That in itself is a major problem for this Government. In that same period the percentage of tenants in Housing Trust accommodation on assisted rents was about 7 per cent whereas today it is almost 70 per cent—another drastic change and one that puts more pressure on the Government and the Housing Trust.

Despite these changes to funding, I still believe that rents are becoming too high. I know there is a ceiling of 25 per cent of income, but with modern living and expectations this is too high. A lot of people in my electorate who live in Housing Trust accommodation are really hurting. I appreciate that some people in private accommodation are hurting even more: some private rentals have increased to 50 and 60 per cent of income, and that is absolutely disgusting.

We have to keep rents down. I know that some years ago 25 per cent of a person's income for rent would have been reasonably cheap, but today, because of the way we live and other factors, it is very expensive. People are hurting, so, at all costs we have to keep rents down.

A couple of my ideas may help in this regard. For instance, we must build cheaper homes. I do not mean inferior homes, but cheaper homes. With modern materials and technology the Housing Trust should be able to build cheaper homes. I believe that the trust should have a research and development group set up to explore this idea. The types of houses and the way houses have been built have changed very little over the years, and with modern technology and materials the trust should be able to provide much cheaper housing.

I am glad to see the restructuring of the Housing Trust itself. I think this will play a big part in keeping down costs. A restructuring is under way at the moment in terms of the reduction of levels of management and, with increased efficiency and a better method of servicing tenants, this is another way to go. Tenant participation is also a concept being introduced into the Housing Trust area. That is another way to make the trust more efficient and enable it to keep costs down. Repair of damaged trust homes beyond the normal wear and tear costs a lot of money which, in many cases, is not recoverable from tenants. Maybe an incentive could be built in to the rental structure to reward good and careful tenants and to encourage others to look after their home.

The conditions of tenancy must be reviewed to allow for the moving of people into more appropriate accommodation. For example, the case of, say, an elderly woman who has lived in a three-bedroom or four-bedroom home for many years, whose children have grown up and married and who has lost her husband, should be reviewed. As a

condition of tenancy where that happens that person could be relocated in a one-bedroom or two-bedroom dwelling. I will refer to this matter at another time, but economies must be introduced into the Housing Trust to keep rents down. As I said before, rents are becoming too high and people are hurting.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Back in the days of the Tonkin Government, our Premier introduced a system of committees into this Parliament in lieu of the traditional Committee system to deal with Bills that come before us. He acknowledged and, indeed, retained the Committee process following the second reading except in relation to that Bill which appropriated the master funding for the State budget early each financial year. For the purpose of dealing with the details of that Bill, Premier Tonkin introduced a system of having Ministers and their staff, on the floor of the Parliament, available for questioning by a panel of members.

I was a bit critical of that system in the first instance although, as a Minister in that Government, I, and my fellow Ministers, were required to bite our lips and to wear the system like loyal subjects of the Executive of the day. In that situation I thought we ought to make the best of it, so I, along with the rest of my colleagues, exploited the system. I make no apologies for having done that. It was an opportunity for Ministers to grandstand, to canvass and to advance the propaganda surrounding their portfolio or the objectives of the Cabinet as a whole—almost whatever. By the end of the Tonkin era, the system of Committees in this Parliament had clearly become a farce. I thought and, I suppose with tongue in cheek I hoped, that subsequent Ministers of another persuasion—those of the Labor Party—might see the error of our ways and, indeed, settle down and properly address themselves to this system, that is, if it were to be retained. But alas, they did not; they were just as blatant in their disregard for the real objectives of that Committee system, as indeed, were their predecessors.

In fact, as time has gone on, through the subsequent Parliaments, Ministers have become even more expert in spreading the propaganda associated with their respective portfolios. They have become more expert in using up the allocated time and thereby minimising the number of questions that can be asked of them.

I do not think that the situation will improve a great deal. However, in this very short debate toward the end of the consideration of the budget in the full Chamber, I would simply plead with those Ministers who are to address the Estimates Committees over the next two weeks to show a bit of statesmanship, to confine their remarks to answers to questions and, on the other side of the coin, I request members from both sides of our Parliament to confine their questions to those matters of import that they wish to raise without explanation. Wherever possible, some arrangement along those lines ought to be sought because, quite clearly, the media in South Australia, if not the public across the board, have been very critical of the behaviour of members of Parliament, *per se*, during the Committee stage of each of our Appropriation Bills under the system that has been in place in recent years.

I think it would do us all well to at least try to cooperate in relation to that matter in the forthcoming period. We will no doubt see a bit of straying from time to time, especially on the part of those new members who wish to have themselves well and truly heard and recorded in *Hansard*. It is an opportunity for members to sound off and boast about their achievements and, Party politically, promote themselves within their respective districts. I can

understand all that stuff: I have been there and done that, as have a good many other members in this House. However, I think that it is the best opportunity that we collectively, as members in this place, have to show a bit of impartiality, to show a bit of commonsense, and to demonstrate our desire to capture and cultivate a bit of credibility during this period. In my view it is an opportunity for many members—backbenchers included—to ask a whole lot of questions if they confine themselves to short questions with no explanation and if Ministers, accordingly, give short answers if they know the answer or, if they do not, simply give an undertaking to provide the answer in writing rather than reaching for reams of paper outlining prepared propaganda, as has been the practice so far.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We do not have the member for Napier to contend with this year.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I suppose it is fairly easy to respond to the member for Light and join his criticisms of the member for Napier, but we all know the member for Napier. He will not change. He is too old and long in the tooth and too staid in his ways to change. My request is directed not specifically to the likes of the member for Napier but more especially to the current Ministers, to those who are in the clan of shadow Ministers and to our new members on the back bench: it is simply to do the right thing on both sides of the House. I am sure, now the Minister of Agriculture is here, and given his past record in this regard, that he would acknowledge, if not publicly then privately, that the whole system of committees following the budget debate in this place has become an absolute farce. It is unfortunate that the Minister was not here earlier.

So, in summary, my plea is that this time, members and Ministers display a little bit of commonsense and that, when members ask a question, they do so without explanation during the Committee period and that Ministers give their replies without all the propaganda that has previously gone with it. If they do not know the reply, I ask that they simply indicate that they will provide it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I acknowledge the Minister's apparent concurrence with this theme. He has not confirmed that he will observe it, but I hope he will participate in it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I have been there and done that, and I have witnessed the Minister of Agriculture in that situation on a number of occasions since he has taken on his various portfolios. He is just as guilty as everyone else in this place of using up time in this place and minimising the number of questions that can be asked.

As I indicated earlier, it was not and is not my intention to name any individuals in this situation. Of course, I name the member for Napier; he is a special person. He wanted to be named; he has been saying, 'Come on, what about me?' throughout my address. So, I have little alternative but to name him but I do so with a degree of reticence. That is a much safer term than 'innocence'. At this point, at the expiry of my allocated time, I simply repeat my plea and say that it would be in all our interests. Also, in the longer term, our credibility as a Parliament will be acknowledged beyond this place and in the public arena.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I wish to address my remarks to certain concerns of my constituents in the electorate of Newland in relation to their fears and concerns about law and order and the offences that are committed against members of our community. I will read into the record of the House letters from constituents that reflect some public

concerns about a range of issues within the sphere of law and order: issues that this Government cannot and will not address with responsibility and issues that people rightly expect this Government to deal with and find solutions to.

In his policy speech in October 1982, the Premier, Mr Bannon, said nothing about law and order and the personal safety of the citizens of South Australia from criminal activity. In his policy speech in 1985, he devoted some time to that issue of law and community security. He said that respect for law and order and the security of individuals was the basis of any civilised society. He expressed concern about serious crimes such as rape and armed robbery and promised to begin preparations for major test cases before the Court of Criminal Appeal to obtain tougher penalties that could stand as a benchmark for these and other serious crimes. That has still not occurred. Before I read into the record some of the letters that I have on hand, I wish to refer to a survey that was conducted very recently on trends and issues in crime and criminal justice. The survey was conducted over a number of Western countries, 14 in all, with comparable economic and social standards. The survey states:

Australia is ranked third highest of the 14 countries in terms of overall victimisation, behind the other two non-European countries, the USA and Canada. In assaults involving force, sexual incidents, burglary and motor vehicle thefts, Australia ranked highest of all countries surveyed. Only in such categories as motor cycle or bicycle theft and pickpocketing did we fail to finish in the top half of the list. The risk of having a car stolen in Australia in 1988 was equal highest with France, even after taking Australia's high rate of car ownership into account. During 1988, 6.9 per cent of Australian respondents also said they had had things stolen from their cars (for example, luggage, radios, car mirrors, etc.), and 8.7 per cent had had the car damaged in some way.

Burglary affected 4.4 per cent of Australian respondents during 1988 compared with 3.8 per cent in the USA and 3 per cent in Canada. European rates of burglary were only around half the Australian figure. These figures appear to be related to the percentage of detached or semi-detached houses, which is very high (85 per cent) in Australia.

Australia on 5 per cent ranked equal second with Spain for its frequency of personal thefts, with Canada (5.4 per cent) in the unenviable top spot. These crimes consisted of thefts of personal items such as purses, jewellery or shopping while at work, school or in some public place. Interestingly, though, as noted earlier, Australians were at very low risk of pickpocketing.

Australia had very high rates of sexual incidents, including sexual assaults, even when other factors, such as the high female labour participation rate and our high propensity to go out in the evenings, are taken into account.

I would now like to read a letter that I received from a constituent which states:

I thought you may be interested in a clipping I took from last week's *Sunday Mail TV Plus Guide*. I couldn't believe the statistics and am concerned that, like in so many things, Australia is rapidly following the trends of America. I only hope that, with caring, determined people like yourself in positions of influence, we aren't going to wait until acts of violence and rape reach these portions [*sic*] before we wake up and do something concrete to stop it continuing. I am speaking up now hoping that action to curb such crimes can take place before we personally have to experience the anguish and heartache of seeing ourselves or our loved ones victims of these crimes.

The statistics that this person mentioned in this letter that came from the *Sunday Mail* are as follows:

Rape has reached epidemic proportions in the US. One woman is raped every eight minutes and as many as nine out of every 10 attacks are unreported. Also, alarmingly, only one rapist in 60 is caught and, after serving a fraction of his sentence, there is every chance he will rape again.

The other major area of concern to ordinary South Australians is that of assault. Citizens want to be able to go out at night without fearing that they will be mugged. They want to be able to walk at night through the hopping streets of Adelaide and its suburbs without fearing for the safety of their families and themselves and without harassment.

But they no longer have the same relaxed attitude towards venturing out at night that they once had. Older people, in particular, have developed a real fear of venturing out from their homes—not that they are always safe in their own homes. A further letter I wish to read covers another area of offences in relation to assault. This letter is from a concerned parent and states:

I feel it is my duty to write to you to advise and protest about a very sad state of affairs happening in my area and your constituency. On Sunday morning 17 June at 2 a.m. I received a call from my son from the Modbury Hospital. He and two friends had been bashed senseless by bouncers and security guards at the Golden Grove Tavern. My son has baton marks all over his face, throat, hands and head, and three stitches. One friend has baton marks up his back, hands, face and head, and a third person has had three front teeth completely knocked out, roots and all, plus abrasions and bruising.

The police believe these batons are long-handled black, solid torches. These men, aged between 23 and 26, are a mess. This all started after they and a group went to the 'Grove'. Half the group were admitted and my son, his girl friend and other two friends were not. All these people were dressed in clean, tidy, collared shirts, jumpers and jeans and two weeks before, they were admitted, my son in exactly the same clothes as he wore the last time.

When he asked the door person what the difference was between wearing jeans this week and the last time, he was not given a reason but forcibly shoved out of the door. Before any of them had time to think, they were assaulted by six to eight thugs. They were repeatedly bashed to the ground while trying to run for their lives and were even chased in this manner to the car park. I believe these bouncers are sadistic, untrained, undisciplined thrill seekers who have no regard for their victims or what kind of damage they can inflict. If it is allowed to continue someone will be permanently disabled or killed. I am appalled that these lunatics are allowed to be hired by a local business. Surely if there is a tragedy this also makes the management just as guilty as the bouncers. The other point is, why can't they be made to use trained, responsible security such as MSS or perhaps a special police unit for the Friday and Saturday night? The staff at the Modbury Hospital told us they see 10 to 12 people every weekend with 'bouncer abuse', so the problem is obviously not new.

This is a traumatic state of affairs, not only for the young people who have incurred these assaults but, obviously, for the parents concerned.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Before addressing matters more directly related to the budget, I should like to say a few words about an idea I raised a few weeks ago about the possibility of having a resident royal family, which seemed to generate a bit of discussion in the community. The member for Napier certainly took great interest in this and, I believe, was disappointed that he was not on the short list. My reason for raising this issue was to generate some discussion within the community in terms of the various possibilities that face us in our community in respect of the sort of governmental system we should have and are likely to have in the future.

To that end, I believe that it generated some discussion and, at least, took people's minds off Port Adelaide's bid for the AFL. I was rather disappointed to learn that the member for Napier was unable to take a lighthearted remark made by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Napier is keen to dish it out, but not so keen to be on the receiving end. That is unfortunate and, in itself, along with many other factors would disqualify him from membership of any resident royal family.

I had a late night telephone call from someone who claimed to be a member of the royal family living in Australia. I did not catch the name clearly—it could have been 'Hemmings' or 'Lemmings'; I was not quite sure. It sounded a bit like 'Terry here', but I do not think it was the Terry Hehir of the ABC. I am not sure who it was, but I think it was someone who had his sights set on being part of that family.

Comment was made about Screaming Lord Sutch in the media and also in this place. People were somewhat unkind to Screaming Lord Sutch. I did some research on the honourable gentleman, and the *Encyclopedia of Pop, Rock and Soul* said that Sutch's problem was that he was ahead of his time. He was originally a working class boy rather than a hereditary Lord, but during his career he did acquire a number of blueblood friends. There is some similarity there, and perhaps this gives the member for Napier the opportunity to elevate his status.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is not as silly as it sounds, because we did have King O'Malley in the House, didn't we?

Mr SUCH: We have a few kings and perhaps a few potential others. It is interesting to note that this biographical detail states that Screaming Lord Sutch was associated with a group called The Savages. If I am 'Screaming Lord', the mind boggles as to who constitute the remainder of the group.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: At least you're no threat to the leadership!

Mr SUCH: Just be careful! It has to be noted that Screaming Lord Sutch was a pioneer in commercial radio in the UK. He was also a pioneer in seeking and obtaining the vote for 18-year olds. This is an indication of his true merit: he stood against someone called Harold Wilson, a British Labour stalwart. From that brief account, obviously, he was not a bad person. Raising this topic generated a few letters to me, and I should like to share briefly some elements of those. I received a letter from a group in Sydney whose acronym members can work out for themselves. The group is called The British Ultra Loyalist League Serving Historical Interests Today. The letter states:

We of BULLSHIT were delighted to hear of your wonderful idea that here in Australia we should have our own resident royal family. However, your search is over before it has begun, for we do indeed have our very own royal family, none other than Lord Bloody Wog Rolo, his Royal consort Lady Wog and two delightful princelings, or, as His Lordship and Her Ladyship often refer to them, Woglets.

It goes on in similar vein and is signed 'Your obedient servant, Sir Albert Bootlicker, President'. I had some more serious correspondence, including one letter from the UK which suggested that mine was a good idea. Someone from Wolverhampton wrote to me as follows:

One feels that you are right to concentrate on the British royalty as a source for your own royal family, as this would appear to continue and in some way enhance the British link. The Scandinavian royalty all seem to be closely related, and the links between Norway, Sweden and Denmark seem to have improved since 1905 when the union between Norway and Sweden was dissolved.

I received another letter from a person from the suburb of Wingfield—a well-known Adelaide suburb which is gradually moving up in status. This particular person says:

I believe your plan to import royalty has merit and imagination and in no way deserves the ridicule given to it by the media, but I do not believe that you have extended the idea far enough. If we go to the trouble of having a royal family in residence, we must also have noble ranks (barons, dukes, earls etc.) . . . Thus a member of the House of Representatives or Legislative Assembly would be a knight or lord, a Minister (or shadow Minister) depending on Party ranking, would be a baron or earl. The Premier would become prince (but who would vote for 'Prince John' then, after being raised on Robin Hood stories). The Deputy would be grand duke, as would the Leader of the Opposition. Legislative Councillors would be counts with maybe a duke or two. Senior public servants would become marquises, dukes or counts. Heads of industry can actually become merchant princes . . .

I received quite a smorgasbord of correspondence on that issue. I accept that it has a light-hearted element to it, but it has a serious thrust in that I trust that South Australians and Australians will start to think about whether we maintain the present monarchical system, whether we modify it or go down the republican path. However, I hope that

people at least weigh up the pros and cons of the various possibilities.

In the short time left to me. I will comment briefly on some aspects of the budget that I have not mentioned before. I believe that the free bus scheme needs to be reviewed. I trust that the Government will get cracking on that review very quickly, because I receive constant representations, particularly from STA bus drivers, who point out the abuses and weaknesses of that scheme. I believe it needs to be modified to take account of the serious complaints that are made.

In respect of housing, I note the statement that this State has experienced a sustained reduction in the real level of Commonwealth assistance for housing. I am very unhappy with the fact that many of my constituents have to wait six years to obtain Housing Trust accommodation. I trust that the State Government will pursue this matter vigorously to reduce the waiting list that currently confronts constituents in my area and elsewhere.

Finally, I encourage the Government to proceed quickly to expand the Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works which serves the area contained within my electorate, and I encourage the Government to introduce a power generation plant sustained by the production of methane from that sewage treatment works. At the moment it is the only metropolitan treatment works which does not have that.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Before I get down to the main subject of my speech tonight I would like to put on the public record a few remarks about an individual who passed away some two weeks ago and with whom I had the pleasure of being acquainted for many years. I speak about Desmond Patterson—we all called him Don. He was 65 years of age, but his family and most of his friends would have liked Don to have had a longer life. It should be recognised that he packed a great deal of quality and a great deal of community service into his life. Although sadly missed, his contribution in many areas has been recognised by friends and by many members of the community who knew him.

Don Patterson went to war in 1943 and stayed in the Army until the end of the Korean war. He very much looked back to those days when he was in the Army. He learned to speak Japanese. He was one of the first people to tell me about events on the Island of Amam. That story has been made into a film which I understand is showing around town. It is with much regret that I never got the chance to see that film with him. In his years of combat service he distinguished himself and received many decorations. After that he set up a business in South Australia and was arguably one of the best gunsmiths in Australia and, in fact, received acclaim from many parts of the world.

His activities as a JP and in many community service organisations, and his willing hand for the working bees of community organisations, were well known. He was never up front; he was always in the rear. In fact, I am sure that if he could hear these remarks today he would be very embarrassed, but he is the sort of person who needs to be acknowledged on the public record of South Australia.

I move now to another topic and it is not about death; it is about what I think can be described only as a serious illness. Primarily, I refer to the state of the Opposition. I get very concerned in a democracy when we have all sorts of remarks made in the media which indicate that all is not

well with our friends opposite. I guess by any system of performance we really have to look at the fact that, over the past couple of months, there have been a number of problems. I really am sorry that on the first sitting day of the session the Opposition censure motion did not work and there have been a lot of problems since. Much of the debate over the past 24 to 48 hours, and many of the contributions on a whole range of different areas were quite curious, and I was somewhat perplexed about their nature until I read tonight's *News*.

In fact, in many respects I suppose I was wondering why we had such an empty landscape of political ideas and suggestions about the way we should go in the future. I suppose if one makes a long speech—similar to one of the contributions from the Leader—one would expect a whole series of lights to be placed on the hill or on the horizon. In fact, the Leader's performance was particularly inept. I think that is the only way to describe it because it offered no hope at all. It offered very little in terms of gutsy detailed analysis on the way we should proceed in this State. The only thing that makes me sad is that every performance after it was even worse from the members opposite. I think the last contribution really was marvellous. I always thought that the Unley Palace was a restaurant until I heard some of the ramblings of the member for Fisher. I now know that the Unley Palace will be used to house other people.

I guess in many respects we cannot be too hard on members opposite because, like everyone else, they follow advice. In fact, in tonight's *News* there is an article which says:

Sections of the [Liberal] Party have admitted privately that they are upset with the leadership of Mr Dale Baker and Mr Stephen Baker and the influence people outside Parliament are having on Dale Baker in particular.

When I read that, suddenly the jigsaw came together. I must say that a number of things have happened here in the past 24 hours which have puzzled me. When I read that article I thought that a hatchet job was being done on the Leader's speech writer. I thought that was grossly unfair because he has a great deal of experience in these matters. However, last night it came together because I saw that a new influence, obviously a much more powerful one, has emerged in the front ranks of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. H. Allison: Martin Cameron?

Mr QUIRKE: I am not talking about Martin Cameron, as the good member opposite suggests. I am talking about George Apap. George was here last night and I understand that he offered a great deal of advice to the Liberals.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And plenty of grog.

Mr QUIRKE: Yes. When I saw them I thought that George had jumped in with some strange bedfellows. I thought the whole episode was curious. I have heard George speak on many occasions and I know what he thinks about a number of individuals. He has never been any kinder about members opposite than he has about people on this side of the Chamber. I have also heard a number of comments that members opposite have made about George, unions and blue collar workers. This new, worker, blue collar, born again attitude of the Liberal Party has its source in George Apap and some of his mates who were here last night.

A moment ago, the member for Napier said they drank a lot of grog. I am sorry that the honourable member mentioned that rumour but, now he has, I must deal with it. The rumour going around, which I do not believe, is that not one cold beer was left in the fridge after George and his mates left. The rumour continues that it took the offer of all that beer to get them here. I do not know whether that is true; it is a little unkind. From looking at this afternoon's newspaper, I am prepared to take the kinder

view, that is, that George has been enlisted by the Leader of the Opposition.

I noticed last night that several other people were present at that dinner, including one of the pretenders to the throne. I do not want to be unkind to the member for Bragg, because I think it is wonderful that the Opposition has finally discovered workers. It is wonderful that, although members opposite have gone on for the past 48 hours about cutting the public sector and firing people ('but do not upset any of my local projects'), they now say they are the workers' friend. I find that to be as credible as the suggestion that we bring the royal family to Australia so they can breed with commoners such as members opposite.

The Opposition is very upset. I can understand that, in their turmoil, members opposite have a hard decision to make. They can return to the terrible performance that they gave in the first six months of this year or they can carry on with the performance they have given in the past month or so, which has been absolutely dreadful. I hope they get their act together or take up the member for Napier's kind offer to act as a consultant.

Mr VENNING (Custance): My contribution will be a change from the frivolity of the last two speeches, which is understandable at this stage of the week's proceedings. I note that the Minister of Agriculture is in the Chamber, and that is pleasing. I thought that, in reply, the Premier looked uncomfortable last night. His budget was not credible. Everyone knows it and, worst of all, he knows it. One could see that the usually placid, confident Premier was not himself. I was amazed to hear the Premier who, as all members know, is the National President of the Labor Party, criticise a Federal Labor Treasurer. Fancy blaming him for all this State's woes! Members opposite blame everyone but themselves.

The Labor forces in this country are divided, and they are sure to fall. Everyone knows that this State's economy is in a mess but, from listening to the Premier last night, one would think that all is well. I do not think that members opposite realise how bad it is out there. I will read from an open letter to the Premier, written by the President of the United Farmers and Stockowners, which has been published in the rural papers. The letter states:

My dear Premier, I am writing to convey personally the very desperate situation that is unfolding among the farming community of South Australia as we approach the harvest of 1990-91.

I ask members to listen to these figures because they are brand new and alarming. The letter continues:

Across the whole range of commodities which we produce in our State, from grain to grapes, from citrus to wool, we are seeing our export markets deteriorate and our farm gate prices fall dramatically.

To put the situation in the context of gross farm income, I quote from the State Bank of South Australia—Rural Report of August 1990.

SA GROSS FARM INCOME

	1989-90	1990-91	% Change
Wheat	\$473m	\$240m	-49%
Barley	\$200m	\$138m	-31%
Wool	\$614m	\$421m	-31%

It is important to note that these figures for 1990-91 are estimated on an exchange rate of A\$/US\$0.70 and, as I write to you, the exchange rate is around A\$/US\$0.81, indicating that the situation will be even worse than the State Bank of South Australia predicted. The following figures reflect the current situation.

SA GROSS FARM INCOME
(A\$/US\$0.81c)

	1989-90	1990-91	% Change
Wheat	\$473m	\$207m	-56%
Barley	\$200m	\$119m	-40%
Wool	\$614m	\$363m	-41%

If those percentages are averaged out, it represents a fall of 48 per cent this year. That is a fall of 52 per cent on last year's income from the rural sector. What does the member for Napier think that will do to the State's economy?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr VENNING: You were listening, so I picked you out.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I take a point of order, Sir. The member for Custance has viciously singled me out as the only person listening to his speech.

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

Mr VENNING: The letter continues:

I know you are aware that the State's farmers are facing a difficult year from the references made in the Governor's speech to Parliament on 2 August 1990 when he said:

A very late opening and subsequent cold weather, together with the fall of the live sheep trade and continuing concern over wool prices, will create problems for many farmers, especially for those relying on wool for their income.

However, the situation is deteriorating extremely fast, and I have very real fears for the future of many farmers and their families, as well as the South Australian economy.

The letter goes on to list specific areas in all commodities, and the Minister of Agriculture is probably aware of those figures. I will read also from a letter from a Mr Kelly, who has a car franchise at Jamestown. The figures in his letter highlight the point that I am trying to make about how country businesses are hurting. The letter states:

We are concerned many small business operators are not fully aware how much they are contributing to the Government, and yet they seem to be on the receiving end of any actions put in place to remedy the mess our leaders have got this country into. Having completed another financial year, we assess our results and budget for the following year. We run a small business employing seven staff and have calculated we collected about \$500 000 for the Government over the last financial year.

Sales tax on new vehicles was in the region of \$145 000, while stamp duty and registration fees added more than \$115 000, along with personal and company tax, WorkCover, Federal and State Government fees and so on. Our total wages were less than 35 per cent of the amount we collected for the Government. Our four directors work around a 65 hour week to keep the business going, as there is no incentive to employ staff to relieve the workload. I could sit at home on unemployment benefits with no worries, apart from boredom, and receive \$654 a fortnight plus concessions.

Before WorkCover was introduced, we paid \$4 785 a year for all our insurance—last year the cost was more than \$11 000, despite their claim that employers with a better than average claim record would be granted a remission levy. This is a 230 per cent increase in our insurance costs in three years and we have not had one claim with WorkCover. We estimate the Clean Air Act will cost us \$300 for registrations and training, plus more than \$1 900 for equipment, which just happens to have 20 per cent sales tax to comply with Government regulations.

This year we have paid \$2 677 in transaction taxes—State credit tax and Federal debit tax. This compares with \$441 when introduced in June 1984, or a 600 per cent increase over six years. Then we have compulsory superannuation at this stage at 3 per cent. We can see the benefit in catering for retirement, but for a worker on \$300 a week super is calculated at \$9 a week and the employee is credited with about half that amount by the time the administration fee, death cover and 15 per cent contribution tax are deducted.

If we are to decrease the burden of pensions in years to come why should the contributing tax, then the tax on lump sum payments be in place to act as a deterrent to people to plan for their retirement. For the past four or five years, we have been told the inflation rate was about 8 per cent—it is easy to see who bears the brunt of Government mismanagement. If other small businesses contribute similar amounts to ours, just where does all this money go? If our income is down, we must trim our

expenses—it would be a dream world if we could just raise another tax.

These are just two of several letters that members in country areas are receiving. The situation is becoming worse. This Government is like a farmer who is just putting in his eighth crop. At no time during the past eight years has he returned the cost of his production. He has not tried to change the seed or the method of his farming management. He now borrows money to put in his crop and sinks further each time he does that. He is on borrowed time. He will be sold up as the equity in his farm sinks. As the people of South Australia realise, and as has been said, a lot of people would be much happier in rural areas to see a much tougher budget, which would put us all on an equal footing to help get the State out of the malaise it is in.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): We saw an incredible sight today when the Premier came into the House before Question Time and admitted that the Government had done it again: it had failed to get another project off the ground. The Wilpena project was due to start some time ago. The Opposition and the taxpayers of South Australia have been wanting to know what was happening, but what does the Premier say? Something has gone wrong again. This is turning into another Marineland exercise, and we know how much that cost the taxpayers. Why was this legislation introduced? Where has the Government bungled? What is the legislation? I think it is the greatest cover-up of all time for the Premier to come into the House and, for the first time, put on notice something that has not yet been drawn up and to ask the Opposition, 'Will you support it?' What a joke! It is as big a joke as the headline that the honourable member is holding up on the other side of the House.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: This is your big chance now.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member knows he has had his chance, and his arms are only just recovering after they were broken to get him out of the Ministry. I will not listen to the honourable member, but I will come back to him later, because his relatives will be coming out when the cricket team comes to Australia and they might help him with his aspirations in the royal area.

Today, the Premier has tried to get through this Parliament legislation which we know nothing about to cover up yet another bungle. This project is supposed to get off the ground in six weeks, being two years late, but what happens? We have seen today what happens: the Government is absolutely bereft of financial management because, every time it starts dealing with any development project, it messes it up.

Returning to the budget, it is interesting to note what it really contains. For three or four weeks we have been telling the Premier that he did not lose \$180 million from his friend the Treasurer—or \$90 million, \$70 million or \$250 million that he claimed. It took him about a month to find out the right figure. The Opposition put that matter into the public arena, but it has never been rebuffed. We said that the taxpayers of South Australia are demanding a Public Service that they can afford, but what happened when the Premier brought down the budget? He delivered the biggest tax slug in this State's history. Taxes have been increased by 16.5 per cent—a real increase. The Premier loves talking about real increases. A lot of the increases have been unreal. The real increase in taxes is 9.5 per cent by which the Government will raise another \$225 million from the taxpayers of South Australia.

Good, decent and hard-working men and women are struggling along in the present economic environment that has been caused by the Labor Government (both State and

Federal), and the Premier is covering up the inefficient management of this State by ripping more out of their pockets. He will never learn and that is because he does not know anything about running the finances of this State.

Let us look at what has happened in the budget. Not only is there a record rip-off in terms of tax increases but there are record borrowings to prop it up. The Government is borrowing \$270 million extra this year, which it calls 'receipts', to prop up the budget. It is a scandal. The interest that this State pays each year is just on \$690 million, or 50c in every dollar of revenue raised. How would members like to try to run a business when the interest component was 50c in every dollar raised? This Government is bereft of financial management.

The Opposition put forward what it would do and tore the budget apart, line by line. The Premier attempted to cover up to the people of South Australia what is really going on. He tried to hide from them where the increases would be, and he tried to fiddle the books to make things look as if they were not as bad as they are. Line by line we tore the budget apart and then we told the Government what we would do. We put down clearly and succinctly how to get this State off its knees and how to provide some incentive. That is something about which this Government knows nothing. 'Incentive' means that people want to do things: they want to make South Australia great. That has never happened with this mob, because all they are doing is dragging more and more money out of people so they can bloat their Public Service.

There is only one area in which the Premier said last night there was some confusion. He said it related to the Public Service and that he was confused about FTEs and what went on. So, I thought I would go through that part of my speech on the public sector because the Premier does not understand it. He might have seen it in *Hansard*, and I am sure that his minders would have read it, but I will go through it again so that some members opposite will understand that we were not mixed up.

I said that in the wider public sector the Treasurer, in his Financial Statement last year, informed Parliament that:

Broadly, the Government is committed to the maintenance of overall public sector employment at the level existing at 1 July 1982, which was 89 500 FTEs.

That is 'full-time equivalents'—in case the Premier's minders got mixed up with that. That was in the 1989-90 Financial Statement (page 93). I thought that that was fairly clear. However, tucked away, right at the back of the Financial Statement this year (page 184) is the number of FTEs—or, for members opposite, 'full-time equivalents'. It is amazing that the number is now 98 200. That means that since 1982 there has been a rise of about 8 772 FTEs in the Public Service—after the Premier said last year that the Government would maintain the 1982 level. That is the hub of the problem: not only can the Government not count but it is bleeding the taxpayers and bloating the Public Service. The Auditor-General makes a very good comment about all of this; he stated that in the past 12 months the Public Service has bloated out by 2 100 people. Is the Government saying that—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will quote from it in a minute. It is right here, if the honourable member does not know. He is one of the few who knows something about finances, because I am told that he is a very wealthy man. The Government should move the honourable member onto the front bench, because the Minister of Finance has no idea. He wants more FID. However, I am told that the honourable member is pretty well healed, yet he is on the back bench, rotting. I think it is about time he came to the front bench and told

the Ministers how to frame a budget. Or, better still, the honourable member could stay there and we will go over there with his support and show the Government how to frame a budget.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Which is—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member says, 'Don't worry, I will be here as long.' I will not be here long if members opposite keep on promising money when they visit the river without telling their Minister. I will not be here long; I will be over there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: You want to be careful on that; you have the member for Chaffey very upset about that. He had to ask you several questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will direct his comments through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will do that. When we start looking at the public sector, we see that the statements made by the Premier are all hot air. First, he cannot deduct \$89 500 from \$98 200 to get the difference; secondly, as the Auditor-General points out, there was a blow-out in the public sector last year of 2 100 people. That is the reason why we are in trouble; that is why we outlined in the budget debate exactly what we would do. That is not what this Government has done in relation to the Department of Marine and Harbors, 15 years ago there were 800 poor old blue-collar workers and now their ranks have been decimated to 400 people, while the number of white-collar workers has remained at 250.

Those white-collar workers sit in their air-conditioned offices, enjoying luxurious accommodation, while the true working people of this State are being obliterated by members opposite who do not have any soul or any heart at all. That is not what we are talking about: we are talking about giving everyone a fair go. The Government should remember that those good guys in the Department of Marine and Harbors—the blue-collar workers—have families, mortgages and accounts to pay. But members opposite forget them. Those blue-collar workers came to see me last night and told me a few home truths about the performances of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I can guarantee that the taxpayer did not pay for it. However, the grievances of those people are very interesting, because they are saying exactly what we are saying: we have to sit down and talk to the people if we want a more efficient Public Service. What we are saying is, of course, that we have to have a Public Service that the taxpayer can afford. That is what has never been recognised by members on the other side. That is what the Treasurer of this State is saying: 'We will keep sucking it out of the taxpayers and we will keep bloating the Public Service. But if there are to be any cuts, they will be at the blue-collar end, because we do not want those people here.' That is happening because the white-collar workers have the Premier's ear.

Things are changing; the taxpayers are starting to revolt; businesses are going broke every day in this State because of the way in which they are being treated by this Government. Of course, we have put down very clearly and succinctly the way that we would run this State. We have said that we will have to look at commercialisation and privatisation, and I think that that is very fair and sensible.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The honourable member interjects. I know that he was out of order, Mr Speaker, but he was interjecting about the word 'commercialisation'. I will deviate for a moment to mention that I received a letter today from Ayers Finnis Ltd, which is running a seminar on commercialisation of the public sector in South Australia. This seminar is to be held on Wednesday 19 September. I think that it is very important for South Australia—and the taxpayers would think so—for the Premier to attend that seminar. However, the Premier is going away. Just as this State is on its economic knees, the Premier is leaving—no doubt following a dream, and I hope it will not be another that turns into a nightmare. He is leaving the State just as this seminar is to be held. It will be addressed by the Hon. Roger Douglas, member of Parliament and former New Zealand Finance Minister. He is a very knowledgeable man on privatisation and commercialisation and has been brought over here by an arm of the State Bank—the Treasurer's bank; our bank—to tell us how to run South Australia.

Mr Douglas has managed to get New Zealand off its knees by taking some pretty hard decisions and he has done that very well. New Zealand is just about off its knees and is competing with Australia. However, poor old South Australia is going down the gurgler. It has a bloated Public Service and taxpayers are going bankrupt every day. The Hon. Roger Douglas is coming over here to talk about 'Rogernomics' but the Premier of South Australia is buzzing off overseas on a junket with some high-class business people. That is about what we are getting in this State: absolutely no responsibility at all.

I would have thought that the Premier should make every effort to get to that seminar, because it is in the long-term interests of South Australia. However, of course, that is not all. A special ALP conference on privatisation is to be held on 24 September. However, the Federal President of the ALP will, again, be away. Every time we talk about achieving a more efficient South Australia or a more efficient Australia, every time we get together some people who know anything about finance in Australia to try to make the situation better and to put some incentive into the system, where do we find the Premier? He has gone off overseas again, following another dream. This goes on and on.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member, through you, Mr Speaker, for his interjection. I would have thought that the Minister of Finance should be going to this seminar, because he might learn a few things. I will get onto him in a minute. The Auditor-General had some quite good things to say about the Minister of Finance of this State. However, the fact that the seminar is being held is on the public record now and I will give any honourable member a copy of the program if they would like to attend. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Perhaps they could contact John Lessees, because he is going along as well. He is the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council; he is going along to discuss commercialisation with Roger Douglas. This is all pretty good stuff and I would hate members opposite to be left out. I will make sure that Ayers Finnis issues members opposite with invitations so that they do not miss out.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is all right for the member for Henley Beach. I know that he has enough money and does not have to attend it. He has gained his knowledge in the private sector while all the other members opposite have had their education in the public sector. I will pass on that informa-

tion. The Treasurer will be away so let us consider the Minister of Finance. It is incredible that the Minister of Finance quite openly rejoices in the financial institutions duty and says that it should be doubled. What we have done in this State is take away the last vestige of incentive to business. We now have the highest FID in Australia and the Minister of Finance is saying, 'I could not care less. I am very pleased that it is at that level.'

Of course, this same Minister of Finance is the person who will run the review committee to look at all of this. The Treasurer has been here for eight years, the Minister of Finance has wandered around between both Houses—and his politics has wandered a bit as he has gone around—and he is the person who will review how to get South Australia running economically. It really is incredible. Who is running this State? Is it the Minister of Finance, who wants to keep putting up taxes? Is it the Treasurer, who keeps buzzing off overseas? I will make sure that the Minister of Finance can go along to hear 'Rogernomics' as well, because it could do him some good. However, I was rather interested in some of the Auditor-General's comments about this Minister of Finance, who will be running the review committee. Even though the Minister of Education seems to berate him constantly in this House, the Auditor-General does some very good work and he can quite understand whether people are efficient or know anything about finance.

In respect of the State Transport Authority, I note that the Minister has been involved there, and I think it is an indictment of the Minister of Finance and the man who is heading this review committee when we read some of the things that go on there. The Auditor-General has highlighted areas in the STA that should be looked at. It is sucking up about \$120 million of taxpayers' funds; it is recognised that the inefficiencies in this area are great. In the past, the Auditor-General has recognised that these inefficiencies are great; however, he has recommended that an audit take place. What happened? He recommended to the Minister of Transport, who is the Minister of Finance, that a review take place because of some of the things that are going on. They are fiddling around with sick leave, and all sorts of practices are going on there that are costing the taxpayer many dollars.

Finally, the Auditor-General said that we should have a look at all this. The Minister said, 'We have found areas where we can save \$24 million.' Last year the Auditor-General said, 'Excuse me, Mr Minister, you have done nothing about it; I have written to you, but it took 10 months for you to reply.' It took 10 months for the Minister of Finance to reply to the Auditor-General and say that he should be doing something about it.

That is fantastic, is it not? The member for Henley Beach would not do that, because he knows what business is all about. Here we have a Minister in charge of one of the largest organisations in the State to be spending taxpayers' money, which loses \$120 million and, when the Minister is asked by the Auditor-General to investigate doing something about it, 10 months later he replied and said, 'Yes, we have done it.' The Auditor-General did look at it and he made some quite scathing remarks about what he had been doing and what he had not done, and about the annual savings that could be made. He said, 'You have made only about \$6 million to date; it is about time you did some other things.'

The Minister of Finance is the head of the review committee, yet he cannot run the STA and he cannot reply to the Auditor-General's letter. So, surely, he is the wrong man on behalf of the taxpayer to be running the review committee. The Premier might like to respond to some of these

things but, so far, he has said—eight years too late—‘We will set up a review committee.’

The Auditor-General details other areas of waste and I will go through a few of them. Every year since I have been in this House, the Auditor-General brings these matters before Parliament on behalf of the taxpayer of South Australia and what happens? Year after year they are ignored by people on the other side who are ideologically not game or have not the capacity to run things in the businesslike manner they should be run.

Here are some of the things the Auditor-General has been telling us. The Education Department has failed to seek savings of \$7 million annually through revised arrangements for non-contact time teaching. The Minister of Education is not here, but he has not done much about that. That is \$7 million of taxpayers’ funds that could have been saved out of the \$225 million the Government has slugged out of the pockets of the taxpayers this year. The Government is overpaying teachers at the rate of \$36 000 a fortnight and nothing is being done about it. Sick leave abuses are still going on, the Auditor-General says.

The Government’s computing program remains a fiasco and the Auditor-General comments on that. There are blow-outs of well over \$30 million as enunciated by the Auditor-General in the motor vehicle registration system. That is absolutely scandalous. The South Australian Centre of Remote Sensing now has a deficit of some \$340 000, after repeated warnings from the Auditor-General that the operation has not been established on a proper businesslike basis.

The Auditor-General does not say these things just for the fun of it. When will we see some action over there? All we hear from the Premier is about more and more dreams and more and more public services, but no bottom line. The Jam Factory Workshops are facing a loss of \$126 000 this year. The commercial activities of the State Conservation Centre, which is funded by the Government, has a net deficit of funds of \$53 000, and so it goes, on and on. The Auditor-General now tells us that the South Australian Timber Corporation’s future relies on the scrimber project. The scrimber project has cost the taxpayers of this State \$56 million and it has not produced one stick of commercial timber at the other end of it. Yet, it was due to be finished in 1987 at a cost of \$17 million; it has now gone up three times that rate and nothing has happened. How far will these people go in trying to interfere with private enterprise? Private enterprise cannot afford that sort of inefficiency. When will these people realise that? Because it is about time we started to get out of it.

The South Australian Timber Corporation bought a New Zealand company that was technically bankrupt, and it bought it on unaudited accounts, even when it was advised by its consultants that the accounts were unaudited and that they should not purchase it. However, it went ahead with that great ideological kick they have that, if it gets out there and competes with private enterprise, it can do it as well as private enterprise. I can tell members that it cannot because, every time the Government tries, it fails, and it fails dismally. It is about time it started to learn—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I hear an interjection from the honourable member. We have been talking about micro-economic reform and saying what we will do, but I will do better than that; I will provide a bit of bipartisan stuff and I will read the Goss budget that was brought down yesterday. I will read what the *Financial Review* said about it because it should be music to the ears of some people on the other side of the House. This is the new wonder up in

Queensland, Mr Goss, who came in and inherited a State that did not have too many debts, and this is what he is doing. Just listen to this:

It is definitely not socialism. Queensland’s first Labor State budget in 34 years is a wide open invitation to private enterprise to move north and flourish.

That is a pretty good statement for the *Financial Review* to come out with about the first Goss budget. The article continues:

It is backed by a determined bid to transform the running of Government to a commercial practice. The Goss Government is unashamedly capitalising on the budgetary roads of other States by following the old Bjelke-Petersen creed of no new taxes and selling Queensland as an investment haven for the rising tax burdens down south.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: The *Financial Review* goes on, and this should be interesting to people on the other side of the House. Along with an invitation to this commercialisation, I could also send a copy of this budget in the mail, and the Premier might take it on his overseas trip—on his junket. It is very good reading. The article goes on to state:

Queenslanders have been presented with an economic plan which faces up to the glaring inefficiencies in the public sector: a new era of accountability emphasising fee-for-service and user pays principles. The railways and ports will be looked at.

The railways provide the most dramatic example because, all of a sudden, the Government has said it will not keep paying. The Minister, the head of the financial review committee, allows the STA in this State to lose \$120 million a year; Premier Greiner in New South Wales will break even on his transport department this year; and Premier Goss is saying, ‘No more for us.’ All we have in this State is the head of the review committee saying, ‘We do not care how much it costs. We will suck it out of the taxpayers’ pocket.’ I think it is an indictment of the intelligence of the taxpayers, and it is an indictment of the intelligence of people on the other side. The article continues:

... in reflecting the Goss Government’s promise to give priority to fostering a healthy and competitive private sector as a basis for earning the spin-off wealth to deliver social reforms.

That is something that members of the Government have never done, namely, to earn the spin-off wealth so that social reforms can be introduced. On this side, we have a very simple philosophy, and I know that the man of finance wisdom opposite can understand it. The rest of them did not even open their mouths. We have a philosophy that we have a moral obligation to look after the needy and the disadvantaged. That is the philosophy you members on the other side should have, but you do not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will address the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will address you. I hope that we all have that same moral obligation to look after the needy and disadvantaged. After that, we have to get off the backs and out of the pockets of the taxpayers of South Australia and give them the incentive to get this State back where it was, because at present things are not too good in this State. If some members opposite went out and talked to the average man and woman in the street, they would understand that they are being taxed out of existence.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am glad that the member for Napier interjected there because there is just one other thing I wanted to cover. I noticed a press article on 17 August after some comments made—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: It was after some comments made by the member for Fisher about obtaining some blueblood English stock to help start a royal family in Australia. Several eminent people commented on that, including the Archbishop of Adelaide, Mr Bruce Ruxton, the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER:—and other very eminent people, reading down the list. As someone whose father was English, I was asked to make a comment. The member for Napier would know that if your father was English you could still obtain a British passport. Having a great feeling for the English, I decided that I had to look around for someone who could be used, so to speak, for seed stock for this new royal family that was to be established by the member for

Fisher. I made some comments in that regard that I thought were very praiseworthy. In fact, I thought they were some of the most witty comments I had made for the year. However, I received a letter from a firm of solicitors, one of whom was a Mr Groom, demanding that I withdraw those comments.

The letter said that, although some of the comments were made in a lighthearted vein, they were libellous to their client. I am sorry if the honourable member took my remarks in the wrong way, but I replied to that letter briefly, as follows:

Any suggestion that the statement referred to in the second part of your letter is defamatory and malicious is laughable.

I finished with a quote from Shakespeare—not from the Scarlet Pimpernel:

Methinks your client protesteth too much.

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed payments for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Wednesday 10 October, in accordance with the timetables as follow:

Estimates Committee A

Tuesday 11 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, Legislature.

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

Wednesday 12 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Minister of Health, Minister of Family and Community Services, Minister for the Aged

South Australian Health Commission
Family and Community Services
*South Australian Health Commission

Thursday 13 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Education, Minister of Children's Services

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

Friday 14 September, at 9.30 a.m.

Attorney-General, Minister for Crime Prevention, Minister of Corporate Affairs

Attorney-General's
*Attorney-General's Department
Court Services
*Court Services Department
Electoral

Attorney-General and Minister for Crime Prevention,
Miscellaneous
Corporate Affairs Commission
*Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission

Tuesday 18 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Local Government, Minister for the Arts, Minister of State Services

Local Government
*Department of Local Government
Arts
*Department for the Arts
State Services
Minister of State Services, Miscellaneous
*State Services Department

Wednesday 19 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Ethnic Affairs

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

Thursday 20 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Tourism, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Small Business

Tourism South Australia
*Tourism South Australia
Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous
*Adelaide Convention Centre
Public and Consumer Affairs
Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Small Business, Miscellaneous

Estimates Committee B

Tuesday 11 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

Employment and Technical and Further Education
 *Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education
 Office of Tertiary Education
 *Office of Tertiary Education
 Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs,
 Miscellaneous

Wednesday 12 September, at 11.00 a.m.

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

Environment and Planning
 Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous
 *Department of Environment and Planning
 Engineering and Water Supply
 Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous
 *Engineering and Water Supply Department
 *South-Eastern Drainage Board
 Lands
 Auditor-General's
 Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous

Thursday 13 September, at 11.00 a.m.

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

Police
 *Police Department
 Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous
 *Country Fire Services

Mines and Energy

*Department of Mines and Energy
 Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister of Forests,
 Miscellaneous

Tuesday 18 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Transport, Minister of Correctional Services, Minister of Finance

Office of Transport Policy and Planning
 Road Transport
 *Department of Road Transport
 State Transport Authority
 *State Transport Authority
 Correctional Services

Wednesday 19 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Labour, Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Minister of Marine

Labour
 Personnel and Industrial Relations
 *Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations
 Minister of Labour and Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous
 Marine and Harbors
 *Department of Marine and Harbors

Thursday 20 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Recreation and Sport

Housing and Construction
 *South Australian Housing Trust
 *Department of Housing and Construction
 Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous
 Recreation and Sport
 *Department of Recreation and Sport

*Works and Services (Payments of a capital nature).

I understand that the member for Elizabeth will later move a special motion. To save the House time, I indicate that the honourable member and I have discussed this matter, and I ask the House also to support that motion.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the motion but wish to put on record briefly a few of my thoughts about previous Estimates Committees over the past several years. I have been involved in the organisation of those committees for some time, and the general feeling of members (of the Opposition, in particular) is that they get very little out of the whole exercise.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says, the public get virtually nothing. Over recent years we have seen a degeneration of those committees where questions are put up by Government members that require long answers from Government Ministers with one purpose in mind, that is, to delay the proceedings of the committee and ensure that the Opposition does not do what it seeks to do—obtain financial information.

I will not name the Minister, because I am sure that many Ministers are involved, but during the last Estimates Committees we drew to the attention of one of the committees a note that was circulated to the department. There were, in fact, two notes, which showed the attitude of some

Ministers. The first note was from the office of the Minister to the Director-General of the department. The Director-General was asked to arrange the preparation of 10 Dorothy Dix questions for preemptive purposes for the Estimates Committees. The second note from the department's Director of Policy and Planning transmitted the Minister's request to officers of the department as follows:

Ten Dorothy Dix questions and answers are required by the Minister on major achievements of the department in the last 12 months and planning activities for 1989-90. To this end, would each Director please ensure the preparation of at least two questions with answers for your area of responsibility.

That is the attitude that prevails in departments, brought about by Ministers of this Government having determined that the Opposition will be denied the opportunity of asking questions.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members say 'Rubbish', but I say to the House that at 11 o'clock the Opposition asks its first three questions and, on most occasions, is unlikely to have another chance to ask a question before the one o'clock luncheon break. Members are aware that I am telling the truth. It is designed to prevent the Opposition carrying out its mandate. I appeal to the Government and to the Ministers: in the interests of fair play do not turn the Estimates Committees for 1990-91 into a farce, as they have been in the past.

Some Ministers have done the right thing, but on many occasions other Ministers do not. I believe that the responsibility to provide information is in the hands of the Government. It is a fact-finding exercise as far as members on both sides of Parliament are concerned. I believe that the Opposition deserves more courtesy, since we are asking questions on behalf of the public of South Australia and deserve the courtesy of not long, drawn-out filibusters but genuine answers. That would also complement the work put in by officials of Government departments who have, no doubt, been working for weeks to prepare themselves for the next two weeks but who do not get an opportunity to answer questions because Government members seem hell bent on stopping Opposition members from asking questions that it is their right to ask.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): On the last two occasions when, and similar motions have been moved by the Deputy Premier, I have drawn attention to the importance of the information that is promised by Ministers or their staff to be made available without undue delay in the supplementary *Hansard*. In 1988 the Minister undertook that every effort would be made to make that information available to members. That year, the book which provided the answers—or some of them, as a number of the answers have never been given by the Ministry—came out five months later. In 1989, I sought the same assurance from the Minister, and it was forthcoming—sincerely, I believe.

In fact, not only have a number of the answers promised never been forthcoming, but also the supplementary *Hansard* in which those answers were given arrived seven months after the Estimates Committees. No doubt, the Minister will give me the assurance just as sincerely as he has in the past. However, I ask him to ensure that the promise is honoured in the future and is not disregarded by whomever he deposes to undertake the delivery of service.

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Messrs D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Groom and Trainer.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Brindal, De Laine, Hemmings and Heron, Mrs Hutchison and Messrs Ingerson and Such.

Motion carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable—

(a) the clauses of the Appropriation Bill to be considered by Estimates Committees;

and

(b) Estimates Committees to ask for explanations on matters relating to estimates of receipts.

To explain this resolution I have long believed that the House should never approve legislation when it has not had the opportunity to consider the clauses of that legislation. Unfortunately, that has been the case in respect of Appropriation Bills up to date. I believe that, by allowing the Estimates Committees to consider the actual clauses of the Bill, the House will at least have the opportunity to comment on them should any member so desire. I have no expectation that this will actually consume much time in the Estimates Committees, but it will set to right a procedure that has long been ignored should the House adopt this resolution.

Part (b) of the resolution is far more important in my opinion. No proper consideration of the budget could really take place in the full context without examining the receipts side of the budget as well. I ask members to support the resolution so that the receipts side of the budget and many other aspects of receipts by statutory authorities as well—Commonwealth grants and other important taxation measures—can be considered in full by the Estimates Committees along with the estimates of payments. I commend the resolution to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion. The Opposition wholeheartedly supports the motion currently before the House. The Opposition did attempt some time ago to obtain from the Government agreement as to which statutory authorities could be brought before the House to be examined on their performance. We are still awaiting a response and, in fact, an indication from the Premier as to what would be allowed in those circumstances. That is quite intolerable. I would hope that when the Estimates Committees are sitting there will be sufficient personnel available to answer some of the questions in some of the lines that we believe are very vital to the budget.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 October at 2 p.m.