

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 October 1990

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

ECONOMY

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this house congratulates Senator Walsh for his remarks in stating that the Prime Minister 'needs a spine transplant' and congratulates Senator Button for predicting the inevitability of hard times ahead for Australia and no improvement in living standards and condemns both the Federal and State Governments for the way they have handled the economy during the past eight years and in particular for the way they have treated the agricultural and rural industry in general.

Since I gave notice of that motion, you, Mr Speaker, and all members of this Parliament would appreciate that things in this country have not got any better. In fact, they have got worse. It is interesting to go back to the last Federal election, and even to the last State election, and reflect on some of the comments being made about the state of the economy both at our local level and at the national level. In each case, the Government was painting a rosy picture, telling the people that everything was all right, that it had things on track. The Opposition was pointing to an array of statistics which suggested that the Government was wrong and that things were headed down the wrong track. We are off course.

The elections came and went. At State level, the Liberal Party received a two-Party preferred vote of over 52 per cent but did not win Government. At the Federal level, the Hawke Government was narrowly returned, probably because it distorted aspects of the truth—in quite a way. The Federal election was in March of this year. Less than two months later, a former prominent Minister, Senator Walsh, revealed what the true situation was like at that time and before the election. Senator Walsh was able to take that position because he was fed up with serving on the Hawke Cabinet. As was said in one article, Senator Walsh told colleagues that he quit Cabinet because he could not stand another three years of sitting through Cabinet meetings with Mr Hawke. All members on this side of the House would certainly agree that Senator Walsh took the right course of action. Who could stand sitting in Cabinet meetings with a person like Mr Hawke presiding? Senator Walsh also proclaimed in the corridors of Parliament House that Mr Hawke was 'Old jellyback'. After some years of being closely associated with Mr Hawke and the Labor Government, he recognised the truth.

In fact Senator Walsh went on and indicated that what really made his blood boil was Mr Hawke's extraordinary statement in 1988 that 'living standards would rise because of last year's wage increases and tax cuts'. Obviously, Senator Walsh knew that that was not going to be the case, that it was another furphy, that Hawke had no idea where the economy was going. Mr Keating certainly had no idea where it was going, and they were prepared to put their credibility on anything that came floating past.

So what do we find? Certainly, following on from the fact that Hawke 'needs a spine transplant', we found that another Federal Minister backed Senator Walsh. In fact, it was none other than Senator Button. Senator Button went so far as to say that, 'Investment in Australia was falling and rises in living standards should not be expected'. He joined former Finance Minister, Senator Walsh, in predict-

ing tough economic times, and he certainly criticised the Government's lost opportunities.

Those two men had recognised what the Opposition had been saying. They recognised that the situation in this country was looking grim and they were bold enough to make a stand in their own right and point it out to the Government. In fact Senator Button said that, 'Australia was in the midst of an economic downturn and it was not fair or appropriate to talk about rising living standards'. He endorsed the remarks of Senator Walsh and said that he had always taken the view that we would have 'difficult times in this country in the next few years'. Again, the truth keeps coming out.

The Federal Leader of the Opposition, Dr John Hewson, is correct in saying that the present Government is involved in a giant cover-up of the true economic position. It is quite clear that Mr Keating and Mr Hawke are doing everything possible to try to camouflage and cover up the true situation as it currently exists. It is understandable that the Prime Minister was a little upset over the comments—perhaps he recognised them as being true—and certainly Treasurer Keating was more than a little upset, I guess because he felt it was an attack on his own credibility, at a time when Keating is trying to displace Hawke from the Prime Ministership and put himself in there. The chances of that, I guess, are a reality within the Labor Party, and I suppose if Australia really wants to go under, well, put Keating in there as Prime Minister.

Dr Armitage: The world's greatest Treasurer.

Mr MEIER: The world's greatest Treasurer: well, he certainly created the world's greatest crisis here in Australia. So we find that Treasurer Keating, therefore, came out with a bitter attack on Senator Button and he actually indicated that the economy would be better off if Ministers like Senator Button worked harder at reforming areas under their portfolios instead of criticising the Government's performance.

Mr Keating went on to cite car manufacturing. He accused Senator Button of trying to push through a private arrangement with the industry to keep protection higher than it needed to be when the current car plan ends in 1992. So we find that the Treasurer himself now starts to attack the Button plan, the plan that Button had been going around the country praising for so many years. The Treasurer himself now says, 'Well, he shouldn't try to push through private arrangements.' We see complete disarray in the Federal Labor Party. It is small wonder, therefore, that this country is in disarray when Federal Ministers cannot agree amongst themselves.

When referring to the car plan, we should look at how successful this Button plan has been. I remember listening to Senator Button some years ago at the opening of the Manufacturing Centre at Woodville; in fact, I thought I was at the launch of a Labor Party campaign! However, I realised that he was just criticising the Opposition and trying to give the Government's viewpoint, which was not a very diplomatic thing to do. He said that the centre would be the saviour of Australia's car manufacturing industry. Yet, in the past few months, when the plan was supposed to be coming to full fruition, when everything should be rosy, we find that Ford Australia has called for a massive injection of about \$150 million into the car industry, otherwise it had all the signs of collapsing.

However, we see that Nissan is currently having to discount cars by \$2 000 to \$3 000 so it can sell enough to meet the requirements of the Button plan. What is that doing to the car industry? It is certainly undermining the whole of the used car sector. It is undermining the economics of the other car manufacturers and has created complete instabil-

ity. In fact, it was very interesting to read Nissan's statement that it could very well bury the cars it was making, simply to qualify under the plan, but instead it is selling them at a significant discount. So, the Button plan is showing itself for what it really is. It has not solved the problems of this country's car manufacturing industry, and Senator Button, like Hawke and Keating, does not know where he is going.

Things have gone from bad to worse in the Federal arena. In fact, in July we saw Senator Richardson going off at one of his colleagues over logging in the south-east forests of New South Wales. He took a swipe at the Minister for Resources (Mr Griffiths), so again we have public bickering, identifying the real problems in the Labor Party at the Federal level. Also, Mr Dawkins, Mr Duffy and Mrs Kelly were publicly arguing with their Prime Minister and colleagues over what was right and wrong in terms of policy. Prime Minister Hawke is having the carpet worn out in his office by bringing in these Ministers and carpeting them over statements that they continue to make. Small wonder, therefore, that the people of Australia have recognised the absolutely hopeless situation that we are facing at present and are looking for some light and some hope on the horizon.

What about the situation in terms of specific policies at the Federal level for the rural sector? I will refer to Mr Hawke's promises, prior to the 1983 election, to the rural people of Australia as a whole. He released plans to overhaul Australia's meat marketing system. A proposal was put forward to depoliticise drought relief, and he made many other promises. With reference to the plan to overhaul Australia's meat marketing system, we in South Australia and in Australia are presently facing a massive rural crisis, and one reason is the marketing of our mutton overseas. In 1983, Hawke said that he would fix that problem, but he has done nothing to solve it.

With reference to the proposal to depoliticise drought relief, I did not know that the word 'depoliticise' means to take away funds and make sure that the rural sector gets little or no assistance. Obviously, that must be the meaning of 'depoliticise', because the Prime Minister has simply backed further and further away from recognising the importance of the rural sector. In fact, he does not want to recognise the existence of the massive problems that currently prevail.

The Prime Minister also put forward such things as rejecting the concept of conflict between city and country, and that is to be raised. Mr Hawke said:

... have to bear in mind the special problems of small businessmen and farmers caused by high interest rates and the problems of their need to obtain access to loan funds.

Mr Hawke, in 1983, talked about the problems of high interest rates. Since 1983 interest rates have continued to rise and Hawke and Keating are now saying, 'No, look, you have got to have high interest rates for our economy that is going downhill at a rapid rate.' They have no sympathy at all. However, Hawke talked about high interest rates when, compared to today's interest rates, they were very low.

The Prime Minister certainly needs a spine transplant. In fact, it could be suggested that he needs quite a few other transplants but far be it from me, being a non-medical expert, to venture into that area. We all remember the Prime Minister's promise not to introduce a wine tax. He said that was not part of Labor policy and would not occur, but we know what happened there. With respect to South Australia generally, much more will be said about the State sector as a whole. In October 1982, the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said that South Australia needed a new direction and a new start. He also said that South Australia

had to put behind it the stagnation of the past, the lack of effort and failure. If only he had tried to carry out some of those things.

South Australia does need a new start but, since Mr Bannon became Premier, we have had a disastrous move backward. Stagnation of the past in this State showed itself to be one of the great heights reached under the previous Labor Government. We now see new records set with respect to taxation increases and bankruptcies and in the number of people leaving the State. In October 1982 Mr Bannon made certain promises to the rural sector. He said:

We will use rural adjustment schemes, State research programs, extension and advisory services to assist the rural economy and to take advantage of the new technologies. We plan a farm technology centre to encourage the export of dry land farming. Unlike the Liberals we will not allow state charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation. The ALP will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I hear ironical cheers from members opposite who recognise that all of those promises have since been broken. As a result, those broken promises are starting to impinge on the rural sector, and it is starting to hurt more and more. If we look at the new taxes and the increase in taxes, we will recognise that the rural sector—having had years of relatively good seasons (with occasional exceptions such as the West Coast drought and other minor irregularities)—should be able to stand on its own two feet very easily. However, when the first crisis occurs the situation is desperate because Government policies each year have absolutely stripped the rural sector and made it poor in the sense that there is no reserve capital left to face any disaster, particularly at a time when we are not facing a drought. In real terms, we are facing a very good season. In fact, the country looks like a picture book. The rural sector crisis is directly attributable to the mismanagement of this State and of this Federal Government. We are seeing now how the Federal members—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is a pity that members opposite treat this with an air of humour and that they do not wish to recognise the problems that exist, nor to appreciate that they are partly responsible for having got us into this mess and that they are no better than their colleagues. This is particularly so when one considers that their own Leader is President of the Federal Labor Party; he is not prepared even to take a message to Canberra at a time when Canberra should be moved aside, as far as the Hawke Government is concerned, and when some action should be taken. I wish to say many more things in this debate, but at this stage I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I move:

That this House recognises the right and need for all South Australians to have access to acute medical care and condemns moves to curtail such services at the Elliston Hospital in particular and in country areas in general.

Country hospitals are obviously the issue of this debate and, of course, the issue concerns mainly country people, but what strikes me is that this is also an issue for city people who travel. Many people travel throughout South Australia, and, in particular, people who go fishing or holiday on the peninsula would obviously be affected if acute care was no longer available at the Elliston Hospital. If people need a doctor and a hospital with acute care facilities to stabilise

them after a motor vehicle accident, to transport them further or to give them care at the time, money spent on maintaining acute medical care in these areas is money well spent.

Unfortunately, the health debate is no longer about health care; it is about economics, and I feel that this totally misses the point. It is a long time since I have heard anyone in health administration or, indeed, in the Government, say about a particular issue, 'It may be more expensive; we may have to cut other programs; but it is good for the health of South Australians, so we will do it anyway.' People who said that would certainly have my support. I believe that that indicates that this Minister is out of touch with the provision of acute care in hospitals.

I note that in March 1990, the Health Commission indicated to the Elliston Hospital board that acceptable levels of funding were about \$320 per head of population served. That would have meant, on previous years' figures, a shortfall of \$312 000. Were the board to try to run this service on the funds suggested, either the acute care facility would have to be closed or the hospital would have to devolve into a community health service. In fact, Elliston Hospital is getting no more funds than are other hospitals and, indeed, I have before me details of three other hospitals which have much more than \$320 per head of population served to keep them going. The Elliston Hospital is particular because it is the most isolated of all hospitals in South Australia. But if that most isolated of all hospitals is looking at closing down its acute care facility, how will the others on the peninsula feel?

One of the suggested mechanisms by which to cut costs—and again I emphasise that the health debate is now about economics rather than health care—is to have a joint Director of Nursing. Wudinna Hospital totally rejected this proposal and the process is now being looked at by the Streaky Bay Hospital. However, as often happens in cases where solutions are imposed by bureaucrats, the people at the coalface have actually looked at what they need rather than what they are told they can have. They believe that, with an alteration to the nursing structure, which, in my view, ought to be available in smaller hospitals such as this, they would save \$12 000 if they had a single Director of Nursing on site to accept responsibility for urgent cases. If, however, the Elliston Hospital board did what the South Australian Health Commission dictates it should do, we would see increased costs over what is presently provided.

Far be it from me to suggest to the Health Commission that it ought to cut costs but, if the people at the coalface in Elliston believe they can do it better and cheaper, surely the Health Commission ought to listen. The people at the coalface have been innovative in employing a consultant to examine total services in an effort to get best value for their dollar. It may well be that a combination of a nursing home, a hostel and an acute care facility, thus combining Commonwealth and State funding and using the same staff, may result in the best of all worlds.

Why did not the Health Commission think of this? Why does pressure have to be put on country communities before the people at the coalface come up with those innovative and cost-saving ideas? At Elliston Hospital at present there is one registered nurse and one enrolled nurse per shift—the smallest number of staff allowed legally. However, the servicing of that legal requirement, that is, the minimum staffing level, takes up 79.1 per cent of the budget of the Elliston Hospital. The Health Commission swans into Elliston and says, 'Cut the budget by nearly half.' The hospital cannot further reduce staff numbers. How can the Health Commission possibly suggest that the hospital can get by

with one nurse? If there is another emergency in the hospital, someone else must be there and, as members opposite would know only too well, under present occupational health and safety legislation one person cannot be expected to lift heavy patients. It is an impractical suggestion.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: As the member for Newland says, there is a hidden agenda—to close the hospital. If the proposed action is taken, there will be no acute care facilities at the hospital. Recently, a baby was delivered in that area following a labour of 14 minutes. Thank God, this baby was quite healthy, but what if it had not been? What if it had been a little premature—and I assure members opposite that premature labours are often quite quick. The nearest hospital offering acute care, if the acute care service at Elliston was closed, would be at Wudinna, 105 kilometres away across atrocious roads. I know that the roads at Wudinna are atrocious because as a medical student I actually helped to build them when I had a holiday job and was a member of the Transport Workers Union. That road is closed in wet weather. However, if the patient who is having premature labour decided to travel on bitumen roads, the nearest hospital is Streaky Bay, which is a mere 130 kilometres away.

Mr Quirke: Did you make that road, too?

Dr ARMITAGE: I made that road, too. However, to go to Streaky Bay is to go away from Adelaide. If there was no acute care in Elliston most sensible people would go to Port Lincoln, because at least one would be going closer to the major health facilities in Adelaide. Port Lincoln is a mere 170 kilometres away, on a road filled with kangaroos. I can imagine someone's wife who is in premature labour sitting in the back of a car going at 150 kilometres an hour in the rain, in the dark, with heart beating and adrenalin pumping, and kangaroos on the road. That is great health care provided by this Government.

The community has raised funds for hostels, and so on, in the area, but these funds will not be utilised unless the community has a fixed future—and it is an uncertain future. This uncertain future has destroyed staff morale, and that is hardly surprising. Elliston hospital has lost two experienced staff because of the uncertainty of the future.

Due to the rural crisis, about which we have heard so much, often it is the second income from the wife that enables a family to stay on the land. Those working wives need to feel that their job is secure. This totally insecure future, which is being given by the Government, is causing those wives to leave work, and, unfortunately, this will result in a dreadful situation. I will emphasise this to members opposite by quoting from a letter I received from someone pleading that Elliston not be downgraded. It states:

After a function at the Colley Hall last year, a three car collision occurred one kilometre from our house. One of the people woke us at 3 a.m. to ask for ambulance and first aid assistance. There were nine people involved in the accident. We had a 1½ hour wait for an ambulance. We transported four of the injured in our car. Another passer-by took three injured people in his car. We had left the scene and were proceeding to Elliston when we met the ambulance heading for the accident scene to pick up the other two victims when we were 120 kilometres from Elliston. We arrived at the hospital at around 5.30 a.m. The ambulance did not arrive back until 7 a.m.—

which is about four hours after the accident, and that is just to get to Elliston—

Two people were hospitalised at Elliston, four were transported to Port Lincoln after being seen by the doctor at Elliston and stabilised.

As I said, Port Lincoln is another 170 kilometres away. The letter continues:

If there had been serious head or internal injuries involved the chance of survival without the Elliston Hospital [providing acute care] would have been nil.

I emphasise 'nil'. We are talking not only about country people but also about city people holidaying in the area. What else does this Government do in an effort to rationalise? It has put the fee for service line and the patient transport system in the budget. Previously these had been single lines for country hospitals that allowed patient transport and fees for service (the fees given for doctors providing services in hospital). This Government in its economic munificence, has tied them to the global budget.

It is impossible for country hospitals to predict patient transport or fees for service requirements. This Government has put a lead weight around country hospitals. It has allowed no planning and has not given any guarantee whatsoever that fees will be available to run the hospitals. In fact, there is scuttlebutt that the Health Commission has said, 'When the money runs out, that's it.' Is it not great for this Government to say that no money will be available at all for medical services in country areas when the money runs out?

Of course, country sport is a major benefit to isolated communities. Country sports people are very anxious about acute care being removed from their hospitals. They are particularly anxious about minor injuries, but, more specifically, they are worried about more major injuries. I was personally involved in the mouth-to-mouth resuscitation of a footballer on the Adelaide University oval and in transporting him to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We managed to get this footballer to the hospital where unfortunately, several months later, due to the desperate state of his injuries, he died. Having been involved in that personally, I can assure members that, if the Royal Adelaide Hospital was not as close as it is to the university oval, we would not have got that patient to the Royal Adelaide Hospital where he at least had a chance of surviving.

What is this Government saying? This Government says, 'Don't take him to Elliston—take him to Port Lincoln,' which is another 170 kilometres away. That is marvellous! It is great stuff, and great support for health care in South Australia. I have had many letters from people and sporting bodies in the West Coast area, who have said to me such things as:

We feel that a decision to downgrade the hospital would place the lives and general welfare of many people at great risk, and we ask you to reconsider.

I assure these sporting people there that I reconsidered ages ago; it is just members opposite that I cannot get to do it. The sporting bodies feel endangered by this decision, and sport is such a major part of the life of country communities.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you think many members opposite know where Elliston is?

Dr ARMITAGE: I am not sure that they do, but I can tell them that it is 170 kilometres from Streaky Bay and 105 kilometres from Wudinna.

An honourable member interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: You will think of me when you drive on the roads; that is right. The other downside of downgrading country hospitals from acute care is that the doctors may well leave. This is pooh-poohed by members on the other side, but doctors have rung me saying that they will leave if they do not have acute care facilities available. This will affect not only country health—which is obvious and which I expect members opposite to realise—but also country communities.

If a doctor and acute care facilities are not present in country communities, schoolteachers will not go to the area.

They will say, 'No thanks; I'm not going to take my young family to an area where there is no doctor for 105 kilometres one way across atrocious roads or 170 kilometres the other way.' Accountants will not go. Small business people will not go. Acute medical care is one of the major hubs of community centres, and my direct opposition blithely downgrades it. If there is no acute care, no country hospital and no doctor, country communities are further endangered.

An honourable member interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: If you had listened, I said it before. With the current rural crisis, this sort of issue may well be the straw that breaks the camel's back in the rural community.

Members interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: The last thing I say about this issue, with my opposition being so vocal, is this: they vaunt social justice. We hear it non-stop. Where is the social justice in downgrading acute care facilities in the country? Is there one jot of it? Of course not! The Government's policy on country health is disastrous and throws into complete disarray its issue of social justice. Country people do not want community health services, and so on, to be downgraded; they want their own general practitioner in their own local, well-equipped hospital which is capable of acute medical care. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That this House applauds the State and Federal Government support in principle for a mobile mammography unit for South Australia; however, it calls on the Government to make funds available immediately for the implementation of those services to enable all women of South Australia, particularly in country areas, access to effective mammography screening.

In moving this motion I recognise and support the motion moved by the member for Newland in calling for these facilities to be made available to a wider range of women. The implication in the honourable member's motion was that the facilities be provided in the metropolitan area, although I believe it was understood to apply to the whole of South Australia. The practicality of the situation is that the facilities are currently available only in the metropolitan area. However, my concern is wider than that inasmuch as I believe that such facilities should be available to all women throughout the State and, in particular, that a mechanism should be made available so that country women can have access to such facilities.

This matter was first brought to my attention more than 12 months ago. At that time the question was raised because a constituent of mine who had to visit Adelaide for another reason, presumably a business reason, wanted to undergo a screening test. Upon presenting herself at the hospital in Adelaide—because such facilities were not available in Port Lincoln or any other country centre—she was told that there was a wait of at least six weeks. The person concerned was prepared to wait 10 days but was unable to wait the required time. No consideration was given to her because she came from the country; she just had to wait on the end of the line. Therefore, effectively, that meant that she was unable to avail herself of such a screening test.

On further inquiry, it was established that she was also ineligible to receive benefits from the Patient Accommodation Travel scheme (PAT), because even though a doctor can refer a person for that screening test, the procedure was not to be undertaken by a specialist. It was not a referral from a general practitioner to a specialist. The only way in

which such a procedure could qualify under the PAT scheme is if a general practitioner refers a patient to a specialist who, in turn, requires that the screening or the appropriate X-rays take place. So, effectively, country women were being precluded from access to these facilities unless they travelled to the metropolitan area at their own cost and made the appropriate appointment some six weeks, or so, down the track.

That was the first instance that brought this problem to my attention. I subsequently wrote a number of letters to the Minister, seeking his consideration of a mobile mammography unit. The example I quoted was the unit used to screen for tuberculosis. A caravan was provided with appropriate X-ray equipment and travelled all through the country areas. As a school student I was one of those who lined up and went through the appropriate X-ray process. Indeed, it was a very valuable facility made available for the promotion of general community health. That was the concept I had in mind at the time, that is, that a mobile mammography unit and X-ray unit be installed in a caravan.

Since then considerable work and thought has gone into the issue. I have no doubt that other people support such a scheme. The Federal Government and the State Government have acknowledged, in principle, that such a facility should be made available. It therefore becomes a matter of cost, who should pay and when it can be worked into the system. I also understand that concern has been expressed at some levels that the facility should be staffed by appropriately trained personnel, because there is a fear that if a wrong diagnosis were made then a person could be mistakenly of the opinion that they were clear of any growth and, therefore, would not undergo any further testing that would be desirable. That false sense of security is of concern to various people in the department. I totally support what is happening. My only concern is that the facility be implemented as soon as is humanly possible, and that such a facility be made available to a wider range of women than was first mentioned.

At present such a facility is available to women aged 50 years and over, but my concern is that it should be made available to women aged 40 years and over, and to any woman who is at risk, particularly where there is a family history of breast cancer. I believe that women who fall into that latter category should be able to have immediate access to such a facility. I understand that at present the idea is that the mobile facility will not travel to small communities but will go to major centres and that, through a direct mailing system (through Australia Post), letters will be sent to every household outlining where the unit will be located and staffed in the major centre. I have no great objection to that because publicity will be given to the location of the unit and ample time and staff will be allocated so that people living 50 or 100 kilometres away can arrange a visit to that facility at the major centre.

I am aware that the Government totally supports this facility. However, I impress upon members that there is a need to broaden the scope of this facility. I know that this requires money, but I have friends who have been victims of breast cancer and their age group has been from 40 years plus. That is why I am concerned that the age limit, which is proposed to be 50 to 64 years, be further extended so that any person who believes they are at risk can use the facility.

It is a health preventive measure, a diagnostic measure that is not the complete answer in itself. However, if it can identify breast cancer at its very early stage—and usually it can be identified much more quickly by screening than by self-examination—then it is worth while. Unfortunately, it

is not possible for everyone regularly to go to doctors on the off chance that they require an appropriate examination. I applaud the action that has been taken. Needless to say this unit will have to operate continuously because it will be necessary for it to travel from district to district on an ongoing basis. Whether that be a two year or more round trip, I do not know; only the health experts can help us on that.

I was pleased that the Federal member for Grey gave his full support to this issue and has been pushing it at Federal level. Mr O'Neil has made no secret of the fact that he totally supports the project, as I think every member of this House would. I do not see any problem at all. It is really a matter of an already accepted concept being put into operation as soon as is humanly possible. I do not intend to go further than that, other than to request that this House impress on the Government the urgency of the matter so that the proposal can be put into effect as soon as is possible. We do not want delays. Every delay could well mean that a person who otherwise might be identified is not identified. To that end, I call on the House to support this motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

VIDEO MACHINES

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That the regulations under the Casino Act 1983 relating to video machines, made on 29 March and laid on the table of this House on 3 April 1990, be disallowed.

I never thought that the day would come or the occasion would arise when I would have to move such a motion. At the time that the casino legislation was before the House, it was a controversial issue, and the Premier of this State—the same Premier as we have now—said that he did not support poker machines. Subsequently the Government inserted a definition in the Act to make sure that poker machines were clearly defined. I am sure that if at that time the question had been asked whether poker machines included video machines, as they are now defined—that is, the type that is being talked about being let into the casino under this regulation—the Premier's response would have been, 'Yes, they are poker machines.' I think that every member of the Parliament, if they are honest, would also have said that they are poker machines. There is no doubt that they are poker machines.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member suggests that I have not seen them. I should inform him that I made a study trip for the very purpose of looking at the machines. They are operating in other parts of Australia now and I do know them. I do not oppose the regulation on moral grounds. If anyone says that they are not poker machines, I would point out that the regulation provides:

'Poker machine' does not include a device designed or adapted for the purpose of gambling—
(a) that simulates any of the games commonly known as draw poker . . .

If it has draw poker in it, what is it if it is not a poker machine? They are specifically trying to exclude a machine to play poker. That is exactly what they are saying: that it is a poker machine. I do not need to go any further than that definition. The definition of a poker machine is quite clear. The argument that one might have to press a couple of buttons and take a choice of what cards or numbers one picks does not take away from the fact that the machine is drawn to beat the gambler who stays at the machine long

term, because he will lose. That is the case with all gambling. Poker machines are opposed in virtually all parts of the world. In America, only 25 out of 50 States allow gambling at all.

Mr Ferguson: Have you ever been to the United Kingdom?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will come to the United Kingdom. If the UK concept is to be supported, I will go along with it. The Government say, that the benefit of having these machines is to help the casino. The problem is that they represent impulse gambling: it locks people in and they do not leave them. There is clear evidence worldwide to show that that is the case. In England, gambling is allowed, but if people want it they have to seek it out. The advertising of gambling in the UK is prohibited. Members might like to contemplate here that those who seek to gamble may do so.

I promised the Minister that I would bring up this matter today, but I will restrict my comments to 10 minutes. When I sum up at a future date, I will go to greater length. I took that action in fairness to others and I am grateful that other members stepped aside, and I dropped off one of my own notices of motion, to move this motion today.

All members have received a letter from the licensed clubs and hotels pointing out their concerns if these machines go into the casino. When the casino opened, it ripped out the guts of a lot of inner suburban hotels. We know that. All it did was transfer employment from one venture to another. In the main, the money generated by the casino goes out of the State, because its profits do not stop here, except in the form of taxation that goes to the Government. Most of the money goes out of the State to directors and shareholders who do not live here. Some of them live overseas. Now the Government wants to give the casino a bigger profit margin to the detriment of our own businesses. We should contemplate that very seriously.

Why should we give the sole rights of another form of gambling to a place such as the casino? It already has the sole rights to a lot of games that are played in this State. It is a privilege, yet the casino is greedy enough to want more. In addition, I believe that it has already started putting in facilities in readiness to install the video machines. That is an arrogant contempt for Parliament. That being so, each and every one of us should stand up and say that it is contemptible and an act of hasty greed.

When it was first proposed to permit video machines, all the minutes of the meetings and all the documentation concerning the design, etc., used the words 'poker machines'. It was not until April this year, or thereabouts, that the words 'poker machine' were removed and the words 'video machine' inserted. That is how shonky the deal is. The casino operators and the people employed to prepare for the installation of the machines call them 'poker machines'. That just shows their contempt for the intention of the Act. The Government has gone along with it.

Every member would have received a letter from the Uniting Church setting out its views and the results of a survey undertaken by that church. On 5 October this year, I received a letter from Brian Lewis Smith, Executive Officer of the Social Justice Commission of the Uniting Church, stating, in relation to the 1986 survey:

Since that time, I have observed the operation of video poker machines and I am convinced that all the findings of our 1986 study are applicable to this new generation of poker machines.

The Australian Hotels Association stated in its journal:

Results of a survey on the effects on hotels of poker machines and the Hawke Government's entertainment tax were tabled at the last meeting of the Australian Hotels Association . . . It appeared from the results of the AHA survey that the casino had had the

greatest effect in the city and Government taxes were blamed for much of the loss of trade in restaurants and with hotel counter meals.

I am not a supporter of poker machines. I never have been, and I have studied them. If they are introduced to the casino, what will that do to the licensed clubs? What will it do to restaurants? What will it do to the hotels? It will take business away from them. What will it do to the racing industry?

Mr Ferguson: Make money out of it.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Henley Beach suggests that it is not a problem, that if poker machines go into the casino it will not affect the racing industry or its take. On a really wet day, does the honourable member believe that people will choose to go to Morphettville rather than the cosiness of the casino and play its poker machines? If the Government allows the casino to introduce poker machines and the casino goes ahead with them, I believe that will be a total back-down from the promises made by the Premier in Parliament. When the Casino Bill was introduced, the Premier also promised to do a survey on the effects of gambling on people and society. He has not honoured that promise; nor has his Government. That in itself is contemptible. I ask the House to reject the set of regulations.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Kotz:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should continue funding for free screening mammograms for women aged 50-64 years and to include women aged between 40-50 years.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 352.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I have pleasure in supporting the thrust of the motion put forward by the member for Newland, that is, for the continued funding for free mammography screenings for women in the metropolitan area. I also support what the member for Flinders said, that that would include country areas.

As in the case of cervical cancer, it is essential that there is early detection of breast cancer, which enhances the chances of women being able to have successful treatment. In order to do that there is a very real need for regular screenings to be carried out. In supporting the motion, I would also like to comment on some of the points raised by the honourable member. First, in dealing with the preferred age groups for screening, the honourable member said:

The first interpretation favours the 50 years and over age range as the most effective age category for screening. This opinion is not based on medical science results, it is an opinion based purely on financial, administrative and technological constraints . . .

In answer to that, I would say that the choice of the 50 to 64 age group as the appropriate age range at which to target mass screening in South Australia was not made purely on the grounds of financial, administrative and technological constraints, as has been stated. It was also based on an expert assessment of the medical and epidemiological evidence of the likely benefits and costs to women of screening outside this age range, as well as on an assessment of the availability of adequately trained personnel and treatment services.

Many expert public health authorities, including the Breast Cancer Screening Evaluation Steering Committee established by AHMAC, have suggested that existing evidence for a benefit from routine screening of all women aged 40 to 49 is inconclusive. In order to support that, I would like

to read some extracts. In March 1988, in the Journal of the American Medical Association, it is stated:

Virtually all experts conclude that an asymptomatic woman who is at least 50 years old will benefit from regular breast cancer screening.

In another document in 1989 from the US Centers for Disease Control, they state:

Screening with mammography reduces breast cancer mortality among women aged greater than 50 years and possibly among women aged 40 to 49 years.

In 1989, the Nordic Cancer Union Symposium stated:

Screening for breast cancer by mammography... can reduce mortality. The most clearly documented benefit is in the age group 50 to 69 years...

Nevertheless, the recent report of this committee to AHMAC suggested that the policy for the national screening efforts should allow—

and I agree with that—

for screening for women in the 40 to 49 year age range if requested, but that most effort should be directed to achieving a high participation rate among women over the age of 50, where the incidence of breast cancer is higher and where mammography is a much more reliable tool for early detection.

As the member for Newland said, it is true that the American College of Radiology has in the past recommended baseline screening mammograms for women between the ages of 35 to 40, but this recommendation has been repeatedly challenged by medical scientists as having no support from published research.

With reference to costs in the context of screening mammography, the 'cost' component of the term 'cost effectiveness' should not be interpreted narrowly. Here, costs do not merely relate to financial costs; they can also relate to other costs incurred either directly or indirectly by women and health care providers. One of the costs to women is the anxiety that may accompany the screening test itself and, in particular, a positive screening result, and I have some very personal experience of that involving a family member. It is an enormous anxiety for somebody who is placed in that position.

Screening has a down side as well as a plus side. Some women attending for screening will need further tests, up to and including surgery to the breast for about two in 100. Among those women who undergo breast biopsies, some will not have cancer and therefore can be judged in retrospect to have undergone unnecessary surgery, and that in itself can be quite traumatic for the woman involved. The extent of such surgery will be predictably higher among younger women because I believe their breast X-rays are harder to interpret.

In a tightly controlled screening program, the extent of these so-called false positives can actually be kept to a minimum. Experience with poorly controlled screening activity has shown, I believe, that up to 14 breast biopsies may be performed in order to detect just one cancer. The minimum acceptable standard set for Australia is one cancer in every three biopsies, and the South Australian Breast X-ray Service has achieved an even higher standard than this.

To suggest, as the honourable member has done, that the 40 to 50 age group is the high risk category is perhaps at odds with the facts. Both the incidence and the deaths from breast cancer in South Australia, as elsewhere, increase dramatically with increasing age, and I will read briefly from a table that indicates that fact. In the 30 to 39 years age group, there were 37 new cases, with eight deaths. In the 40 to 49 years age group, 110 new cases with 27 deaths. In the 50 to 59 years age group, it increases markedly to 152 new cases with 53 deaths. In the 60 to 69 years age group, 195 new cases with 72 deaths; and in the 70 to 79 years age

group, 240 new cases with 117 deaths. It can be seen from that table that there is a marked increase as the age increases. That is a real concern, so we must put as much effort as possible into screening those women, but not to the detriment of younger women.

I believe that in South Australia we are committed to supporting the national screening program and hence our national screening policy, and I am delighted to be able to support that because it is something we have needed for some time. I commend the member for Newland for raising the matter in this House, because it is something that is extremely important to me as I am sure it is to her.

When additional Commonwealth funding is made available to support the South Australian Breast X-ray Service screening program—and I believe that some time this month we will hear what that funding is—the service will be extended to include those women in the 40 to 49 years age bracket who are keen to use it. Whether that funding comes through or not, it has been indicated to me that those women would still be screened in any event. However, I support the limiting of the vigorous promotion to women in the 50 to 64 years age group who would benefit most from the screening.

This is an extremely important motion, and I have much pleasure in supporting it. Further, I believe that as and when additional funds become available we should certainly look at lowering those age ranges in order to make sure that as many women as possible in South Australia are screened through the mammography program.

Mrs KOTZ secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRANSPORT CHARGES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

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.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 767.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I do not wish to go much further in this debate. The reason that I sought leave to continue my remarks later (when this motion was before the House on 6 September) is that I was hoping that the Minister of Transport would respond at that time because that was the day before the ATAC meeting, subsequently held in Hobart. At that time, it appeared that the Minister was not prepared to respond. Therefore, I sought leave to conclude my remarks later, pending the outcome of the ATAC meeting. Since that time, there have been reports that agreement should be reached regarding a uniform transport code. That will take time to compile and to implement. However, I was most interested in the fact that there has been a re-think regarding the scale of fees which were originally proposed by the Inter-State Commission.

The commission proposed a massive fee increase for heavy haulage vehicles, which would have been very restrictive to that industry. No doubt, it would have forced many people out of that industry and massively increased the cost of freight. The cost of living of country people would have increased also, causing great difficulty. It would have made the farming and mining communities less competitive due to the built-in cost structure associated with such an increase. There is no doubt that a \$19 000 per year increase in

registration fees for road trains would have a great impact on the cost of living, aside from the cost of operating such vehicles. People who live outside the metropolitan area would have to pay additional freight on consumables and household goods by which they live and also increased freight costs on produce that they must sell in order to make a living.

At a time of rural crisis, and with the present situation, any increase would be of great concern. A fee increase would be compounded through local government and every other form of living. The Inter-State Commission has revised its suggested scale of fees and has reduced the increase by about two-thirds. That is still a massive increase, despite the figures that it has now suggested. I do not believe that this Government would be wise to adopt the views of the Inter-State Commission. After all, the recommendations of the Inter-State Commission were designed solely to solve a problem that occurs in the eastern States where Governments are attempting to force the general freight off the roads and on to the railways. That is fine if rail is a realistic alternative. However, in most of South Australia we do not have that option. Therefore, why should South Australia pay for the cost of another State's problem? In particular, on Eyre Peninsula road trains are not allowed to compete with the railways nor run parallel with the rail system. They may run only on designated routes as determined by the Department of Road Transport and, therefore, they are not competitive with the rail system.

In that regard, it would be wrong if they should therefore be further disadvantaged by being asked to pay this sort of cost. Furthermore, safety measures are involved with road trains where their braking capacity has to be double the norm for this industry. They are subject to six-monthly inspections. No other semitrailer is subjected to that sort of safety inspection. I do not say that this is wrong; it is good that those safety inspections take place, but they just add to the costs of all concerned. I trust that the Government will look very carefully at any move to increase the cost for any freight in South Australia, because it adds to the cost of living and to the cost of production, and makes it uncompetitive, particularly now, at a time when economic circumstances are so dire and difficult in country areas, so any such increase should be strongly resisted.

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

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

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.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 770.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I intend to speak only briefly on this motion but, in doing so, I would like to pose a very pertinent question to the member for Bright—in fact, to all members of the Opposition—in regard to this motion. In his speech, the member for Bright has given no indication whether he as a member of the South Australian Parliament supports the marina at Marino Rocks. In fact, since his election to this place, he has given no indication where he stands on the matter at all. If one goes through the speech made by the member for Bright, one sees that it

was just a regurgitation of petitions that he has presented in this place and statements that he has made in his local press, and he placed great value on a survey that he had sent out to 4 487 households in those areas that would be affected (and I use that word 'affected' in the terms used by the member for Bright) by the marina at Marino Rocks.

We all know what can happen with surveys. I would have thought that there would be a bit more credibility in what the member for Bright has put to the House if he had outlined what the survey actually said. The member for Bright is no fool; he is misguided, but he is no fool, and he must know that, by composing a survey cleverly, one can get the answer one wants.

That is an age old trick used by politicians long before the member for Bright was even conceived, and I hope he understands exactly what that is all about. He comes into this House and says great things about the responses of the residents of Hallett Cove, Marino and Kingston Park. I accept those percentages, but I would like to know also—as I am sure would all members present—exactly what the survey said, because I suspect that it was couched in such a way to ensure that the member for Bright got those percentages. He could then come into this House and tell everyone about the problems in relation to a marina at Marino Rocks without having to say exactly where he stands.

If one listened to the member for Bright, one would be forgiven for believing that he is not only against the marina at Marino Rocks but belongs to that large faction of the Liberal Party which is completely anti-development. One of the surprising things about the Liberal Party in relation to its attitude towards development is that its members—with the exception of the member for Coles—are all careful to sit delicately on the fence. The member for Coles is the only person who has the guts to stand up in this place or out there in the community and say that she is opposed to development. In fact, she was even prepared to give her life for this cause; and I understand that quite a few people were willing to drive the bulldozer, but I think that was rather nasty.

I for one have some sympathy with what the member for Bright is saying, that is, that because another developer wishes to get involved, more work should be done. I have no problem with that.

Mr Quirke: Does he want two bob each way?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That is the point. The member for Playford is dead right: the member for Bright wants two bob each way.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford is dead wrong. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: He was dead wrong about the interjection, Sir, but in what he said he was dead right. That is the real problem for the member for Bright; a small section of his Party is suddenly realising that they cannot just oppose *carte blanche* every development proposed by this Government. He is stoking the pot and agitating out there, but he has not yet told us where he stands on development *per se*. I do not know whether the member for Bright is prepared to join with the member for Coles in tying yellow ribbons around Wilpena Pound, giving his life for the cause of anti-development—we will have to wait and see.

The member for Bright is symptomatic of the NIMBYs—not in my backyard. He would have no problem with a marina at Wirrinna; he would have no problem with a marina in Napier, if there happened to be a coastline in my electorate—and I am working on it; but, when it is in his own backyard, he does not want to know. The danger of adopting that attitude is that one progresses into being anti-

development all the way through. Too many people in this State are led by cowards, that is, people who are frightened to state publicly where they stand, and I refer to those members of the Liberal Party leading the people in the community who are prepared to run up the white flag in South Australia as far as development is concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The Chair is of the opinion that that statement imputes improper motives to the actions of others, and I ask the honourable member to be very careful with his use of words regarding the intent and motives of other members in this Chamber.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I appreciate your advice, Mr Speaker, but I think it is fair to say—and I am sure that you would agree with me—that there are people in South Australia who may be classed as the enemies within, those who are prepared to run up the flag as far as development in South Australia is concerned. It is not my fault if some members of the Liberal Party wish to be identified with those people to whom I refer as the enemies within. I am not making an allegation against the member for Bright or any members of the Liberal Party. I know that the members for Alexandra and Eyre would not only develop Wilpena into a tourist resort but also mine it if they had the chance. That is not a reflection on them; they have a strong and independent view and, thank God, some people in the Liberal Party are still prepared to speak their own mind and not be bound by the wishy-washy leadership on their front bench.

I am talking about those people in the community who are not patriots; they are the quislings who confuse their own limitations with those of South Australians. That is the problem, because we on this side have made a decision in relation to the marina at Marino Rocks and to Wilpena. We are prepared to stand and fall by those decisions and we hope that there are people out there in the community who support us.

The problem is that the Liberal Party has yet to make up its mind and, as the member for Playford correctly interjected, they want two bob each way. As an astute member of this South Australian Parliament, Sir, you know who are the knockers and whingers who oppose every conceivable form of development which has been put forward in this State in the past and which will be put forward in the future. You have been in this place long enough to know who they are. They knocked the Grand Prix, the submarine project, the frigate project, the casino, the ASER development, the entertainment centre, and the Commonwealth Games. It is just like the days of the Vietnam moratorium when charges were levelled against those people—and I was one of them—who took to the streets of Adelaide to oppose the war: we were said to be professional knockers and agitators.

But if one looks at file film of any television station of all those people who were opposed to the Grand Prix, one finds that they are exactly the same people. They were at Marineland protesting in relation to the dolphins. Unfortunately, the member for Bright, in his motion, has identified himself with those knockers and those whingers. However, I have faith in the people of South Australia. I believe it is time for people with ideas, people who actually have a record of achievement, to turn their back on those knockers and those whingers, the ones that the member for Bright is trying to stir up in this particular motion, who, no doubt, members opposite will follow like sheep when this motion comes to a vote. I am convinced that the tide is turning out there in the community, that we are moving into a pro-development stage and that people are turning

their back on people such as the member for Bright who want to oppose anything that is being promoted by the Labor Party.

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think there is a Standing Order that refers to a member reflecting on the views and reputation of another. I take objection to the inference that was made by the member for Napier in that last statement.

The SPEAKER: What was the particular implication?

Mr MATTHEW: He implied improper motives on my part and alleged that I am anti-development. Clearly, the gentleman has not read in *Hansard* statements I have made when I have found it necessary to make a personal explanation in regard to a similar statement.

The SPEAKER: The comments of the honourable member were very general. I have taken the honourable member to task earlier in this debate, and I am not of a mind now to support the point of order. Obviously, I did not hear it the way the honourable member did. I do not support the point of order. However, once again, I advise all members to be very careful about the use of words in this Chamber when referring to other members or their actions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, realise the fine line I am having to tread in identifying these knockers and whingers out in the community and the fact that, in this instance, the member for Bright in his motion has identified with those knockers and whingers so that I am guilty, I suppose, of actually accusing the member for Bright. I am not accusing him of having improper motives—far from it. I would never accuse the member for Bright of having improper motives. All I am saying is that he is completely misguided and being misled by those knockers and whingers in the community.

As I said, I think that the tide is turning. People are turning their backs on those knockers and whingers. Let us face it: the biggest growth industry (you could call it a cottage industry) in this State at the present time is that of knocking and whingeing. No matter what is put up, someone will always say that it is not good. I remember a Minister in another place, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, making a very valid point when she said that there are some people who want to put a glass dome over Adelaide and let the rest of the world go by. You, Sir, are a realist. I am a realist, as we all are on this side. That just does not happen. We must develop, and we will develop in a proper way by consultation with all sections of the community.

I, for one, on this side of the House will not accept the white feather of the Opposition, the knockers and whingers. I want this State to go forward, and I am sure that, under the stewardship of the Bannon Government, it will go forward. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

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

(Continued from 6 September. Page 772.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I have great pleasure—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker, but I should have thought that members opposite would realise by now that I thrive on the kind of criticism they offer. I was only too pleased to take the adjournment on this motion moved by the member for Hayward, because I should have thought that, by now, the member for Hayward would have learnt something about good government. I well recall the occasion on which the member for Hayward wanted this Government to spend something like \$10 million upgrading the Brighton High School, regardless of where it stood in the capital works program or what had been spent by the Government in regard to that high school, or whether the Government was arranging curriculum activities elsewhere in surrounding high schools.

The member for Hayward said, 'I have been elected into this State Parliament, therefore, I want the Treasurer to open the coffers and spend millions and millions of dollars in my electorate.' This is a typical case. I can just imagine what the member for Hayward was like as a little boy walking through a toy shop with his mother and father, because he would have wanted everything he saw. I should imagine that he was never satisfied at Christmas time, despite the gifts his mother and father gave him—unless he still believed in Father Christmas! I think he does believe in Father Christmas, after some of the motions of which we have heard. No matter what he got from Father Christmas or from his father and mother, the honourable member always wanted something more as a child.

He has gone back through *Hansard* and has seen a question asked of the then Minister of Transport in regard to the Morphett/Diagonal Roads and Noarlunga railway line intersection. The honourable member saw the answer that the Minister gave. However, if one looks at the answer, one sees that the Minister was not promising anything. In effect, the Minister was saying that some work had been done at that intersection and that when money was available and more work was done in line with the capital works program, more work would proceed on that project.

The honourable member then tried a classic case of blackmail. He reads into *Hansard* road accident statistics dealing with personal injury and property damage for the years 1986 to 1989. That is all very correct. In fact, he said that the information came from the Department of Road Transport. As I said, he then tried a classic case of blackmail. Fortunately, in those years—1986 to 1989—there were no fatalities, and thank God for that. There has been a lot of property damage in relation to vehicles and some personal injury. The degree of personal injury has not been identified, but it has occurred. The honourable member then stands up in this House and says that he will hold the Minister and this Government responsible if there is a fatality at that intersection. That is pretty low. I think that every member in this House could identify an intersection within his or her electorate where there were problems. However, no-one but the member for Hayward, I think, would stand up and blackmail the Government by saying that, if there were a death, he or she would hold the Government responsible.

There is only so much money to go around and, if the member for Hayward had taken the time, in reading *Hansard* and finding that the previous member had asked a question of the Minister (to which he had subsequently provided a reply), to either write to the Minister or to ring him or his office, this would not have occurred. I know that the member for Bragg does this and he does it very well: he ascertains the facts before he comes into this House and shoots his mouth off. The member for Bragg has never been guilty of that. I may disagree with many of the things

that the member for Bragg says in this House. I refer to the time when he accused the Minister of Recreation and Sport of cheating in relation to a gold pass, for which he never apologised.

When I chose to take the adjournment on this motion I said to the Minister—and the present Minister of Transport does not curry favour with members either on this side of the House or on the other side; he is a pretty hard Minister, and I have never got a favour out of him—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, has the honourable member's time expired?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Again, Mr Speaker, I thank you for your protection. As I said, members opposite may not like what I am saying, but I should have thought that they would have the decency to listen. As I was saying, the Minister of Transport is not known to give favours to members on this side of the House as opposed to members opposite. I just said to the Minister of Transport, 'Look, Frank, I have taken the adjournment on this motion. Is there anything in it that has any vestige of truth?' After the Minister got up from the floor, he said, 'I will find out for you.' There has been an investigation. The previous Minister was correct in saying that an investigation would be undertaken in relation to this intersection.

In fact, the investigation took in all the information that the member for Hayward tabled in this House. No-one was trying to hide anything. What the member for Hayward failed to find out from the Minister, or did not even try to find out from him, was the cost.

Yesterday I listened, grudgingly, Sir, to the Leader of the Opposition making comments that were totally untrue. He said that this Government was a high debt Government; that this Government was heavily into borrowings; and that we would eventually have to pay the price. The Leader said that we should draw back the reins of capital spending and decrease taxes and charges, despite the fact that we are the second lowest taxing State in the Commonwealth. Yet the member for Hayward—mind you he is inexperienced—wants the Government to spend either \$10.41 million on a road over rail, \$8.87 million on a rail under road, or \$7.94 million on a rail over road.

The consultants—people entirely devoid of governmental control in as much as the findings they deliver—reported to the Government the costs, and that it would not be feasible at this present time; that the previous work on the speed limit discrimination signalling, which had been implemented, was taking effect. If members look at the figures on page 771 of *Hansard* they will there find that since this implementation there has been a decrease in the number of incidents at that location. So, the Government got it right, after the request of the previous member for Hayward.

But, that does not satisfy the present member for Hayward. It is 'give me, give me, give me' all the time, Sir. He wants more. You and I, Sir, if we put our heads together, could set out a shopping list for this Government to spend in our electorates. I am sure, Sir, that the Government spends more in your electorate than it does in mine; it seems to have been disregarding my electorate since 1977. Only my sheer personal following has enabled me to hold my seat.

I now turn to the results of the study that was conducted. That advice was there for the Government to take, and the Government took it. It stated:

Of the three grade separation options under consideration, the visual and noise impacts would be least for the rail under road scheme.

That scheme would cost \$8.87 million. It continues:

Economic evaluation shows the rail over road option to be favoured, but none of the options has a positive rate of return.

This report comes from people whose sole job it is to provide advice to the Government—whether that be this Government or, by a fluke, the other mob over there of which the member for Bragg would probably be Premier. We are given the same advice as any other Government would receive. The report states:

Even the least cost scheme for grade separation with no improvements to the surrounding road network shows a benefit/cost ratio of only 0.43, which does not justify the project on economic grounds.

This low rate of return arises substantially because of benefits already realised by the recent commissioning of the train speed discrimination system.

After reading that information, which was supplied by the Minister's office, I would like to congratulate the Minister of the day for promptly taking action to try to alleviate the problems. Sir, you and I know that most problems with intersections are not caused by bad road design, by the fact that there is a lack of traffic lights or because there is no bridge over or road under or whatever. In the main, it is caused by bad driving habits.

Mr Ferguson: The nut behind the wheel.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague, the member for Henley Beach, in a more realistic way, says that it is the nut behind the wheel. That is the cause of most accidents in this country—in fact, worldwide. If the member for Hayward thinks that by putting fancy bridges over roads and fancy underpasses under railway lines that will avoid these problems, he is a fool. The answer lies in educating our drivers on the way that they treat other drivers on the road.

Mr Oswald: That's a lot of crap.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will disregard the vile language that the member for Morphett is using.

The SPEAKER: Order! The comment from the Opposition side is, in the opinion of the Chair, most unparliamentary. I ask that language be considered before it is used in this Chamber.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I never realised that some members opposite were low enough to hurl personal abuse at members, but that is perhaps a sign of the times.

As I was saying, the answer to most of our problems as regards personal injury and accidents to property lies in better driver education. We cannot pull millions of dollars out of the hat to satisfy the ego of individual members of Parliament. This State Treasury is not one gigantic toy shop that we can lead members through and allow them to pick this or that up as it suits their fancy. We live in hard economic times.

Yesterday we heard a speech by the present Leader of the Opposition, despite the stress that he is undergoing, which, in effect, stated that we have to pull in the reins on Government spending. Yet, at the same time, every member opposite is asking and demanding that this Government should spend more money. The two are not compatible. I suggest that the member for Hayward and other members opposite, who want this Government to spend millions of dollars on their own little personal flights of fantasy in their electorates which they think will get them kudos, have to get rid of their present leadership, because the present leadership is not in tune with what they are saying. If the member for Bragg becomes the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure that he will follow the same line: that we are in hard economic times and that we need to limit capital spending in this State. I should like to think that the member for Bragg would have more influence on these wayward backbenchers who continually prattle on here about how much this Government should spend in their electorates.

A comprehensive investigation has been carried out into the viability of grade separating the road and railway at Oaklands Park. It was carried out by consultants acting for the State Transport Authority in 1989. That is despite the fact that over the two weeks of Estimates Committees we had the Opposition continually whinging about the use by this Government of consultants. However, this Government believes that if there is a serious problem, the best way to overcome that problem is to get an independent, first-class opinion from consultants. The Department of Transport played its part. It participated in the study by supplying data on traffic predictions. The investigation indicated that grade separation could not be justified economically at this time and consequently no further action is currently being taken other than to ensure that necessary land is retained to enable a structure to be erected at the appropriate time in the future.

Those few words say it all. That is good government in action. I can forgive the member for Hayward because he is too new and too inexperienced. However, members such as the member for Bragg should understand that that was the only result possible from that particular study. Will the member for Bragg stand up and support his colleague the member for Hayward and say that this Government should find \$8.87 million? Will the member for Bragg say that, in finding that \$8.87 million, we have to reduce the number of policemen, nurses and teachers and reduce other areas of Government spending, areas for which the Opposition continually makes demands on the Government?

Will the member for Bragg stand up in support of the member for Hayward and outline exactly from where the Government should take that \$8.87 million? He is nodding his head and I hope that, when I have finished dealing with this motion, he will stand up in support of his colleague the member for Hayward. If he does, all that work I have been doing over the past year in trying to undermine the leadership to ensure that the member for Bragg gets the job will be wasted.

But I have digressed, and I should not have done so. As I said, the correct decision has been made, but that is not all. Despite having that advice, the Minister requested that the operation of the level crossing and the road junction be monitored continually by the Department of Road Transport. Traffic congestion is not considered sufficient to warrant alterations to layout or traffic signals ahead of the currently programmed work. That does not mean that this Government has turned its back on the fact that there needs to be some form of grade separation.

What the Government is saying is that, until it is justified on the grounds of monitoring the traffic flow and it is economically viable, which is equally important, the speed discrimination measures put in place in 1989 are sufficient. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 12.53 to 2 p.m.]

HOUSING COOPERATIVES BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PHARMACISTS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts

of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

CHIROPRACTORS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LIMIT

A petition signed by 520 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to set the blood alcohol concentration limit for fully licensed drivers at .05 per cent was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOUNT LOFTY RANGES DEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to limit the prohibitions on development in the Mount Lofty Ranges as ordered by the interim supplementary development plan was presented by the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ISLAND SEAWAY

In reply to **Hon. TED CHAPMAN** (Alexandra) 9 August.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The detailed business plan for the *Island Seaway* ferry service is currently being finalised in discussion with the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee and R. W. Miller. The vessel operation is based on a continuation of, but modification to, the ferry service. The business planning work was necessary to gain more effective use of Government subsidies by better matching the ferry service schedules to projected cargo levels. The Government is working towards the achievement of significant savings in vessel operations while essentially passing on these savings to vessel users.

Charges to vessel users have been carefully assessed in order to protect the main link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. The charges on the Port Lincoln/Kingscote leg could have been set at much higher levels if we were seeking to recover average costs. The \$12 per foot on that leg is, therefore, still a concessional rate.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the statement of the Registrar of Members' Interest for 1990.

Ordered that the statement be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education for the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Triennial Review, 1986-87 to 1988-89.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Commissioner for Public Employment and Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations—Report 1989-90.

By the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

South Australian Code of Practice for Manual Handling—September 1990.

MATTER OF URGENCY: RURAL CRISIS

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition I give notice that it is his intention to propose the following matter of urgency when the House resumes this afternoon:

That this House, at its rising, adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House:

- recognising that forecasts of a 43 per cent reduction in South Australia's income from wheat, wool and barley in 1990-91 foreshadow a serious rural crisis which will lead to hardship, unemployment, bankruptcy and personal tragedy in all sectors of the State economy;
 - urges the Premier to make immediate personal representations to the Federal Government for a lowering of interest rates which are decimating rural and other businesses in this State;
 - urges the Premier to also call on the Federal Government to use all policy weapons to ensure that the artificially high Australian dollar exchange rate is reduced to enable exports of Australian produce to be competitive on world markets;
 - urges the Premier to press the Federal Government to use windfall fuel tax gains to assist those in greatest hardship;
 - urges the Premier to seek Federal assistance for farmers so that, as far as practicable, the disposal of surplus sheep is cost neutral to farmers;
 - urges the Premier to seek to have the special Premiers Conference later this month extended to place the rural crisis on the agenda so that full Federal and State co-operation can be achieved in dealing with the crisis;
 - urges the deployment of personnel and equipment from State Government departments including Agriculture, Road Transport and Water Resources to help dispose of surplus sheep to reduce the cost to local government and private individuals and to ensure health hazards and pollution are minimised;
 - urges a moratorium until 1 January 1991 on the charge increases applying to the *Island Seaway* so that additional sheep can be transported from the hard-hit Eyre Peninsula to the Kangaroo Island Abattoirs;
- and
- urges a reversal of decisions in the State budget which will double registration fees for primary producer vehicles under two tonnes and increase heavy commercial vehicles charges by \$600 to \$700.

I ask those members who support the proposed matter to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

The SPEAKER: I call on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr Speaker. This morning, just north of Naracoorte, I watched one of the most horrific scenes that anyone who has had anything to do with the rural industry could watch. I saw farmers borrowing trucks, and helping each other take their sheep to a pit. Some 3 000 sheep were gathered by many farmers, and taken into yards 50 at a time, shot and pushed into pits. That is one of the most horrific and disastrous things that anyone could see, especially because

those farmers, who have reared those animals and cared for them all their life, now see their source of income shot and put into a pit. I wish the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture had been there this morning—instead of flying out of South Australia today—to see the looks on the faces of those people who know that they are facing bankruptcy but are receiving absolutely no help from the Federal or State Governments.

Those people are destitute, their incomes are absolutely decimated and many of those people were in tears because they know what will face them—eviction from their property. What is going on down there is an absolute human tragedy, and it will go on all around South Australia and Australia because of the policies of the Federal and State Governments.

Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture put forward the greatest load of drivel I have ever heard since I have been in this Parliament. All he did was recycle election promises that he has never implemented and get away from the real cause of the problem. The only new initiative was a promise to lend farmers more money at higher interest rates. It is an absolute cop-out: it is an absolute disgrace to this Government, and shows exactly how much it cares about the rural population in this State. The situation will flow through from the rural population to the business community in South Australia because not only is the rural community on its knees but also small business and business generally in this State is facing similar problems.

Then we asked some questions of the Premier. The Premier got up and said, 'Well, I've made plenty of statements. It is quite obvious what I think. There is nothing we can do about it.' That is an absolute cop-out again. Of course there is something he can do about it; of course he should get out there and talk to these people; of course he should stand up and fight the Federal Government on its policies which are causing the situation; and of course he can do something about it in his State budget, which we all know has increased taxation quite dramatically.

Let us get back to a few of the facts for a moment. The problem in the Federal area is that Australia is facing the highest interest rates in the history of the country. And not only are they the highest in our history but also they have been in place for longer than any other high interest rates have been in place in this country's history; they have been in place for five years. So, it does not matter how good a business person someone is; it does not matter how much people want to help produce their way out of Australia's problems; it does not matter how much entrepreneurial spirit they have, the back of those people has been broken by that single issue of high interest rates, which has been perpetrated on the people of Australia by the supposedly world's greatest Treasurer, and I might say supported by the Federal President of the Labor Party.

Of course, the other problem is that, because it is a dirty float, the Australian dollar is currently between US82c and US83c. It does not matter what we do in Australia or what our exporters do; they are not competitive in the larger world community. It does not matter what we do because of this dirty float.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am glad that the Minister of Finance is becoming involved, because he might learn a little bit if he read a few basic economic things. He is in charge of the razor gang—and we know what that will do.

The basic economic problem is two-fold, first, high interest rates, a dirty float by the world's greatest Treasurer, and a high dollar so that no matter what happens Australian producers and Australian exporters can never be competi-

tive. Of course, that is highlighting the problem. We cannot sell our produce; we cannot export our goods—although the Premier has been trying to tell people that we can. However, until the dollar comes down to a realistic level, there is no hope for South Australian and Australian exporters to be competitive and get this nation off its knees. And that is a fact of which the Minister of Finance should be aware, and if he wants a private briefing I am happy to talk to him about it.

An honourable member: The market has collapsed.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The market has not collapsed. The honourable member came from overseas and should know better. Of course, the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture say that there is nothing we can do about the problem. However, I might add that the last State budget has just increased taxes on South Australians by some \$233 million. FID went up quite dramatically, and that affects all people in South Australia, both rural and city people.

Payroll tax went up; that affects employment in South Australia. The WorkCover levy for the rural community has just gone up from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent, and we have been highlighting the rorts that are going on in that regard. That is a direct impost on our rural producers. Under the last State budget we increased registration on primary producers' vehicles under two tonnes. In that same budget we saw the Government increase registration on local government vehicles where no concessions now apply. All these imposts are on the rural communities in South Australia as well as on the business community in Adelaide and the other cities.

Let us look at some areas in which the State Government could help. The Premier says there is nothing he can do: I will tell him a few things he can do. He should get out of his air-conditioned office, take the Minister of Agriculture and go around this State, meet the people and hear the stories they are telling me and my colleagues, especially the rural representatives. In the past fortnight, my electorate office has been receiving an average of 10 calls a day from the most productive area in South Australia, the South-East, telling us that people will have negative incomes and, in two cases last week, people broke down in tears. One person said, 'I am going to commit suicide if this goes on any longer.' That is the problem.

Members opposite should get out of their air-conditioned offices, go around and talk to the people in South Australia and hear the problem for themselves, because they are not prepared to recognise the problem in this place. South Australians demand that something be done about it. A Premiers Conference is coming up. We noted that, when the conference on commercialisation and privatisation was held, the Premier went overseas. Let us hope that he goes to the Premiers Conference at the end of this month and asks to have that conference extended so that we can discuss the rural crisis in South Australia and Australia, as well as the business crisis that is facing this nation.

Let the other Premiers tell Mr Bannon about the problems in their States, because the other Premiers have already realised the situation. They have not put up taxes and charges: they have been prepared to bite the bullet and do things that are in the interests of business in their States. Unfortunately, in this State we have copped out to the detriment, I am afraid, of many of the residents.

The Premier must start fighting the causes. He has to start criticising the Federal Treasurer. Of course, he finds it difficult to do that, as Federal President of the Australian Labor Party. He must stand up for South Australians and say that it is not good enough: we are losing businesses in this State at record levels. Unemployment today has shown

a massive increase all around Australia, including South Australia. When will the Premier do something about it? When will he start fighting? He should get out there and tell the public that it is time we had a public sector that taxpayers can afford. He should start making some cuts instead of dragging more taxes out of taxpayers' pockets. All South Australians will be affected by this downturn.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I don't want more: I said 'We should have a public sector that taxpayers can afford.' Members opposite would not understand that. Tomorrow we will have a meeting with all rural leaders in South Australia.

An honourable member: Are you going to bring George Apap to that one?

Mr D.S. BAKER: In the spirit of bipartisanship, I should like to invite Mr Apap and I should like to invite the Premier. They could sit down for as long as they want—probably 1½ or 2 hours—and tell us the problems. The people at the meeting tomorrow will be from the Australian Wool Corporation, the Meat Board, the Barley Board and the United Farmers and Stockowners, and there will be representatives of the citrus growers and country community groups. They are all coming to Parliament House so that we can talk to them, find out how bad things are out there—and find ways around this problem.

If the Premier would like to join me, I invite him to do so. Above all, I want him to have some guts and visit Canberra, knock on the door of the Treasurer and go in there and tell him exactly how bad the situation is. If the Premier does not have the guts to do it, he should make an appointment; I will go and tell the Treasurer, and the Premier can hide under the chair beside me.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier): That was an abrupt ending to a speech that I thought was quite disgraceful in its approach to a very real problem. Let me start with that point. The Leader of the Opposition spoke for a short time—and I thought the most disappointing thing was that he sat down with some minutes to go without once telling us exactly what sort of prescriptions or action are really necessary in this area, without in any way making clear why it is that the things he proposes will solve this problem. But, let us put that aside. I found the Leader of the Opposition's contribution most disappointing. The bulk of his remarks were about the fact that there is a major problem in the rural areas. There is absolutely no dispute on that point. The Minister—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What about the cause of it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A very good point; a good interjection from the member for Kavel, because instead of trying to analyse in a comprehensive way the causes and the source of the problem and thereby trying to point to some solutions, all we were told is that we have to have meetings and discussions to hear the problems. We recognise that there is a very acute problem. The scenes described by the Leader of the Opposition are extremely distressing: there is no question of that. It is distressing on all sorts of counts, not only for the economic implications of those decisions but also for the human and other elements involved, such as the disgraceful waste in the destruction of livestock.

I fully empathise with what the Leader is saying, as I am sure do all my colleagues. We are not sitting sheltering in air-conditioned offices ignoring this. On the contrary, that sort of cheap personal abuse does not help the Parliament's consideration of the issue; it does not help the farmers in their plight; it does not help our overall economy. It does absolutely nothing but politicise and create confrontation

and strife on an issue where we, as South Australians, ought to be united in trying to do something about it.

So, that sort of cheap abuse of me and the Minister, with a suggestion that we are unaware of the problems and that we are afraid to go out and view them first hand, which is totally at odds with the facts and what the Minister, I and others have been doing consistently over a long period, is nonsense. It is demeaning for the Leader of the Opposition to devote the bulk of his speech to saying that there is a problem and that we on this side of the House are not interested in acknowledging or recognising it. Where was he yesterday when the Minister of Agriculture made a major statement in which he outlined the problem?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I see. Not content with abusing us while he is on his feet supposedly arguing the case, members opposite, led by the Leader, want to interject and drown out anything I have to say. That typifies their attitude. I think it is very sad for members of the rural community to feel that they have to be represented by a rabble like that, who are demeaning and degrading this argument. We are not approaching it in that way, and the statement by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday indicated that we are putting many resources, much effort and much recognition into this very important problem. For the Leader of the Opposition to pretend otherwise is disgraceful.

What I find most odd about this whole argument and about the way in which this motion is framed, particularly this almost derisory political rhetoric that was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, is that it is a classic case of self-flagellation. In fact, we are perceiving a problem here in the South Australian rural communities and in our vital agricultural economy, and what is the starting point? It is to blame ourselves; to say it is things we are doing; that it is State Governments; that it is the Federal Government; that it is individuals here in Australia—we are the reason why these problems exist. Do you know who would be most delighted about that, who would be very pleased to see this form of debate taking place within Australia?

I will tell you, Mr Speaker. It is overseas producers in those countries which are protecting, dumping and doing all sorts of uncompetitive things in a world market. That is creating a massive disadvantage on particular exports. I will tell the House of someone else, an individual, who would be delighted with this debate and the way it has been framed—the self-flagellation element of it. I refer to Saddam Hussein, the ruler of Iraq, who has a lot to answer for in relation to the current plight of our industry and our economy.

If somebody reported to the agricultural lobby of the United States, or the agricultural protectionists of the European Economic Community, or the perpetrators of the crisis in the Persian Gulf that Australia sees this international rural problem as something that is caused by domestic and local policies, they would laugh: they would be delighted, because it takes the pressure off them. Let me not be misrepresented by the Leader of the Opposition, because on a number of occasions I have made statements indicating what our views are in relation to Canberra's economic policy. I have not said that there is nothing we can do about it, and I am not saying that on this occasion, either.

I will preface what I am about to say by indicating that there are some things that we can do, and the Minister of Agriculture outlined a number of those in his statement yesterday, and will work progressively at them. There are a number of things that the national Government can do, and we will be urging that Government to do so. But let us

not be fooled by the desire to make cheap political points within the country about the fact that it is Australia as a nation that faces a problem in this area, in large part because of what our competitors are doing overseas. A motion such as this should be directed at supporting and reinforcing the efforts of our national Government and of people such as Neal Blewett and John Kerin, who have been appearing in international forums trying to do something about this. That sort of support must be given with that sort of recognition of the problem.

We are deluding ourselves if we think that fiddling around with taxation systems, interest rates, and so on, can solve the problem. There is no way that it can, and the starting point must be the international perspective. We must support the Minister for Trade Negotiations, who is standing up in international forums attacking the United States and the European Economic Community for their outrageous practices and agricultural subsidisation policies. I am sure that any one of those he is attacking would be delighted to have a copy of the Leader of the Opposition's speech so they could read it out to a gathering and say that what they are hearing is nonsense, that they are not causing any harm to Australia, that it is the policies of the Federal Government and the State Governments that are causing the problem. They could suggest that it is nothing to do with them and tell us to go away so they can continue with their practices.

We know that is absolute nonsense. The rural and agricultural industry in this country operates in an international market. It is internationally competitive. It is an extremely efficient sector on the world agricultural scene. It can hold its own in any market in the world. What is preventing it from doing so is the way in which those who produce goods overseas also protect, subsidise and, indeed on occasions, dump in various countries around the world. That is what we should be talking about.

Import competition is obviously a crucial factor. As a State Government, we urge the Federal Government to take action against the dumping of particular imports in this country, ruining as they do the livelihood of many of our producers. That action will be encouraged. That was one of the points that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture mentioned yesterday as being the primary cause of action by this Government. We have conveyed our concern and we are establishing a special watch organisation to try to ensure that the evidence can be given. That is something that needs to be done.

Secondly, in terms of that protectionism I mentioned, its sheer scale should not be ignored. Support for agricultural producers in the European community and in the USA resulted in 1989 in 48 per cent of EEC farmers' incomes and 27 per cent of US farmers' incomes coming directly from their Governments. This is what Australia's efficient farmers are up against, and we ought to be directing our attention and energy towards doing something about that.

The recent fall in the international wool price, again, had something to do with the reduced international demand for wool in major importing countries. We are susceptible to those sorts of factors. We hear from the Leader of the Opposition about the destruction of sheep forced upon us in the South-East in these terrible circumstances, but what about the incident in Europe recently where so-called angry French farmers demanding more protectionism were slaughtering lambs from Scotland? There is no question that those international effects, pressures and lobby groups are causing us major problems. This ought to have been the beginning point and the focus.

What about the impact of the Gulf crisis, which has been completely ignored by the Leader of the Opposition? This is having a couple of major effects. First, it is having a major effect on the markets for our agricultural products. I point out that, in this instance, as we understand from the present figures, it is having a far greater effect on the South Australian agricultural sector than on the national area. In other words, whilst about 5 per cent of Australia's agricultural exports go to the Middle East, so do about 21 per cent of South Australia's exports. Therefore, we are suffering to a much greater extent, and I believe that there is a case, which is now being developed by the Minister of Agriculture, to take to Canberra to suggest that special support is required because, in a sense, we are on the front line of the sanctions that are having to be implemented regarding this crisis.

The second impact of the Gulf crisis relates to the exchange rate. The fact is that, recently, the exchange rate increased quite markedly. It is defying all the indicators and other measures that one would use and, by so doing, makes one wonder why there is such strength in the sort of economic environment described by the Leader of the Opposition. The answer is simple: the international market, because of our plethora of natural resources, perceives us as being better protected or insulated from the long-term effects of the crisis than other countries.

Is this something about which the Australian or South Australian Governments can do anything? The Leader of the Opposition talks about a dirty float of the dollar. In fact, it was rural organisations which insisted on the floating of the dollar in the first place, but welcomed deregulation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, Mr Speaker: under the regulated system it would be even higher—it certainly was when the Fraser Government was in office. That also is an important part of the situation and one that has been completely ignored and put to one side by the Leader of the Opposition, because he does not want to come to terms with the fact that he could go around to every part of rural South Australia and say, 'We will change the Government'; 'We'll change Government policy'; or 'We'll get this done, and everything will be fixed.' That is a con, a cruel and shallow trick.

The Minister of Agriculture will be meeting with the Federal Minister on 26 October, accompanied by the President and Executive Officer of the UF&S, and he will be putting to the Federal Government a number of the points contained in this motion. I do not disagree with a number of the points that have been made; indeed, they have been picked up already by the Minister of Agriculture and were mentioned in his statement yesterday. My colleague will deal with some of the other points contained in the motion.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is having great difficulty hearing either side of the debate, which is very significant in the State's history. I ask all members to pay due respect to the member on his feet. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): We have just listened to a Premier of eight years standing address the House on one of the most important economic issues to come before this Chamber for a long time. We have a Premier who, as Federal President of the Australian Labor Party, has gone hand in hand with Mr Hawke and Mr Keating, and together they have inflicted upon this community and this nation the highest interest rates in history. Together they have artificially pushed

up the dollar, which has made our rural products unsaleable on the international market. The Premier and his colleagues cannot escape the blame—they have ripped great gutters across the economic fabric of rural Australia. They have shorn from the backs of rural producers and those small industries that rely on them every dollar that they can until there is nothing left in the economic bale.

Yet, they fail to understand that the great industries that built this country, which will continue to sustain it and maintain a decent standard of living for all South Australians and Australians, are in dire straits. All that the Federal Treasurer can say is that 'we are on track'. Some track! We are heading for a dead-end with this minority Government and the irresponsible element in control in Canberra, both of which will have to answer for their actions for some years into the future. Never in my involvement with agriculture have I known things to be so despondent in rural Australia. People have nowhere to go. They are not only concerned but also are looking for some leadership from Government. They are looking for their Premier of eight years to stand up on their behalf. What did we hear today? We heard more platitudes and saw the Premier ducking away from the issue.

Across South Australia some of the most efficient rural producers are facing the most difficult time in their history. They want the Government to appreciate the extent of the problem and to put some confidence back into the industry. They do not want economic nonsense or more taxes. They do not want another \$230 million of taxes inflicted upon them. They want to be able to drive their utilities on the road. They do not want their registration fees doubled. That is the thanks that this Government gives them. When the State is facing a loss in excess of \$530 million in rural income this year the Premier says that really it is a Federal issue. He is the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party. He accepted that role, but it would appear to this House and to the people of this State that he is not prepared to stand up to his Federal colleagues.

It has been said by way of interjection that rural industry wanted to have the dollar floated. Of course it wanted the dollar floated, but it wanted a full float and not a dirty float. The Commonwealth Government has not allowed the dollar to find its true level. The most effective mechanism that the Federal Government can put into place on behalf of rural producers is the bringing down of interest rates by at least three to four per cent. If we bring down interest rates by at least 3 per cent, we will probably put \$16 to \$18 per tonne on the price of wheat. We have a situation in this nation where producers will be paid \$95 per tonne at the silo gate. Anyone who knows anything about the wheat industry would be aware that we could take \$16 to \$18 a tonne off that. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture officer at Streaky Bay that many producers in that area, after paying their ongoing expenses to put in their crop, will be left with about \$6 000 in their pockets. That will not pay their interest rates.

The Premier and his colleagues should go to Canberra and tell Mr Keating that, if he does not have the wit or is not responsible enough to bring down interest rates so that the dollar will fall or be more competitive on the international market, he should get out and let people with the welfare and interests of the people of this nation at heart take over the reins. We have in this State some of the most efficient rural industries in the nation, and we have other industries which live on them. We have had fine agricultural, manufacturing and support industries. They are all facing economic ruin. Coupled with that, the Government is using fuel agents as tax collectors, with massive amounts

of money being ripped out of the pockets of rural producers in the community on a daily basis. It is reaching scandalous proportions and it should be stopped forthwith.

The State Government has to cut its cloth. It must reduce taxes and charges. The Premier said recently from Rome that South Australia's survival depended on exports, yet he and his Government have the opportunity to help exporters in this State and improve the port facilities. That is one positive thing they can do, yet his Minister has steadfastly refused to do anything to upgrade the port of Thevenard and other ports around the State. He does not have the economic courage to do anything about it. The Government ought to be selling off to private enterprise surplus Government assets such as the loading facilities so that funds are generated to improve the ports. That ought to be done as a high priority, but the Government will not act. All it wants to do is continue to reap millions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets and put it into non-productive enterprises.

The argument that it does not have the money does not stand up to proper analysis. The Government has wasted millions of dollars on foolish enterprises in this State and overseas. The people of this State want a Government that has the courage to tackle its colleagues in Canberra so they will change the economic course. It is very simple if you have the guts and the political will. If you do not, and want to hide behind all sorts of platitudes but do nothing other than duck under the table, then things will only get worse and you will be judged accordingly.

The hallmark of good government is a Government that has the courage to take the tough decisions in the long-term interests of the people of this State. That is the hallmark of sound, sensible government. The current economic policies which have been inflicted on the rural industry and across industry in general are devastating a generation of Australians and, unless interest rates are brought down, the value of the dollar will not fall. It is absolutely essential that the value of the Australian dollar is reduced to about 70c at the bear minimum, and then we will be competitive.

We produce the best agricultural products in the world—second to none. We have been able to sell them because we produce quality. We have had excellent marketing arrangements. We have people who can guarantee delivery, but we have a shocking record on the wharves, and the Government will do nothing about it. The producers have played their part, but Governments have penalised them. Governments must now bear the full responsibility for their economic sins. I call upon the Premier to put aside his normal soft attitude, to put away his feather duster and take a sledge-hammer to his colleagues in Canberra, because he will be acting in the interests of all South Australians. If he fails on this occasion, he will fail the people of this State. I urge the House, in the interests of all South Australians, to support this motion.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I want to reinforce the comments of the Premier and certainly those of the Minister yesterday in his public statement.

Mr Brindal: There haven't been any.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member suggests that there have not been any. Obviously, he was not listening very carefully. The comments by the Leader were inappropriate, particularly given the nature of the Minister concerned. There would not be a more compassionate member in this Parliament than the Minister of Agriculture. He has always exhibited that in whatever he has done. To take a cheap shot at the Minister's leaving the State, when he is

representing this State to encourage more trade for South Australia and for South Australians, is inappropriate and improper in the circumstances. The comments of the Leader in taking those cheap points in an endeavour to reflect on the Minister are certainly not warranted, given the nature of the motion presently before the House.

It is important to go through some of the points to which this Government over the years has committed itself in terms of support for the agricultural community. During the 3½ years that I was Minister of Agriculture, my experience was—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Bragg reflects on my capacity.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: He has not apologised and, if I wanted to size up any one of the Opposition members in relation to my background, I could say that my forebears opened up part of this State as farmers. I am part of the fourth generation of a farming family, so I have a fairly good background from which to draw in terms of my heritage within the farming community. I probably have more farming blood in my veins than most other members on the other side of the House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That draws a good deal of humour from the Opposition, but my grandfathers were opening up the Mid North back in the 1870s. My forebears arrived through Port Adelaide and were listed as carpenters and farmers. I grew up on a farm, and my father and mother worked through the depression. They have told me of their experiences during the depression. I do not think there are too many members on the Opposition benches whose parents were farmers during that period. I have the background on which to draw when debating this issue.

I want to reflect on what this Government has done in the area of agriculture, because I think it is important. Numerous measures have been brought in by this Government over the years to support the agricultural community not only in terms of restructuring but also in terms of the export of agricultural products. This Government has been the first to recognise the importance of the agricultural sector in the export market. It has played an important part in offering structures which support agriculture in the export market.

The Leader touches on the causes of the problem with which we are faced at present. Having just been to Europe, I think it is quite obvious that what is happening here is a reflection of what is happening in the European market and the world market. It is quite obvious that the farming community worldwide is facing similar problems. That is apparent in both the North American and the European scene. There is a great deal of uncertainty throughout the agricultural community, whether in the EEC countries or in North America. It is important to note that this is a world problem, which we as a community face. The Leader's criticising the Premier and suggesting that this State Government is not doing anything to address the problem does not help.

Further, the Leader suggested that the Premier is sitting in his air-conditioned office. When we were facing the worst rural crisis in the West Coast region, on Eyre Peninsula, because of the drought which extended from about 1982 to 1986-87, the Premier went over there and met the farmers in their own homes. He stayed with them. I went over there every time I was called to meet with those farmers to see the problem first-hand. This Premier could never be accused of running away or ducking a problem. He has always

fronted up, and at that time he fronted up to very hostile meetings. I know that personally, because I went to the Eyre Peninsula after the Premier made a second extensive visit. The farming community appreciated that. It appreciated the fact that the Premier went out there and actually met with them and talked to them about the problem, sharing with them what the Government was doing to assist.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: They did, and they were genuine in their comments to me about the way they appreciated the visit. I think it is important to note that that visit and the previous visits were an indication of this Government's concern for the situation. I know that the Minister is concerned about it; I know that he shares the concerns being expressed by people in the community about what is happening in rural areas in the present crisis; and I know that he will deal with it. I know that he will be sensitive and compassionate about the issues which face the rural community.

It is very unfair to say, as the Leader has said, that the Premier is hiding in his air-conditioned office. He is one Premier who will not hide in his air-conditioned office, and the Minister will not hide in his air-conditioned office. They will come out, meet the farming community and be prepared to listen to all the issues that are raised. In terms of this motion, it is important to look at the financial measures that are being offered by this Government: the debt reconstruction, farm build-up, farm improvements and special farm build-up finances, which are quite significant.

Let us be quite frank: I heard the shadow Minister this morning on ABC radio—and I will be interested, if he is to speak today, to hear what he has to say. The ABC interviewer put to him, 'Weren't loans offered to the rural community at much greater concessions than were offered to the rest of the small business community in this State?' He conceded that that was true. In fact, over the years the rural community has been offered very generous loans at significant concessions compared with other small businesses—if we put them in the category of small businesses.

I have about 1 000 small businesses in my electorate, and those other small businesses do not enjoy the concessions which are anything up to 6 per cent or 8 per cent less on what is currently available in the commercial market. That is a very significant contribution worth millions of dollars, in terms of concessions to the rural community, that is provided by this State Government as well as by the Federal Government. We must look at this from the perspective of what we are doing and what we have done in the past. The effort put in by officers of the Department of Agriculture to assist the rural community has been significant. The support that has been offered through the Rural Counselling Service at all levels—financial, social and economic—has been significant. I believe that these initiatives have assisted the rural community, and members opposite know that. The member for Eyre knows that.

Over the years I have had discussions with the member for Eyre, and I know he appreciates that what is being done is practical and sensible. I know that the honourable member takes a more realistic approach, certainly, when I am speaking to him at a personal level about the situation. We as a Government have endeavoured to work with local members such as the member for Flinders. In my time as Minister of Agriculture, I worked closely with the members for Eyre and Flinders. We have had a very workable relationship.

We might not have always agreed on the resolution of the problem, but we certainly worked together. I know that the Minister and the Premier will be doing exactly the same

to address the issues confronting us today. Looking at those areas of financial assistance, I know that the Government has varied the generosity of the debt reconstruction loans. It has varied the loan period, the interest rates available to the rural community and the structure of those loans.

If we look at the rates that are offered—from 10 per cent through to 15 per cent—we see that they are much more attractive than what is available in the commercial market. Even the Rural Finance and Development Division of the Department of Agriculture presently offers commercial rates to rural lending through the rural lending schemes at 15.2 per cent. That is much more generous than the rates available to any of the businesses in my electorate that wish to take out a commercial loan.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member scoffs at that! I am not sure what he wants. Here we have the Party that emphasises free market forces, yet it is the Party that basically stands for social agrarianism—socialism on the farm. It promotes free trade, yet I have never seen any members of this Party vote for free trade. Every time I have brought up the proposition of deregulation, I have met with opposition. I draw the attention of members to the Potato Board and the Egg Board.

The Egg Board that operates in our community adds about 25c per dozen eggs to the cost to the consumer, that is, an enormous added cost through the administration of the Egg Board. With this Government, I endeavoured to deregulate that area, but the Opposition opposed the measure. This Party of free trade, this Party that promotes market forces, we know is a sham. Every time we get close to something that is regulated by the Liberal Party, having been established by a Liberal Government, members opposite run away from it.

It is ironic for members opposite to stand up here and try to lash this Government, demanding that market forces be instituted when, in fact, it has been done. The dollar has been floated. We have seen a large part of this exercise through the financial institutions being deregulated, and we now see the Party of free enterprise demanding that we re-regulate, that we stick in regulations, not for the community as a whole but for one sector. It is important to put that in its proper context. What other areas are involved? The fourth point of the motion is as follows:

Urges the Premier to press the Federal Government to use windfall fuel tax gains to assist those in greatest hardship.

With respect to the cost of fuel, the most recent State budget maintained the favourable treatment accorded to rural areas in terms of the State petrol franchise licence fees. The State Government will be calling on the Federal Government to investigate how any increase in tax receipts gained from rising petrol prices can be used to finance costs involved in finding new markets for our commodities and in providing compensation for some of the losses incurred by producers. So, that preferential treatment still exists. What is the Liberal Party on about? In relation to the disposal of sheep, the fifth point of the motion is as follows:

Urges the Premier to seek Federal assistance for farmers so that, as far as practicable, the disposal of surplus sheep is cost-neutral to farmers.

Where has the Liberal Party been? A program for the disposal of sheep has been in place since June, and was coordinated by local government authorities involving the Department of Agriculture and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Leader himself referred this morning to his visit and to the tragedy of having to see farmers come with their sheep to be shot or slaughtered and put in a pit. That is obviously part of the coordinated program; there is one in place. The Engineering and Water Supply

Department is involved, essentially to avoid any contamination of the underground water. There has been a humane program for the slaughter of these animals, and that is already being administered.

I cannot understand what the Opposition is driving at. Certainly, it is important to note that there is a program in place so that we do not confuse the community into thinking that there is a lack of organisation or a lack of administration—a scheme that is hit and miss and has no organisation at all. The eighth point of the motion is as follows:

Urges a moratorium until 1 January 1991 on the charge increases applying to the *Island Seaway* so that additional sheep can be transported from the hard-hit Eyre Peninsula to the Kangaroo Island abattoirs.

Again, the *Island Seaway* is subsidised by South Australian taxpayers; the Opposition knows that. In 1989-90 it was subsidised to the tune of \$5.45 million. South Australians subsidised the *Island Seaway*—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, taxpayers subsidised—I thank the Leader; no doubt he is accepting the point that we subsidise the *Island Seaway* to the tune of \$5.5 million. Where is the Opposition coming from on this issue? Obviously, it is seeing the situation through rose-coloured glasses and it wants to use this not as a serious motion but as an attempt to point-score off the Government. Finally, point nine is as follows:

Urges a reversal of decisions in the State budget which will double registration fees for primary producer vehicles under two tonnes and increase heavy commercial vehicles charges by \$600 to \$700.

We have to look at the budgetary situation confronting the Government and the community, and I do not think the Opposition is doing that. It is not even considering the circumstances; all it is saying is, 'Cut'. The Opposition should tell us where we are to make cuts, because every day in this House we hear more pleas for increased spending—if it is not the member for Bright it is the member for Hayward asking for additional services, additional roads and additional schools. We hear from the Opposition requests for billions of dollars of expenditure, yet at the same time it claims we have to cut expenditure.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Goyder and inform him that the time for the conclusion of this debate is 3.10 p.m.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): What an embarrassment this debate has been for the Government. We saw some members opposite trying to look the other way and burying their heads in newspapers when the Minister of Housing and Construction was waffling on about nothing. Their reaction was something which I had not seen previously in my time in this House. It is now fully understandable why the Premier, some time ago, had to remove the present Minister of Housing and Construction from his former portfolio of Minister of Agriculture. All we heard from him was a nice dissertation on his family background: how he had been involved in the rural community all his life, as had his father and grandfather, and I do not know how much further to go back.

An honourable member: It didn't take him long to forget.

Mr MEIER: And it did not take him long to forget. We have had that recycled many times before: the Minister telling us how he knows all about farming. He went straight back into history and, if that was not good enough, he then told us about all the good deeds done on the West Coast during the last drought. I wonder whether the Minister recognises that we are not presently in a drought; we are

far from a drought and are now in a new crisis that needs new solutions and new ideas.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As my colleague has interjected, 'Can you fit all the Minister said on a postage stamp?' Obviously, the answer would be that he did not need a postage stamp; he could have had something much smaller than that. I come back briefly to the Premier's contribution. I was very interested to hear him say that there is no dispute about there being a crisis. That is what the Premier said: 'We are not disputing that there is a crisis.' Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture made a statement, and I am sorry that he is not here today because he could have answered one or two points better than did the Minister of Housing and Construction. Yesterday the Minister said that there has been talk of a rural crisis or a rural depression. He suggested that these terms are dramatic. He went on from there. Today the Premier said that there is no question about it. I wish he had told his Minister that yesterday. The Premier cannot hide from that fact.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr MEIER: You know that even on the 7.30 Report last night the Minister would not acknowledge that there is a crisis. At least we have seen a change today, which is a step forward. The Minister called for bipartisan support, and that has been echoed by the Premier. Members heard our Leader earlier today. If this is a time for bipartisan support, the Government could have acted a week and a half to two weeks ago when the Opposition put out its five-point plan. At least our plan has five times more to offer than the Government's plan in terms of real solutions. Did I hear any cries of support? No. The only feedback was either no comment or political point scoring, and I was disgusted with the remarks from the Minister's office.

The Government well knows that the people out there have nowhere to turn; yet it continues to do nothing. We have had no input, no steps forward. The Premier suggests that we should not knock the rural sector or the economy. I remind him, as I mentioned in a debate this morning, that several months ago Senator Button and Senator Peter Walsh were knocking their own Federal Party pointing out that the country is facing a crisis situation. The same criticism is coming from within the Government's own ranks. The Labor Party should fix up its own house and allow the Opposition to start helping people, highlighting a few of the problems.

There is no doubt that we have a rural crisis and a rural depression, the likes of which we have not seen for many years. Time will tell how far back we have to go. Today we heard the Leader cite the fact that 3 000 sheep were shot and put into pits in the South-East, a tragic occurrence. Last week, 1 500 sheep were sold in the Mid North for a total of \$1. At last week's Naracoorte sales, 500 out of 3 000 sheep did not receive a bid and 2 500 sheep received between 10c and \$2. The citrus sector has also been hard hit. In one of the towns in the citrus growing area, 600 blocks are up for sale, so a real crisis is facing that area. As for rural businesses, one has only to get out there to understand what they are feeling.

My metropolitan colleagues know only too well how businesses in Adelaide and the metropolitan area as a whole are feeling, and the crisis they are facing. I question some of the figures in the Minister's statement, particularly the drop in wool income for which a figure of 25 per cent was cited. However, all the figures given to me indicate that the drop is 40 per cent or more. With the new increase, it will be more. We have had eight relatively good seasons, but there have been exceptions such as the drought on the West

Coast. One would imagine that the farming sector would have enough put aside to face a crisis for a year or two. However, because of high taxing policies, high interest rates, the high dollar and the attitude of Federal and State Governments towards the rural sector, farmers have nothing in reserve. That is why we are facing this crisis.

What was not in the package makes a list in itself. There was no call for lower interest rates, no call for a lower Australian dollar, no call for lower fuel prices. There was no suggestion of a reversal of the decision either to double the registration charges of primary producers or to make rural councils pay registration fees, which will cost something like \$10 000.

Instead, the Premier grabs another \$223 million. There are no specifics to hand to help farmers dispose of sheep. Despite what the Minister said about the disposal of sheep, there is nothing resembling cost neutral disposal and he should know that. There is no help for small business in the rural infrastructure, no new rural counsellors and no addressing of the human heartbreak problems. It is the human heartbreak problems that are coming to light more and more. I could cite a few examples and will use fictitious names. Bev contacted me and she was in tears because they have just received a wool cheque for some \$44 000. Last year it was \$76 000. That is a drop of some \$32 000.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr MEIER: We are entitled to half an hour on both sides and you know that. It meant that they were several thousand dollars in the red from the word go and they have no income. In other words, they will be devoid of any income for the coming year. John runs a grazing property and has also had a drop or negative income of some \$25 000. He cannot get a family allowance any more. There was no mention of pushing for the reinstatement of that because his property is worth more than \$300 000. He cannot get Austudy for his two sons at university, which is costing him about \$10 000, because again the property is valued at more than \$400 000. Again we heard no mention of yesterday's statement that they were seeking to amend the criteria for family allowances or for Austudy.

Bill and Jan likewise have large borrowings including a \$27 000 stock mortgage at 22 per cent interest. That stock mortgage used to pay their bills but the finance company has stopped now and they have nowhere to go with respect to paying their bills. Likewise, with the value of their property which earlier in the year was put at \$400 000: they put it on the market some months later for some \$350 000 and then dropped the price to \$255 000 but still there are no buyers. There are many situations like that—they cannot sell out.

If we look at rural assistance, we are told that borrowing limits have been increased. That is like telling the unemployed, who cannot afford to borrow, 'Guess what, your limit has been increased by a third—aren't you happy—smile!' These people cannot borrow, so what is the use of increasing the amount? If they want household support they have to be assessed and that will take a minimum of six weeks. One case took five months. They can only receive household support if they are declared non-viable and to be non-viable they have to get off the property as soon as possible. Some help! Some support! It is a totally disgraceful situation for the Minister to sell a package of borrowing more to readjust their debts.

As the Leader mentioned earlier, anonymous calls have been made because people do not want to identify themselves as people shooting their sheep. One person said that the only thing left to do was to turn the gun on himself. Young people are facing so much of the crisis as is the

community generally and we will see family farms as we know them take a steep decline, a rocket downwards if the Government does not act. The Leader asked the Premier to join us at the rural crisis meeting tomorrow at 2.30 p.m. We would welcome the Premier, as we would at least be doing something positive compared with what the Government has done—nothing in real terms. It is simply copping out and saying it has nothing to do with us because the Federal Government has not done anything either—it is not helping. The situation is growing daily in intensity. I reinforce the view that the Premier should get out of his ivory tower, as should Ministers and backbenchers, and go and see the rural scene as it really is and speak with people at the grass roots level. It is time that a change occurred—time that the Government started acting and stopped hiding behind the curtains.

The SPEAKER: Order! Time has expired.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung, the matter was withdrawn.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

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

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to that committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House today.

Motion carried.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Valuation of Land Act 1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The *Valuation of Land Act 1971* came into operation on 1 June 1972 and although it has been amended a number of times, minor amendments are now needed to take into account changing administrative requirements.

Minor amendments are proposed for definitions contained in section 5. The definitions of 'annual value' and 'capital value' have been simplified and the term 'rating or taxing authority' removed from this section and all places it appears in the Act.

Following public complaints that in certain areas of the State private sector valuers are not available, it is proposed to amend the Act to enable those land owners, or owners who can demonstrate genuine hardship, to request valuations of land from the Valuer-General. Where appropriate, the Valuer-General may recover fees for that service as set by the Minister.

The term 'valuation list' has been removed from the Act. This acknowledges that valuation information is now kept on computer and print-outs provided as required. Registered owners or their agents may view valuation information relating to their property free of charge, but members of the general public will purchase copies of the roll on conditions and at a price determined by the Minister.

This Government acknowledged that heritage buildings should be valued with their heritage status as a factor, and in 1985 amended the Valuation of Land Act accordingly. However, some buildings deemed to be of heritage value to the City of Adelaide are not included on the State Heritage List and are not covered by the provisions of section 22b. It is proposed to further amend the section to allow the Minister to prescribe such buildings as forming part of the State heritage for purposes of valuation.

Administratively the Act will be simplified. All prescribed forms will be deleted, penalties will be brought into line with current values and the Minister will be able to fix appropriate fees for services.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 4 of the principal Act, a transitional provision that was inserted in 1981 and has been exhausted.

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act, an interpretation provision. The clause deletes paragraph (b) of the definition of 'annual value' of land which provides that if the value of the land has been enhanced by trees (other than fruit trees) planted on the land or preserved on the land for shelter or ornament, the annual value must be determined as if the value of the land had not been so enhanced. A simplified definition of 'capital value' is substituted and the definition of 'rating or taxing authority' is struck out. An updated definition of 'the rating or taxing Acts' including reference to the Local Government Act 1934 is substituted.

Clause 4 amends section 11 of the principal Act to remove the reference in subsection (2) to 'rating or taxing authority'.

Clause 5 amends section 17 of the principal Act to remove references to 'rating or taxing authority' and to insert a new subsection (2) that gives the Valuer-General the power to value land or cause land to be valued, at the request of any person, if the Valuer-General is satisfied that there is no licensed valuer with the appropriate expertise available to value the land, the costs of obtaining the services of a licensed valuer to value the land would, in the circumstances of the case, result in genuine hardship or there are other special reasons why the Valuer-General should accede to the request.

Clause 6 repeals section 20 of the principal Act which requires the Valuer-General to keep a valuation list and make it available for public inspection free of charge between office hours.

Clause 7 amends section 21 of the principal Act by providing for fees for the provision of copies of the valuation roll to be those approved by the Minister instead of those prescribed by regulation and by substituting 'Minister of Water Resources' for 'Minister of Works' as a person to whom a copy of the valuation roll must be provided.

Clause 8 amends section 22b of the principal Act to require a valuing authority that values land for the purpose of levying rates, taxes or imposts to take into account, in valuing land that forms part of the State heritage, the fact that the land forms part of the State heritage but to disregard any potential use of the land that is inconsistent with its preservation as part of the State heritage. New subsection (4) makes it clear that the fact that land becomes part of the State heritage does not invalidate pre-existing valuations. New paragraph (c) of subsection (6) provides that for the purposes of the Act, land forms part of the State heritage if the land is, by virtue of the regulations, to be treated as forming part of the State heritage.

Clause 9 amends section 23 of the principal Act to provide that where particulars of a valuation under the Act are included in an account for rates, land tax or some other

impost, the account will be taken to constitute the notice of valuation required under the section to be given to the owner of land by the Valuer-General.

Clause 10 amends section 25a of the principal Act to provide for allowances that members of regional panels of licensed valuers are entitled to receive to be allowances at rates for the time being approved by the Minister instead of allowances prescribed by regulation.

Clause 11 amends section 25b of the principal Act to provide for the fee payable on an application for review of a valuation to be the appropriate fee fixed by the Minister instead of the fee prescribed by regulation.

Clause 12 amends section 25d of the principal Act to remove the reference to 'rating or taxing authority'.

Clause 13 amends section 28 of the principal Act to remove the requirement for returns under the section to be in the prescribed form. New subsection (2) specifies the matters in relation to which the Valuer-General may ask questions.

Clause 14 amends section 29 of the principal Act to remove the following requirements: that where land is compulsorily acquired under any Act the person by whom the land is so acquired must give the Valuer-General notice in writing of the acquisition within 30 days of the acquisition and that, where land is subdivided or re-subdivided, the person on whose application the subdivision or re-subdivision took place must forthwith give notice of the subdivision or re-subdivision in the prescribed form and supply to the Valuer-General such other plans or documents relating to the subdivision or re-subdivision as may be prescribed.

Clause 15 amends section 32 of the principal Act to provide that the fee for a certified copy or extract from any entry in a valuation roll will be the appropriate fee approved by the Minister instead of the fee prescribed by regulation. The amendment also inserts new subsections (3) and (4) to empower the Valuer-General to publish information as to land values in such forms as the Valuer-General thinks appropriate and make publications containing such information available for purchase at prices approved by the Minister. The Valuer-General must, at the request of the owner of land, permit the owner to inspect, free of charge, entries in the valuation roll relating to that land.

Clause 16 converts the penalty references in sections 22a (6) and 22b (5) to the equivalent divisional reference, updates maximum penalties in sections 26 (2), 27 (2) and 28 (4) from \$50 to a division 7 fine (\$2 000) and inserts a maximum penalty of a division 7 fine (\$2 000) for non-compliance with section 29 (1).

Clause 17 is a saving provision that ensures that the definitions of 'annual value' and 'capital value' inserted by this Bill do not affect the validity of determinations of annual value and capital value made by reference to the earlier definitions.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the provisions of the existing Act with respect to allotments of land to which irrigation waters may be supplied.

Within the district of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, an allotment of land that is of an area of less than .2 of a hectare, is not entitled to a supply of water for irrigation purposes. This land is provided with a domestic water supply and the land owner is charged for the supply accordingly.

In recent times, there has been a proliferation of allotments approved for residential use in the Renmark district that are each of an area of up to .4 of a hectare. As these residential allotments are larger in area than .2 of a hectare, the owners are currently entitled to a supply of water for irrigation purposes from the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

It is not desirable that owners of residential allotments should have the same rights and privileges with respect to a supply of irrigation water as those persons whose livelihood depends on such a supply.

This Bill increases the minimum area of an allotment of land to which a supply of irrigation water may be provided, to .5 of a hectare. The owners of the residential allotments will continue to be provided with a domestic water supply by the Renmark Irrigation Trust, but will lose any entitlement to a supply of irrigation water.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act which is an interpretation section. The amendment strikes out the definition of 'ratable land' and substitutes a new definition that differs from the current definition by excluding land that is, in one block, less than .5 of a hectare unless the block forms part of a single holding that exceeds .5 of a hectare. 'Single holding' is defined as any continuous area of land, or any two or more parcels of land, that are separated only by roads, track or channels, situated within the district and occupied and used by the same person as a single vineyard, orchard or garden.

Clause 4 amends section 78 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (1) and substituting a new subsection (1) dealing with the trust's entries into the trust's assessment book of an assessment set out in the form shown in the third schedule.

Clause 5 repeals section 83 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. This deals with the power of the trust to rectify the assessment book in respect of any land that has ceased to be ratable land by reason of subdivision, amendment of the principal Act, or otherwise, or on the discovery of any error or omission in the assessment book.

Clause 6 amends section 92 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2) and substituting a new subsection (2) to bring section 92 into conformity with the new definition of 'ratable land'.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WILPENA STATION TOURIST FACILITY BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to facilitate the establishment of the Wilpena Station Tourist Facility; to facilitate the establishment of an airport

near Hawker and electrical power lines to the facility and the airport; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The objectives of this Bill are very clear. They are to provide a key tourism asset for South Australia which will—

- rectify the current level of damage caused by visitors;
- cope with the number of people wanting to visit this outstanding location;
- replace the existing tourism facility and enable the regeneration of the site beside the sensitive Wilpena entrance; and
- provide accommodation, interpretive, educational and other services to meet the varying needs of a range of people who want to enjoy the Wilpena Pound and other attractive areas of the park.

There has been tourist interest in the Flinders Ranges for a very long period of time. The existing facility at Wilpena Pound dates back to 1947 and has served the needs of the growing numbers of visitors to the area for many years.

Since the early 1980s visitors to the area overloaded the capacity of the facilities and the environmental impact caused by people has been increasingly evident. In a Department of Tourism survey in 1983, 57 per cent of visitors surveyed cited poor facilities at Wilpena among the least appealing features of the Flinders Ranges region.

While the site has historically served the needs of visitors well it was not designed to cope with visitor needs into the next century. The location of the facilities at the very entrance of Wilpena Pound has created environmental problems.

The use of the Wilpena Station land as an alternative accommodation site was canvassed in the 1983 Plan of Management for the Flinders Ranges National Park. The purchase of Wilpena Station was prescribed as the highest acquisition priority in that plan.

The tourism needs of the Flinders Ranges were further investigated by a Department of Tourism study in 1985. This report studied seven regional sites and selected Wilpena Station as the preferred relocation site some 3 kilometres away from the present site near the entrance to Wilpena Pound. The report also foreshadowed a 33 kV power line to Wilpena and the upgrading of air services at Hawker to jet standard. This report was released by the Minister of Tourism in 1986 and received wide publicity.

Wilpena Station was purchased for addition to the national park in 1985. Investigations for the tourist facility site continued through 1986 and 1987 including detailed design, feasibility and infrastructure investigations by Ophix Finance Corporation. In 1987 the Government announced that approval had been given to Ophix to take the project to the environmental impact assessment stage. At the conclusion of the impact assessment and planning studies the Wilpena Station lands were added to the national park in June 1988. The EIS and accompanying statutory planning process documentation was released for public comment on 16 July 1988.

The current litigant against the project, the Australian Conservation Foundation, did not make a submission to the Environmental Impact Statement or Flinders Ranges National Park Plan of Management when it was released for public comment in July 1988.

The ACF initiated litigation before the Supreme Court in 1989 and the Full Bench found in favour of the development process. Subsequently leave was sought and granted for the ACF to appeal to the High Court. The matter remaining under dispute is the interpretation of the position of a lessee in carrying out the Government's actions through the operation of a lease granted under the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

The appeal action to the High Court had a major impact on investment interest in the Wilpena project. Confidence in the project, indeed in investment interest in South Australia, was seriously affected.

Of particular concern to the Government was advice on 23 April 1990 from solicitors acting for the ACF that three further matters in relation to the project gave rise to, in their view, legal considerations and that their clients were addressing the need to consider whether to institute further proceedings, distinct from the already initiated litigation.

The crisis in investment confidence in the Wilpena project generated by the ongoing litigation was of very serious concern to the Government. The rules had been followed by the Government, there had been detailed environmental impact assessment and protracted public consultation.

The District Council of Hawker made strong representations to the Government to move immediately to ensure the project and associated infrastructure could commence and action was urged by the local representative body of the Aboriginal community and the Port Augusta and Flinders Ranges Development Committee.

The Government's objectives in relation to the Wilpena project relate to sound management of the Flinders Ranges National Park and are—

- to provide quality visitor facilities and services and ensure the existing level of visitor damage to the park is rectified;
- to facilitate infrastructure to cope with the ever increasing numbers of visits to the turn of the century and beyond;
- to rehabilitate the existing facility site astride Wilpena Creek in the Wilpena Pound entrance area;
- to provide a range of facilities suitable for and affordable to the large range of people who wish to use and enjoy the park;
- to provide interpretive and educational opportunities about the park's natural and cultural features;
- to provide an attraction that will form a key part of the tourism assets of the State.

Associated with these objectives are important opportunities for the local Aboriginal community:

- Employment will be available during both the construction and operational phases of the resort for Aboriginal people.
- Opportunities for commercial activities including the sale of artifacts and tours have been protected by the terms of the lease.
- The Government is discussing with the local community plans for a resource and interpretive centre for the preservation, and where appropriate, the display of cultural material.

The development site was chosen, among other reasons, because of its highly modified condition. There has been widespread public discussion about the location of the site in a national park with a wide assemblage of native plants and animals. The reality is that the site was the homestead paddock of a property used for agricultural purposes for over 130 years. There is extensive erosion, infestation of rabbits and wide coverage of exotic plants.

I do not intend to repeat the contents of the project's environmental impact statement except to mention that issues such as water supply, landscape protection, sympathetic architecture, pest control and facilities layout were described in great detail and will be adhered to.

A very detailed lease for the project was signed after the statutory planning process was concluded. This lease was immediately released for public inspection, includes the prescribed scale of the resort, a development approval process, security guarantees, environmental protection measures, further water investigations, and a level of rental that will bring in an estimated \$37 million over the first 20 years of operation.

The Wilpena Station Tourist Facility Bill authorises the construction of the Wilpena project and related infrastructure. For this purpose it sets the scale of the development and an upper limit on peak numbers of visitors on any one day.

The lease area will be recognised as the Wilpena Station Development Zone within the Flinders Ranges National Park. The National Park Plan of Management in fact recognises the uses intended for the lease area and it is consistent with the Plan of Management that the lease area be recognised as a development zone.

The peak visitor level will only be reached on infrequent days of maximum usage.

The Bill also provides for authorisation by Hawker District Council for the construction of the Hawker airport and power line subject to environmental impact assessment.

While all care will be taken during construction to ensure that there is a minimum disruption to the habitat of native fauna it is inevitable that some minor disturbance may occur. The Bill provides for this circumstance.

It is unfortunate that the enabling legislation is needed at all. An investigation and public consultation process has now extended for seven years in relation to this project. The Government cannot contemplate an endless process of dispute, particularly when the park visitor impacts on the Wilpena area continue to worsen and the full properly managed potential of the tourism asset and boost to the local and State economy continues unrealised.

The Government readily acknowledges the need to sensitively manage this outstanding example of the South Australian landscape. Doing nothing is not a responsible option. The accumulating problems will get worse as ever increasing numbers visit the area.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for interpretation of terms in the Bill. The airport land will be selected by the District Council of Hawker and must be within 20 kilometres of the Hawker Post Office. The land in this area is pastoral lease land. After selection negotiations will be entered into with the lessee of the land for a sublease. If agreement cannot be reached on the terms of a sublease the land may be resumed by the Minister administering the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, and in that event compensation is payable to the lessee under section 39 of that Act. These comments apply equally to land required for the powerlines. Subclause (2) refers to different circumstances in which the use of land may be changed. A later clause of the Bill (clause 3 (3) (a)) provides that the tourist facility buildings must not exceed one storey if the establishment of the facility is to be protected by the Bill. Subclause (3) of clause 2 specifies two building designs that will be taken not to constitute more than one storey for this purpose.

Clause 3 provides for the construction, etc., of the tourist facility. Subclause (1) sets out the acts and activities in relation to the establishment of the facility. Subclause (2)

specifies the accommodation and other facilities comprising the tourist facility. Clause (2) (b) refers to incidental works such as roads. Subclause (3) restricts buildings to one storey and restricts the height above sea level at which they can be built. Subclauses (4) and (5) enable the Minister to increase the capacity of the facility if the lessee has complied with the lease. Subclauses (6) and (7) allow the Minister to vary the mix of the different forms of accommodation without exceeding the maximum allowed by subclause (4). Subclause (8) provides that a golf course must not be established in the development zone.

Clause 4 provides for the establishment of the airport. Subclause (3) provides that an environmental impact assessment must be prepared and officially recognised before the airport is established.

Clause 5 provides for the construction of the powerline to Wilpena and the airport. As mentioned in reference to the airport land, the land required for the powerlines will either be sublet from the pastoral lessees through whose leases the lines are to be constructed or resumed. If the land is resumed the lessee will be entitled to compensation in an agreed amount or an amount determined by the Land and Valuation Court if agreement cannot be reached.

Clause 6 provides for the preparation and official recognition of environmental impact assessments in relation to the airport works and the powerlines.

Clause 7 provides for the relationship of this Act to other legislation. Subclause (3) recognises the fact that some activities related to the construction of buildings, such as excavation and clearing of dead timber, will inevitably result in the destruction of or injury to small lizards and snakes.

Clause 8 provides that pastoral lands may be resumed pursuant to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989.

Clause 9 provides that no act or activity may be undertaken pursuant to the Bill in contravention of Commonwealth law.

Clause 10 underlines the fact that this Bill does not affect the exercise of rights under the lease between the Minister for Environment and Planning and Ophix Finance Corporation for the development of the tourist facility. However, if Ophix exercises rights under the lease outside the provisions of the Bill clause 7 (1) of the Bill will give no protection in relation to the exercise of those particular rights.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (MERGER OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS) BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for matters consequent upon the merger of Roseworthy Agricultural College with The University of Adelaide and the merger of the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education to form the University of South Australia; to effect the transfer of certain campuses of the College of Advanced Education to The Flinders University of South Australia and The University of Adelaide; to repeal the Roseworthy Agricultural College Act 1973, the South Australian Institute of Technology Act 1972 and the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act 1982; to amend The Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966, the Tertiary Education Act 1986 and The University of Adelaide Act 1971; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It is a companion to the Bill for an Act to establish the University of South Australia; and for other purposes. The Bill seeks to provide the necessary legislative backing for the agreements reached between the various higher education institutions in South Australia for the restructuring of the higher education sector. There are four such agreements:

- between The University of Adelaide and Roseworthy Agricultural College relating to the merger of those two institutions;
- between The University of Adelaide and the South Australian College of Advanced Education relating to the merger of the city campus of the college with the university;
- between The Flinders University of South Australia and the South Australian College of Advanced Education relating to the merger of the Sturt Campus of the college with the university; and last but by no means least
- between the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education relating to the merger of the institute with the Magill, Salisbury and Underdale Campuses of the college to form the University of South Australia.

This Bill provides for the various transfers of staff, students, assets and liabilities associated with this restructuring package. It also provides for the continuity of courses, statutes and by-laws. In addition, the Bill makes some changes to the Tertiary Education Act 1986 which are consequential upon these mergers. This Bill is very much about implementing the agreements between the institutions and does not seek to go beyond that task.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3 defines 'commencement day' as the day on which this Act comes into operation. 'Real property' is defined to mean any interest in land.

Clause 4 defines the references to the two institutions (Roseworthy and Adelaide University) the subject of this Part.

Clause 5 repeals the Roseworthy Agricultural College Act.

Clause 6 vests the whole undertaking of Roseworthy College in the University of Adelaide. The exemption from council rates given to Roseworthy under its Act is continued.

Clause 7 transfers the staff of the college to the university. The transfer has no effect on an employee's remuneration, term of office, leave rights or continuity of service.

Clause 8 entitles a college employee who is a member of the South Australian Superannuation Fund either to remain in the fund or to cease membership and preserve his or her benefits in the fund. The university is, until it enters into the necessary arrangements with the Superannuation Board, liable for the employer's component of all entitlements for which the college was liable up until the commencement day, and for that component of entitlements accruing to the employee after that day.

Clause 9 transfers college students across to the university and also requires the university to continue the courses in which they were enrolled until such time as those students duly complete the courses. Students who had completed a

course with the college, or who complete the course shortly after the commencement day, will get an award in the name of the college. All other college students who complete their courses at the university will get the appropriate award from the university, unless, in the case of a student who completes his or her course before 31 December 1995, he or she elects to take an award in the name of the college, or in the name of the university and the college. Graduates of the college are, for the purposes of The University of Adelaide Act, deemed to be graduates of the university.

Clause 10 preserves the statutes and by-laws of the college, except those that relate to the governing body of the college. The university may vary or revoke such a statute or by-law as if it had been made by the university.

Clause 11 deems references to the college in any instrument (including a will) to be a reference to the university. This deeming provision does not defeat an express 'gift over' in a will or trust deed in the event of the college ceasing to exist.

Clause 12 requires the university to meet the reporting obligations that the college would have had, had it remained in existence.

Clause 13 requires the university to use its best endeavours to implement the relevant merger agreement, to the extent that the agreement is not in conflict with the Act. Part III deals with the merger of the three campuses (Underdale, Magill and Salisbury) of the South Australian College of Advanced Education with the Institute of Technology to form the new University of South Australia.

Clause 14 provides the necessary definitions.

Clause 15 repeals the South Australian Institute of Technology Act 1972, and the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act 1982.

Clause 16 vests in the new university all the undertaking of the institute, all the property attributable to the three relevant campuses of the college and such of the personal property and other rights, interests and liabilities as are attributable to the general administration of the college. The property and liabilities attributable to general administration are to be held jointly with the two other universities, and will be divided between them by mutual agreement (or, in default of agreement, by arbitration—see clause 44).

Clause 17 effects a transfer of the staff of the institute, the staff of the three relevant college campuses (except employees engaged in general administration) and such of the general administrative staff of the college as are assigned by the Minister to the university. (The Minister must consult with all relevant institutions before making such an assignment—see clause 42).

Clause 18 provides the same superannuation provision as in Part II.

Clause 19 transfers students and courses and makes the same provision for the giving of awards to these transitional period students as are contained in Part II.

Clause 20 preserves all relevant statutes and by-laws of the institute and the college.

Clause 21 deems all references to the institute in any instrument to be references to the university.

Clause 22 similarly deems all references to the college in a will, deed of gift or trust deed, to the extent that those references relate to or benefit the three relevant campuses, to be references to the college. References to the college generally are deemed to be references to the new university. Again, this provision is subject to any express provision to the contrary in a will or trust deed.

Clause 23 requires the new university to fulfil the institutes and the college's annual reporting obligations.

Clause 24 requires the new university to use its best endeavours to implement the relevant merger agreement. Part IV provides identical arrangements for the merger of the city campus (Kintore Avenue) of the college and the University of Adelaide. Part V provides the same arrangements for the merger of the Sturt campus of the college with Flinders University. Part VI contains sundry provisions of general application.

Clause 41 exempts from stamp duty and registration fees all the vesting of property by or pursuant to this Act.

Clause 42 requires the Minister to consult with and take into account the advice of the relevant institutions before making any assignment of staff pursuant to this Act.

Clause 43 empowers the three universities to divide up jointly held property or liabilities between them.

Clause 44 provides for arbitration if uncertainty or disagreement arises as to the property that is properly attributable to any of the college campuses or to the general administration of the college, or as to the division of that property between the universities. Part VII amends the Flinders University of South Australia Act to give the Industrial Commission full jurisdiction in relation to all staff of that university. Part VIII amends the Tertiary Education Act by deleting references to the Institute of Technology, Roseworthy College and the South Australian College of Advanced Education. The new University of South Australia is included within the ambit of the Act and will nominate one member of the advisory council. Membership of the institute is reduced from 11 to 9, and the new university will nominate a panel of three for the appointment of one member.

Clause 51 reduces the institute's quorum from six to five. Part IX amends The University of Adelaide Act by giving the Industrial Commission jurisdiction in relation to the academic staff as well as the general staff.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 10 October. Page 926.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last night I indicated that I would address this matter in the order in which the Committees were conducted. However, since then we have debated the urgency motion and I wish to address a few remarks in the first instance with respect to agricultural matters. A few minutes ago I was handed an article from the *Advertiser* of 29 September 1988 when the now Minister of Housing and Construction was the Minister of Agriculture. I drew to the attention of members the comments of Jim McCarter, the *Advertiser* rural reporter, concerning the Minister's package. Headed 'Mayes package lacks substance', the article states:

The much vaunted special State Government assistance package being touted to Far West Coast farmers by the Minister of Agriculture has about as much substance as cocky chaff—the empty grain husks left when cereals are harvested.

I am sorry that I did not have that article in front of me a little earlier to highlight how this Government has no concept of what it is doing when it comes to relieving and assisting the rural sector. I had hoped to identify some of the key points in the Opposition's five point plan, but I am sure that members of the Government would be familiar with it by now.

It upset me greatly when the Minister, in one of the debates of the past 24 hours, accused the Opposition of not having any reference to rural assistance and rural reconstruction in our five point plan. Well, I pointed out to the Minister then—and I put on record now—that I am and have been fully aware of the rural assistance package. It has been around for a long time. There is nothing new in it. However, our plan identifies new features that should be tackled and achieved, and I was very disappointed that the Minister had to go as low as that to say something was not in our plan when everyone knows it exists. If he wants to highlight deficiencies in that respect, there may be another five points he could mention, and certainly the Opposition's plan seeks immediate action. It will help the rural community as much as is possible in the current circumstances and it offers at least some positive hope compared to the Government's plan which, in real terms, is a 'no plan'. In fact, it can be compared to a deflated life raft being thrown overboard to help the rural sector.

It is appropriate that I have made some comments on the rural sector, because the key points I mentioned in the Agriculture Estimates Committee related to the rural crisis as at 19 September. I recall that approaches to the Minister had been made before then, but it is interesting that he has had to wait at least one month before he could put together a no plan. Many of the points I have highlighted and re-highlighted since the Estimates Committee are contained in the Minister's statement as to the extent of the rural crisis then, but we know that it has become worse and, unfortunately, I cannot see any real hope for the immediate future.

It became very clear during the Estimates Committee that the Minister has taken no further action in seeking to improve and increase the live sheep export trade from South Australia to the Middle East. Members will recall that I have mentioned that on several occasions, and the Minister has also acknowledged that. As the Minister stated during the Estimates Committee, 'There have been only relatively informal discussions between the department and the operators of the *Al Mukairish*.' Unfortunately, that is one of the problems: not having a large live sheep export trade at present which is able to get rid of well over one million sheep. One could think of how many fewer sheep would have to be slaughtered presently if that facility were still available.

The Minister looked at the concept of processing mutton and, during the Estimates Committee, he indicated that he felt it would be too expensive, but he was quoting figures of \$6 to \$8 per lamb for processing such meat. I was pleased to read in his statement yesterday that he has looked at another option, but we cannot keep looking at options; we must take action—otherwise the sheep will have been shot and the damage will have been done. Further, the rural people, let alone their businesses, will have suffered. One thing that the Minister made clear in the Estimates Committee was that the South Australian Government would not support any direct subsidies to farmers to slaughter sheep, yet today the Minister of Housing and Construction, the former Minister of Agriculture, said that the Government had already been providing subsidies, so again it is a clear indication that the Government does not really know what is happening—its right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. It is at complete odds. Probably the Government would not know that the rural sector exists beyond Gepps Cross.

I will pay one compliment to the Minister of Agriculture. He gave a commitment before the Estimates Committee to answer as many questions as we were able to put to him. I was very pleased with the brevity and directness of his

answers, and we got through many questions. The worst thing was that we had only about 2½ hours to ask questions and obviously we were not able to get through them all. Nevertheless, in the time available, we got through many questions and more have been taken on notice since then. In that respect, it was a very profitable exercise.

I was also involved in the Department of Fisheries Estimates Committee in my position as shadow Minister of Fisheries. The fisheries portfolio continues to be a can of worms in many respects. The key thing that came out of the Fisheries Estimates Committee related to property rights for fishermen. The disappointing feature is that that issue of property rights was current one year earlier. In fact, my colleague the member for Alexandra asked questions about the property rights of fishermen in last year's Estimates Committee and the Minister then acknowledged it was a complex issue and was still being looked at.

I started off the questioning by asking whether or not the Government would recognise property rights of fishermen, and imagine my amazement when the Minister again said that it was still a complex issue, and that they appear to be no closer to resolving the problem. He then put forward a few ideas as to what could happen. There have been a couple of court cases associated with the recognition of property rights. The Minister said that one option would be to appeal to the court against a particular decision. However, I remind the House that that decision was handed down in the High Court. Therefore, to the best of my knowledge, it is very difficult if not impossible to appeal against something that has already been taken to the highest authority. In further questioning I asked whether the Government was going to appeal, and the Minister said, 'We can't, but we may support a third party that wished to appeal.' I followed that up further by asking, 'Do you have any such party in mind?' The Minister indicated that he did not. So, we could be here next year and the year after for time immemorial if we wait for a party to take a property rights appeal to a court.

The Minister also mentioned this year and last year that he might seek to introduce legislation into this House to vary the conditions and see that property rights either were or were not accepted. Given that the Minister said it last year and again this year, how much longer do we have to wait for the Government to decide to prepare legislation on such an important issue that is affecting so many fishermen, from the very small-scale fishermen through to the very large-scale fishermen? The Government does not know where it is with respect to property rights because the Commissioner of Stamps has stepped in and said, 'Seeing the court cases have acknowledged that there are property rights, you, the fishermen, therefore, are liable to pay stamp duty.' For many fishermen stamp duty can range from a few hundred dollars for small-scale fisherman through to about \$100 000 in the case of a very large-scale fisherman. Obviously, this whole situation needs to be sorted out and resolved. I plead with the Government to get down and do something about it, not to just leave it lie around and not to let people have letters sent to them from the Commissioner of Stamps saying that they probably will be liable for many thousands of dollars and wondering whether or not they should pay such a figure.

Another matter which arose during the Estimates Committees was the use of boats with dual registration, that is, registration for commercial use and registration for recreational use. Up until recently, it was quite acceptable for one to place a bag over the registration number of a commercially registered boat and use it for a recreational purpose. However, the legislation has now been changed and it is no

longer possible for a boat to have dual registration. If one wants to use a commercial boat for recreational purposes, it must be de-registered and then re-registered. I thought I must have made a mistake in my reading of the current regulations, but I was informed by the Director of Fisheries, Mr Rob Lewis, that there was no mistake: boats can be used for only one purpose or the other, they cannot be used for both.

Here, again, the Government is placing an unnecessary impost on the small operators in the fishing sector. Those operators, who perhaps have a 17 ft-plus boat—a boat that is ideal for recreational fisherman as well as marine-scale fisherman—cannot use that boat any more to take their families or a friend out for recreational purposes. I believe it is a very distressing and retrograde step and I certainly will be taking this issue further to see where commonsense has gone and why the changes were made. Again, I give the Minister credit for seeking to answer as many questions as possible in the very limited time available for the subject of fisheries.

During the third Committee, the Department of Marine and Harbors, I quoted on several occasions from various documents that had come into my possession—one of them being the future directives of the Department of Marine and Harbors, and another in relation to voluntary separation packages. I was not happy with the degree of consultation that occurred. The Minister put forward his explanation in respect of the current situation. As the questioning commenced I received the distinct impression that it was a package that certainly was up and running and being offered to employees. However, as the questioning proceeded, the Minister seemed to indicate more and more that it was not a package in its full extent but that it was still open to more negotiation and consultation. I suppose I will never know whether or not full consultation occurs. However, I suppose a positive thing that came out of it is that at least the Minister gave an assurance that there will be more consultation and that there will be further discussions with employees. I think it is only right and fair to have maximum consultation with those people who will be hit hardest. Many employees have contacted me expressing great concern as to what the package could mean to them; and they have also expressed the desire to have more input.

On one occasion I specifically asked whether shop stewards had been involved in the preparation of the package and I was given to understand that the answer was 'Yes'. However, the shop stewards with whom I have spoken told me that they have not been involved. I have spoken to more shop stewards since and that definitely is the case. However, thankfully, more consultation will occur. I am grateful to the Estimates Committees for giving me the opportunity to highlight this problem in considerable detail and to point out that, so far as I could see and so far as the employees could see, the restructuring of the Department of Marine and Harbors is proceeding in a way that is causing great concern in more ways than one.

I thank the Minister also for his approach in answering questions. I do not believe he sought to drag out answers at all; we got through as much as we possibly could. I think it is interesting that we had more time for the Department of Marine and Harbors than the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries, but I will let other people assess whether or not that is the relative scale of the economic scene.

It disturbs me that, from some of the answers to the questions taken on notice, it appears that little money is going to the ports that need it. In relation to the Port of Thevenard (and the member for Eyre highlighted this a

little earlier), no money has been set aside for the dredging of the channel. I do not have the answer in front of me, but this year repairs to the jetty will be minimal. Likewise, there will be no upgrading of the Port Pirie jetty this year; nor any dredging of the channel. They are two key ports to this State. The asbestos infected cladding on the gantry at Port Giles will be replaced in two stages.

I hope that that will occur with a minimum of fuss. Again, I was not terribly impressed with the Minister's answer when I asked whether the jetty would be open over the long weekend. His answer was, 'I have no idea whether the jetty will be open during the October long weekend.' In due course I contacted his department, and was advised that it would be open. If the Minister had anything to do with that, I thank him for allowing that.

In conclusion, I felt that all three Ministers endeavoured to answer questions to the best of their ability. The Estimates Committees were definitely of use. I would have liked to raise many other points.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I rise to debate the motion with a feeling of great burden. I believe that the sight we witnessed in this Chamber today is a sad and sorry comment on this Government. We saw a Premier who rose to his feet and wrung his hands histrionically, bleating, 'It's everybody's fault but ours,' when our farmers and small business and pensioners are bleeding. Apparently, it is the fault of the EEC and Saddam Hussein, and it is little wonder that the Premier did not trot out the Ayatollah Khomeini and Idi Amin! They might both be dead, but there are those in South Australia who believe that this Premier has never been one to let the truth get in the way of his rhetoric.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the honourable member is reflecting upon the Premier in a way that I feel the Standing Orders never envisaged.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that Standing Orders operate to prevent that form of words. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: As I said, it is everyone's fault but the Premier's, his Government's or his Federal counterparts'. I believe that South Australia has the right to expect more of its Premiers, even if they are in their last hurrahs. They can expect a little more flair, a little more light and a lot more responsibility in leadership than is displayed by the gentleman who currently sits on the opposite bench.

Previously in this House I have highlighted the similarities between this Premier and historical characters such as Marie Antoinette. She kept a model dairy at Versailles: he keeps bees at Prospect. They are both interested in idealised agrarian pursuits. When Marie Antoinette's subjects had no bread, she wanted them fed cake. Today it has been amply demonstrated that when the people for whom the Premier is responsible in the city can no longer afford to house themselves, when the small businesses are closing down and when the farmers are driven off their properties, the Premier is quite prepared to do nothing except build an entertainment centre. The bread and circuses mentality of this Government defies belief.

The one difference that I believe exists between the Premier and Marie Antoinette is that, after she lost her head, she kept quiet. The great tragedy of this Government is that, where the Premier leads, the flock opposite are eager to follow. I could respond to the comments made this morning by the member for Napier in answer to a quite serious motion I put before the House, but I learned a long time ago that silence is sometimes the most eloquent response

to the sorts of comments he made. It can be a more effective weapon than all the tub thumping invective of those opposite. I, for one, do not mind whispering what I have to say: truth is a great filter, and if I whisper it might go further on the wings of time than some of the postulating and fulminating of those opposite who sing a song of sound and fury signifying nothing.

I acknowledge the brave and bold step the Tonkin Government took towards open government and accountable administration in developing the process of the Estimates Committees. I believe that those Committees continue to make a most important contribution towards the democratic processes of this State. That is not to say that I believe they are entirely without criticism and cannot be improved.

To that end, I suggest that, while I understand that the Estimates Committees are not, in fact, select committees, on the advice of senior and learned members in this Chamber I believe that they could be treated as such. I suggest that such a procedure should be adopted for next year, since Standing Order 335 provides:

Whenever necessary, the House may give a committee power to send for persons, papers and records.

I suggest this because I think that an important adjunct to the Estimates Committees could be the Auditor-General's being asked to attend before this House. The Auditor-General, quite clearly, is an officer of this Parliament and works closely with this Parliament through the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr Ferguson: He is employed by the Parliament.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you: that is the point that I made. He is an officer of the Parliament. In relation to the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee—which I totally support—I understand that the minutes cannot be made public, nor can people attend hearings, and the only real access the Parliament itself has to the work of that committee is through its reports. Again, I am not denigrating that: all I am saying is that it would be a very useful adjunct to the work of this Parliament if, as part of the Estimates Committees and separate from the valuable work he already does with the Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor-General could attend this Chamber and be questioned by both sides of this House about this report.

There is much interesting and useful information in that report. It gets to the basis of the accountability of this Government in a financial sense. All members of this House who have read that report will know that it contains a great deal of detailed information and a great deal of information which, since it must be brief, is somewhat difficult to comprehend fully. If the Auditor-General attended the Estimates Committees for a day or two, it would be possible for members of this House to ask questions of him to examine various aspects of his report and so come to a position by which we had more open government—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member opposite says that that is done in the Public Accounts Committee. I wish that the honourable member opposite would bother to listen to all that I have said. I do not mind his interjections—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order and the honourable member will not refer to them.

Mr BRINDAL: I shall forget that the gentleman exists. I reiterate the point that I was trying to make: while the Auditor-General works well with the Public Accounts Committee the Parliament itself never gets to examine the Auditor-General and talk about his work. I believe that Parliament has an overriding right over all its committees and structures. Parliament is sovereign, and all its committees are subservient. Therefore, if the Parliament should

choose to examine one of its officers, it should have the right to do so.

Mr Ferguson: Parliament has the right to do so.

Mr BRINDAL: And that right should be exercised.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: I will refer now to some of my criticisms about the process of the Estimates Committees. Unfortunately, my criticisms relate to the obviously different approaches with which some Ministers of the Crown treat the serious business of accountability to this House. I have mentioned this previously—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park's repeated interjections are not orderly or helpful.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will not argue with the Chair in relation to interjections. He has repeatedly interjected during the course of this debate, and the Chair cautions him not to continue.

Mr BRINDAL: In a spirit of constructive criticism I was dismayed not at the approach taken by the Ministers but at what I can only believe must be the somewhat differing quality of many of the senior public servants. In the replies I received, both in the Committee and in subsequent written replies, the degree of difference between various departments and various public officers was remarkable. I would hope that, as the years and my experience in this place progress, I can look forward to seeing a situation in which all public servants are of an equally high standard so that we do not have to comment that some are perhaps less assiduous in answers to these Committees than are others.

I will refer in some detail to the Estimates Committee which examined the lines of the Minister of Education (Hon. Greg Crafter). I believe that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, were the Chairman of this Committee. One incident greatly worried me. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr S.J. Baker, quite rightly inquired of the Minister whether certain materials had been distributed by the Director-General as the head of the department. I believe that the question he asked was germane to the Estimates Committees, because the head of the department is, after all, the permanent head and the senior employed public servant of that department.

The record shows that Mr S.J. Baker cited quite a lot of an article which appeared in a journal. The article was entitled 'Bureaucratic Reform by Cultural Revolution' and was written by John Patterson. Only one of the passages that Mr Baker cited is worth repeating, in view of the time, and it is as follows:

Management knows that a Minister can become vulnerable if unsatisfactory aspects of performance come to light. All but the most alert Ministers are effectively co-opted into the 'tell 'em nothing' strategy which comes easily to the official. Once a Minister has agreed to the first cover up, the Minister becomes a hostage to the organisation, and a potentially destabilising influence is neutralised. The Minister is dragged into service as a further prop.

The Minister refused to let his Director-General answer that question, claiming that it had nothing to do with the Estimates Committee. However, I contend that it has very much to do with the work of democracy, the Minister's responsibility and the work of this Parliament. I acknowledge that the head of any department, in servicing his staff, can and should give them a range of opinion. However, I doubt whether the Director-General distributed *Das Kapital* or the little red book of Mao Zedong. So, I think there is an argument that relevance must be part of an in-service process and, therefore, I believe the question was significant and

deserved an answer. But, three times the Minister refused to answer it.

On other matters I can and must express a degree of disappointment. The Chair of that Committee clearly instructed the Minister that answers in writing were to be incorporated in *Hansard* by a due date, and that date was clearly stated. There was an undertaking by the Deputy Premier that answers would be incorporated by the due. However, I received no answers from the Minister of Education until a week after the date by which he undertook to insert those answers in *Hansard*, and I am still waiting for answers to a significant number of questions.

I understand the problems faced by Ministers in terms of collating detailed information. However, I must contrast the number of answers and the quality of answers I have received from the education portfolio with those that I have received from other Ministers, and the comparison does not reflect well on officers of the Minister of Education or on the Minister's fulfilling of his duty as instructed by the Chair of this House.

Yesterday I was dismayed because the Minister had cause to correct one of the answers that he had inserted; in other words, some of the answers that he had supplied already were inaccurate. Now it is to his credit that he brought in the new answer and chose to make the correction himself, but it leads us to wonder about the quality of a department which cannot get its answers right and which therefore inadvertently leads its Minister into not providing accurate and cogent information to this House.

I also refer to the Minister's answers, which were supplied to me in writing, to questions about country positions and about how much was being spent on incentives for teachers, especially principals, to go to country schools. The Minister replied that in the western area \$25 000 was spent last year to encourage positive advertising and the particular attraction of significant country locations. I applaud that, but, I further asked the Minister how many vacancies occurred last year and how many jobs at a senior level in country schools had to be readvertised. Again, to his credit, the Minister supplied the answer to that question, that is, that eight principal's jobs in the western area had to be readvertised not once but more than once, and that was despite \$25 000 being spent by the same area to attract people to it.

That is a worry to me, and it must lead all members in this House to ask whether positions which have to be readvertised are attracting to them the same quality of applicant as are equivalent positions in the city and, if they are not, all members of this House must view the matter very seriously. I believe that, no matter where a child is educated in this State, they cannot only expect but can indeed demand the same level of education. As this Government is responsible not only to those who elected it in the city but also to those who elected it in the country, this is a matter which all members of the House should view with great seriousness and which is closely aligned to the rural crisis outlined so cogently by members on this side of the House today.

In the brief time I have left I point to such things as class sizes. The Minister, in answer to a question, said that class size data is now collected on an average format. That appals me because, if we are to have an efficient and viable teaching service and if we are to get the best money for education in our schools, we now do not know the size of the classes; and that we are merely being given collected data in an average format must dismay us all. When the format is averaged, it means that principals and deputies who have non-teaching loads are counted in that format and the actual class size is often much larger than appears. I cannot see

how any organisation can be run efficiently and effectively when the Minister says repeatedly in answer to questions that he does not have that information, that that information would take too long to obtain or that the information is too hard or too expensive to collect.

The questions that we asked were sensible, and any manager of a business—and education is a business—would have the responsibility of knowing the answers. Yet, the Minister cannot supply those answers because his department does not bother to collect the necessary information.

I refer briefly to the social justice strategy which, we are told repeatedly, is at the heart of education but which is as mysterious as the veil of the ancient temple in Jerusalem—nobody can penetrate it, nobody goes behind it and everybody is told that therein there is some holy covenant.

In answer to a question from me about social justice and the Country Areas Program, the Minister said that 'the responsibility for the administration of the program rests with the State education systems'. One has only to read the Schools Commission guidelines, or the Department of Employment, Education and Training guidelines, as they are now known, as I do every year, to know that is wrong. The administration of the Country Areas Program rests with the State committee, because it is not the Minister's program. It is an intersystemic program shared between independent and Government schools in isolated locations. Yet the Minister supplied me with an answer, presumably through his departmental officers, which was wrong.

To what extent does this House have to accept wrong answers from Ministers who are being poorly served by departmental officers? There is a crisis in education. Anyone who knows anything about education in this State will agree to that. There is a lack of confidence among teachers, there is a lack of morale and there is disappointment among many parents in this State about the education system. It is a fine system and it deserves better.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): After having positively discouraged my colleagues on this side from participating in the debate in order to expedite the business of the House, I must nevertheless, regrettably, take up one or two minutes only of the House's time to refute some of the nonsense from the honourable member opposite regarding Estimates Committees. It is quite obvious that the honourable member opposite does not understand the Committees. He thinks that they are a form of select committee of the House, and they are not. They are a system that was introduced by Premier Tonkin in 1980 or 1981 to replace—

Mr Hamilton: It was 1980.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I am told by the member for Albert Park that it was 1980. They were introduced by Premier Tonkin to replace the system whereby a Committee of the whole House examined the estimates. I refer the honourable member not to the Standing Order to which he referred but to Standing Order 266, 'Estimates and Appropriation Bill: Committee Rules'.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe I have been misrepresented. Do I claim that now?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If an honourable member does not take a point of order specifically, he claims that right when the speech is concluded.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise, Sir.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Standing Order 266 provides that 'In a Committee of the whole House, the following special rules apply', because it is a Committee of the whole House that has been replaced by the Estimates Committees.

I give credit where credit is due to Premier Tonkin and the member for Hanson, who had a hand in this in 1980, because the system of Estimates Committees is a vast improvement on the system we had before.

Over a two-week period, a Committee of the whole House examined the estimates, calling one Minister after another to respond to questions. Only the 10 Ministers of this House were questioned. The three of the 13 Ministers who were members of another House were not interrogated by members of this House. Furthermore, even some of the 10 Ministers of this House were not interrogated. Over that two-week period, questions started with the Premier, and moved on through the Deputy Premier and other Ministers. If at the expiry of the two weeks we had got through only six or seven Ministers, the other three or four sets of portfolios were completely unexamined.

One of the great improvements is that we are able to examine the budgetary matters under the portfolios of all Ministers, not just some of them. Secondly, by splitting the Estimates Committee into two—Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B—involving seven members of this House in one Committee and seven members in the other, we are able to ask twice the number of questions as had been the case previously. If the honourable member opposite has some constructive suggestions to make, they will be welcomed and listened to, but he should get his facts straight as to how the Estimates Committees came into being.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Mr Speaker, I claim to have been misrepresented by the member for Walsh.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will have the right to respond and make a personal explanation at the end of the debate. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I was disappointed at the performance of the budget Estimates Committees, although this was the first occasion on which I did not have a total commitment, as I have in the past when representing the Party on various Committees. It was the first time since 1982 that I was not a member of the Committee that examined the health lines. I am disappointed, because I campaigned very strongly when my Party was in government to establish the Estimates Committees based on the Senate budget Estimates Committees format, but the whole idea was to provide members of this House with the opportunity to obtain as much information as possible.

I remember in those first few Committee sessions, particularly when my Party was in government, that we on the Government side did not ask many questions, we left the way open for the Opposition to ask as many questions as possible and to find out as much as it could. The request from within our own Party to our own Ministers was to provide the information so that we would have a well-informed Opposition. A well-informed Opposition makes for a well-informed Parliament and a better Government.

I get the impression that the system has turned into a cat and mouse game. In 1983, some of my colleagues took the opportunity to debate certain lines, rather than seek information. In some respects, they tended to get away from the real issue of the budget estimates. It made it difficult, and it was also made difficult by Government members asking Dorothy Dix questions. It is evident that that goes on. There is much toing-and-froing between Government advisers, press secretaries and Government members in the provision of questions, to which the Ministers give very long answers.

Yesterday the member for Napier stood up in this House and berated some Opposition members for the questions

they asked, but he does not understand the system that operates in the Liberal Party. We have a shadow Cabinet system and it is up to the shadow Ministers to prepare the questions in consultation with the committee of members that helps that shadow Minister. The questions are allocated to each member, and they are asked in rotation. I believe that the system is similar to that which operated when the Government was in opposition. It is a team effort by members of the Opposition in asking those questions. I have spent many hours preparing anything up to 120 questions for a shadow portfolio and dividing them between the two other colleagues who were to assist me on that occasion. Everyone wants to ask the question that gets the headline, but in Opposition that opportunity does not always present itself, because the Government works hard to stifle media attention.

From the Opposition's point of view, it is felt that we did extremely well under the circumstances, so it was successful in many respects, although we have been criticised by the member for Napier. He was the worst Minister to answer questions. He was an absolute pest, if I can use that expression, because he would waffle on, doing anything not to give a direct answer. He would go right around the circumference of the issue before slipping in the answer. He made it very difficult. It is no wonder, when acting as Chairman, that he understood the fudging. That is part and parcel of the game. Of course, there is a skill in asking the right question to get the right answers from the public servants.

No member has put more questions on notice than I have to test the validity of the Public Service in this State. If the question is not framed correctly, the answer is anything but what one wants. The Public Service itself is partly responsible for this cat and mouse game. It is *Yes, Minister* all over again; it is a classic *Yes, Minister* exercise. We need to look at the performance of the budget Estimates Committees, and there should be some improvement. As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I suggested that that committee's staff should be available to Parliament to provide back-up research. Premier Tonkin did not like that idea at all. He was not too happy with the idea of having four members. The Parliamentary Library is supposed to help.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That's because you were Chairman.

Mr BECKER: The member for Chaffey says that it was because I was Chairman. I took on that job without fear or favour and, by hell, I paid for it. I did it without fear or favour and I have been paying for it ever since. I believe that we saved the taxpayers a lot of money in those days. When the budget was brought down in this House on 23 August, I weighed myself, and I weighed 105 kilograms; today I am 95 kilograms. I have dropped 10 kilograms. I have trimmed the fat and it is a pity that the Premier did not trim the fat for the taxpayers of South Australia. We heard today of the crisis in the rural industry.

The point is that the taxpayers of South Australia are hurting, too. When one realises that taxes will increase by an average of 18 per cent, is it any wonder that the people of South Australia are really feeling the pinch? It is a pity that the State Government has not heeded the Federal Government's warning that the States must reduce their expenditure and cut costs. It is all about trimming the fat, which makes for a far healthier Government and a far healthier nation. When the Government takes out of circulation such large sums of moneys, irrespective of the percentage per head of population in this State, it is taking away the spending power, incentive and opportunity for the

people. That has always been a recipe for disaster—a fore-runner to a recession as we have come to know them. I have been through many recessions or credit squeezes as a bank manager and have had to enforce the policy of the Reserve Bank which many people did not deserve. It was tough at times. I did not like doing it, nor did my colleagues in the bank.

I learned how to trim the fat and experienced some discomfort in the process. I attribute my success to a book which has been on the market for some time called *Fit for Life*. I recommend the book, written by Harvey and Marilyn Diamond and based on a fruit and vegetable dietary program. The book is available from Ingerson pharmacies, the Morphettville medical centre and most chemists for \$9.95. Yesterday, 10 October, Foundation South Australia launched a similar program. Foundation South Australia is one of the beneficiaries of the recent budget with the taxes on cigarettes and tobacco products. We are now finding that Foundation South Australia is becoming involved in areas that will be of benefit to the community. It is the second time it has undertaken a similar program, this one being called *Fruit 'n' Veg with Every Meal*. A \$300 000 program that will run for five weeks, it is supported by the Adelaide Produce Markets, which are contributing about \$30 000.

Yesterday afternoon in the *News* I read a feature article on the benefits of fruits and vegetables, written in conjunction with the firms supporting the campaign. Some days earlier the *Advertiser* ran an article by Barry Hailstone. It is such an important program and important step that at long last Foundation South Australia is starting to do something beneficial for the community and for the health of citizens. In the long term it will save the Government money through creating a healthier nation. If we can prevent illnesses which soak up millions of dollars of health revenue, we can then provide the care and attention necessary for young people. The media release on this campaign states:

Most Australians are not eating enough fruit and vegetables each day and this is contributing to their risk of developing serious illnesses such as cancer, hypertension, diabetes and heart disease, and unfortunately a large proportion of these people who are at risk are in fact unaware of it.

This is one of the main findings in recent studies conducted by the CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition in South Australia.

With this in mind Foundation South Australia has initiated a major public awareness campaign to encourage South Australians to eat more fruit and vegetables, and to show them new and interesting ways of incorporating them into family meals and snacks.

As part of the campaign, Foundation South Australia has published a new cookbook *Fruit 'n' Veg with Every Meal*.

Commending the new cookbook, Dr David Topping, Senior Principal Research Scientist at CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition and President of the Nutrition Society of Australia, said:

Diets low in fruit and vegetables have been identified as possible contributors to a wide range of diseases. These include cancers of the respiratory and digestive tract as well as reproductive organs. People with low fruit and vegetable diets are also at risk of hypertension, cardiovascular disease, diabetes and bowel disorders.

CSIRO Division of Human Nutrition Principal Research Scientist Dr Katrine Baghurst, who has conducted extensive research into the dietary patterns and intake of the Australian community, reports that her research has revealed a number of public misconceptions about fruit and vegetables. 'While most Australians know fruit and vegetables are rich in vitamins and minerals, fewer than half realise fruit and vegetables are high in fibre,' said Dr Baghurst. 'Only about half the people previously surveyed realise that fruit and vegetables can help prevent cancer, heart disease and other serious illnesses. The research has found that most adults believe they should eat one or two pieces of fruit a day, but most greatly underestimate the quantity of vegetables they should eat. Most think they need only two serves of vegetables a day. But at least four to five average serves of vegetables a day are necessary to maintain good health and at least two or three serves of fruit are desirable.'

Dr Baghurst said surveys have found most people are willing to increase their intake of fruit and vegetables. The five-week *Fruit 'n' Veg with Every Meal* campaign has been mounted by Foundation South Australia's Nutrition Advisory Group in consultation with the Adelaide Produce Markets and will involve supermarkets and greengrocers in the promotion and distribution of information leaflets and sales of fruit and vegetables. Cooking demonstrations have been scheduled for major retail outlets, and many community groups and health organisations will be conducting activities involving local communities.

The cookbook, which is priced at \$5.95, will be sold at newsagents and supermarkets Statewide. Foundation South Australia has also donated 1 000 cookbooks to Education Department school libraries so that teachers around the State will be able to use them in classroom activities.

Foundation South Australia Chairman David David said that the Foundation's Nutrition Advisory Group had been planning the campaign since last November. 'We are delighted with the way that a wide cross-section of the community including health groups, produce wholesalers and retailers have cooperated to mount this important campaign.

The message *Fruit 'n' Veg with Every Meal* applies to the whole community, and, given South Australia's abundant supply of excellent quality fruit and vegetables, there is every opportunity for South Australians to enjoy good health.'

I totally support the campaign and encourage this Parliament—including our dining room and everyone involved—to participate in the campaign for the benefit of their health and, indeed, for their own financial well-being. The Government should take a further step and encourage general fitness in the community.

As you well know, Mr Speaker, with your morning jog and exercise down on the beautiful beach at Semaphore—one of the last unspoiled, untouched areas of metropolitan Adelaide—we need to look at the programs offered by the various gymnasiums. Fitness centres have sprung up all over Australia, including South Australia. People are encouraged to pay their fee membership three to 12 months in advance. The clubs prefer them to pay 12 months in advance but there is no guarantee that the fitness centre will be in operation by halfway through the program. The Consumer Affairs Department should pay some attention to this area. Requiring people to pay so much money up front—\$500 to \$600—for a 12-month program is wrong in principle. I do not mind paying a month or perhaps two months in advance, but 12 months in advance is wrong. There should be some protection for the consumers. That money should go into a trust account and be used on a monthly basis.

Operating fitness centres in this fashion is not in the interests of the consumer and certainly defeats the whole purpose of fitness programs. They are a necessary part of good health and a necessary part of the general well-being of the community through the discipline of having to attend a clinic, whether it be at 6.30 a.m. or 10 p.m. It is part of the disciplinary program established, but we want to be assured that those participating in the programs will continue and not be subject to fly-by-night operations.

That to me was the good news of the State budget, as far as Foundation South Australia's health program is concerned. However, there is a disturbing aspect to the budget. I well remember the Government's election promises in various areas during the last State election campaign. The Government has much to answer for. During that campaign, the Premier stated that there would be record health spending. He said:

This Government has set in place a range of health policies involving major upgrading, increased services and community programs that will ensure excellence in our health care.

I was disturbed to receive the following letter from one of my constituents concerning the well-being of her son:

We are an average earning family with a mortgage to meet and the every day costs of living. In our decision of whether to have private health cover we decided if our child was to need hospi-

talisation and medical attention we felt comfortable with having Medicare to look after us.

Our child has had a most uncomfortable past four months, being diagnosed as an asthmatic needing the help of a nebulizer daily and re-occurring ear infections. The ear, nose and throat Specialist has advised us our child will require an operation to have tubes inserted into both ear canals to relieve the constant pressure built up in his ears. The Children's Hospital can see him as a public patient in January 1991, or we can satisfy our child's needs, and pay for a private hospital and private doctor, and pay the full fee.

Where is the justification of having Medicare? Why should we have a health care system available to everyone when you can't use it when you need it? I know we aren't the only parents in this situation and the feeling in your heart when you thought you were making the right decision for your family. There is a problem in this system and I am looking forward to your reply on how we are to solve this desperate situation.

I made inquiries at the Children's Hospital, because I was disturbed. Over the years I have used the Children's Hospital and have always found it to be a first class facility. However, unfortunately, in the ear, nose and throat section, there is a shortage of specialists, and a public patient must wait anything between four to five months to obtain an appointment with one of the specialist clinics. That is a terrible disappointment and additional trauma to any family, because childhood illnesses can indeed upset a family. They are not easy to diagnose and treat, and it is difficult to obtain the proper attention as quickly as possible.

We would do anything to assist our children. We do not want them to suffer but, like all our other hospitals, the Children's Hospital is now placed under financial pressure by poor Government management and poor handling by the South Australian Health Commission, so that we have children and parents waiting so long, adding to the trauma and discomfort of the disability. I understand that the Modbury Hospital has closed down its ear, nose and throat section for children, and that has placed additional pressure on the Children's Hospital. The Health Commission should have known that. It should have understood the problem and appreciated it.

We were disturbed last week, which was Asthma Week, to learn of the high incidence of asthma and breathing or respiratory problems affecting our young people. A total of 25 per cent of young people suffer from some respiratory problem in their early years. It is time that the Government tackled these problems and ensured that our children do not suffer unnecessarily.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It was not my intention initially to speak in this debate, but then I recalled that this would perhaps be the only week that I have been in Parliament when I would not have had something to say. Secondly, I did not want to disappoint my fans opposite who always hang on my every word when I speak in a debate. I thought I would have a theme today. The Labor Party has accused me of being repetitive on occasions but my theme, like a text for a sermon, is 'When things are different, they are not the same', which can be paraphrased as either the Labor Party's 'flexibility' or its 'absolute hypocrisy'. I intend to deal briefly with some fairly notable examples of the 'flexibility' of the Labor Party in recent times and historically. We all know that the Premier came to Government by being extremely flexible.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Roxby Downs must have a run, but the major thrust of that election policy was that there would be no new taxes. The Labor Party had examined the Auditor-General's Report. It had all the financial gurus—a string of them as long as your arm—to advise

it; it had the now Minister Rann and Mr Anderson (one of the minders) and the economists—there would be no taxes. They had studied the books—no taxes, no problems!

Mr Ferguson: Watch my lips!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, watch my lips. I watched his lips. The honourable member wants to watch his lips. He wants to watch those telephone connections also. I understand that he bought a new suit for his ministerial job. I hope that is right and that he has not wasted his money. I watched the Premier's lips when he tentatively stuck his nose out the back door on election night when he thought he could win, but he was back pedalling on this 'no new taxes' before he could read any more budget papers. He was asked by some sharp journalist, 'What about these "no new taxes"?' So, the Premier's flexibility was apparent from the moment he was elected. Of course, we know of the flexibility of the Labor Party in relation to its policy on uranium: some is safe, some is not safe. Roxby Downs is now a jewel in the Premier's economic crown.

Mr Such: Unsafe sex and safe uranium.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, you've got it, but some sex is safe if you do the right thing or the wrong thing, depending on how you look at it. This well-known journalist, Peter Ward, is now stating that this is the economic jewel in the Premier's crown. He voted against it and did his damndest to beat it, but he then came up with a policy: Roxby Downs uranium is safe—all the rest is unsafe. How is that for flexibility! That is the ultimate in flexibility.

Now we are noting the budget, which also is notable for its extreme flexibility. The Premier stated midway through the year that no Government charges would exceed the rate of the CPI. Well, we know there has been a whole raft of new taxes and charges, and most of them exceed the CPI, markedly so. Again, we see the flexibility of the Labor Party. It has been thrashing around with some fairly important questions which bedevil this country. It closed the mill in my electorate on the grounds that it was not economic, but it is extremely flexible when it comes to the State Clothing Corporation, which I mentioned in my last speech.

The State Clothing Corporation has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars since 1982. It made a modest profit in 1982 but thereafter has made quite alarming losses. The flexibility of the Labor Party is quite apparent when, without blinking an eyelid, it will close down enterprises in a conservative electorate such as mine, enterprises which are poorly managed by public servants, but the State Clothing Corporation goes merrily along keeping 30 women employed in a Minister's district. It would have paid us to have paid them all \$50 000 to stay home in 1982. In fact, we could have given them more than that. If \$10 million is divided by 30 women, it works out at a lot of money. My only regret is that I would not be able to buy my work shirts for \$3 at Harris Scarfe's made by the State Clothing Corporation. It cannot even sell its own goods. The Labor Party is infinitely flexible. If I was not feeling charitable I would, of course, say that it comprised a complete bunch of hypocrites: its hypocrisy knows no bounds.

In relation to the record of the Federal Government in this regard, when I represented the Barossa Valley I well recall Prime Minister Hawke saying that there would be no new wine tax. One of the first things that Government did when it came into power was to slap on a hefty wine tax. We know the flexibility of the Federal Government in relation to the privatisation debate. We know how flexible the Federal Government has had to become, much to the chagrin of members of its Left wing, who are at least consistent. I have a sneaking admiration of the Left wing of

the Labor Party, but I think its economic and other policies are hopeless. However, at least the Labor Left is comprised of fairly straightforward people; you know where you stand with them and they are consistent. So, I give them marks—albeit grudgingly—for being consistent.

Mr Such: Consistently wrong.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, they are consistently wrong, but at least they are consistent. In politics, or in any walk of life for that matter, I have always found it hard to come to grips with people who cannot be trusted. I have an enormous amount of admiration for the leading businessman of this nation, Sir Arvi Parbo. I had some dealings with him on a personal level when there was a sticky situation during the Roxby Downs negotiations. Sir Arvi Parbo was straight as a die and admitted when the fault was on his side and, as a result, we were able to come to grips with the problem. However, when Sir Arvi Parbo accuses the Prime Minister of this nation of going back on his word in relation to BHP mining at Coronation Hill, I for one do not stand back and look at Sir Arvi Parbo (who was roundly abused for his trouble by the Prime Minister) and suggest that he was telling lies to the people of Australia. Instead, I look at the Prime Minister and see another shining example of his flexibility.

Well before the election, the Prime Minister stated to BHP, 'If you satisfy these environmental criteria, you will be able to mine Coronation Hill.' BHP satisfied all the environmental criteria bar none, but, under pressure from the green lobby in the heat of the election campaign, the Prime Minister said, 'There will be no mining at Coronation Hill' and that position still remains.

I know it is ungentlemanly and unparliamentary to use the word 'liar' in this context, but I read a very interesting article (and I think I observed members of the Labor Party reading it in the library) on the good guys fighting back in business. Several leading businessmen—not the Bonds of this world and other so-called entrepreneurs—made the point that they are concerned at the reputation that Australia has now gained not only in this country but also overseas. They are concerned about what is euphemistically termed 'business ethics'. One or two of these prominent businessmen said in last week's *Bulletin* that public and commercial morality is no different from private morality. If somebody is prepared to tell lies in their private dealings and they are prepared to deceive people, then of course they will behave in precisely the same way in business.

I would have thought that the same rule applies equally to politics. I would have thought that, if people in politics are not prepared to be as good as their word, they are not worth tuppence. I see that the Archbishop of Sydney (very kindly, I thought) is taking the Prime Minister to task very gently, very nervously because we know the tirade of abuse suffered by anybody who seeks to point out some blemish or some 'flexibility' in relation to statements made by some Federal members, particularly the Prime Minister and his Treasurer. The Archbishop of Sydney took the Prime Minister to task because a written undertaking was given that overseas aid to the underprivileged would be increased in real terms. The Archbishop pointed out that, in fact, in the budget it had been decreased in real terms. So, even churchmen (many of whom I suspect basically support the Labor Party) are gently letting the Prime Minister down. However, the plain fact is that they have been misled; they have been told one thing and, in the event, members of the Labor Party have quite cheerfully broken their word.

It is no wonder that, during my political career, which is now quite long, the public appreciation and the public view

of politicians is rock bottom. We are down there with used car salesmen.

Mr Hamilton: Speak for yourself.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would have thought that Hollywood—sorry, the member opposite—would be one of those who contributed to this. Certainly the esteem with which he is held in this House is nothing that I would write home about. When political leaders are prepared to mislead the public as frequently as the present Administrations have done, I am not surprised that the public are completely and entirely cynical about the leaders of this country.

I would like to refer briefly to the gyrations of the 'world's greatest Treasurer'. There was a debate this afternoon where the Government was just not prepared to come to grips with the realities of the complete economic mess into which this country has been led by the world's greatest Treasurer. The fact is that the world's greatest Treasurer will not acknowledge the fact that his policies will bring ruination not only to Australia's rural sector but also its business sector. In the long haul, it is those who are economically below the average citizen who suffer most.

Under this Government, the poor get poorer and the entrepreneurs get rich. I will be very interested to see whether Bond finally finishes up in gaol. I hear that the new boss of the national securities body (or whatever it is now called) will get tough in the new year. Fellows like Bond use taxpayers' funds quite unmercifully for things such as the most lavish wedding in Australia (of course, the newspapers lap up all this stuff; they feed off this sort of extravagance). In fact, I read (and the member for Henley Beach would be interested in this) that the nation's most lavish wedding was paid for by funds siphoned off from Bond Corporation. The shareholders paid for it.

Where is the ethics in that sort of operation? This man avoids being declared bankrupt by using shareholders' funds to fight million-dollar law suits. People who have paper in America are prepared to take 60 per cent or 70 per cent of what they are owed just to keep out of the courts because they know that Bond and company will take them to court, and the resulting litigation will cost them millions.

Mr Ferguson: Tell us about John Elliott.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have no brief for Elliott. He is as hungry as the rest of them. I have no brief for Harlin, or Elliott and his bunch. Harlin took over Elders without any money and loaded it up with debt. He is in the same boat. I doubt whether he siphoned off shareholders' funds in the same way as Bond, but I do not approve of what he has done.

This interesting article talks about the good guys fighting back. I am not quite sure how we manage to keep the political leaders of this country honest. Let us just take one example of when things are different they are not the same. The Federal Government, in cahoots with the ACTU, broke the Pilots Federation on the ground that it must obey the dictates of the Arbitration Commission. It broke the Pilots Federation on the altar that it went outside the boundaries dictated by the Arbitration Commission. However, the Federal Government now gives the ACTU its blessing when it says, 'We don't like what the commission is doing. We are going to go outside the commission and pursue our claims.'

Mr Ferguson: That is your policy: enterprise bargaining.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member knows perfectly well that I am saying that a different set of rules were applied to the Pilots Federation. It suited the Government, the owners of the airlines and the ACTU to say, 'No way must it go outside the commission.' But the ground rules have now changed.

The ACTU does not like what the commission is dishing up, so it says, 'We'll go outside the commission,' and it has the blessing of the Federal Government. What absolute hypocrisy: the Government is prepared to break the Pilots Federation rules and then, when its mates and bosses tell it, 'We don't like this,' it falls supinely in line with this new view. Paul Keating on the consumption tax is a wonderful saga. Previously I had several very quotable quotes on the flexibility of Keating in relation to the consumption tax, but I ran out of time before I could read them. However, I now have a moment to cite one or two to the House today.

Keating now says that we must not have a consumption tax. Of course, he wanted option C—a consumption tax—but one night he was undercut by the Prime Minister and the ACTU behind closed doors. Next day, he was done like a dinner. This is what Keating had to say:

If we don't as a nation adopt this proposal, then you won't see significant reforms in this country in taxation for the balance of this century.

On another occasion he said:

The Australian people as a whole do not believe that the existing system is fair. They do not believe that it rewards initiative.

He said later:

Australia faces a clear choice: that it either does something about the high marginal rate impacting on average weekly earnings and finds another base in the tax system or it doesn't.

Later again:

But we must stop dealing with symptoms. The tax laws are in need of radical surgery.

Another quote reads as follows:

The list is, reform of the tax system, restoring Australia's economic health and defeating inflation.

And so it goes on—pages and pages of quotes when Keating was trying to introduce a consumption tax. Let me conclude by quoting the 6 April edition of *Business to Business*, published soon after the Federal election. It reads:

While Mr Hawke tells us that the Labor Government has been given just a 'slap on the wrist' by the voters, the fact is that the vote was less than two-tenths of a per cent above Labor's record low in 1977. Three or more years of the same Labor policies and Mr Keating's own brand of 'voodoo economics', and Australia should enjoy the same GNP as Kenya.

The electorate, in large part, was left out of the game in the policy discussions. Many knew that things weren't good and had been getting worse. But very few people in Australia (or anywhere else in the world for that matter) understand the forces of global economics and when politicians begin using terms such as 'macro-' and 'micro-economics', inflation rate adjustments, and economic pressure points, the average citizen tunes out and goes back to worrying about making the next mortgage payment.

While the election will be debated for a long time, it is an incontrovertible fact that the economic policies of the Labor Government over the past seven years have been devastating to business in this country. For the majors and multi-nationals, it has been a series of irritating bee stings; for the mid- and small-size businesses, it has been the sting of a scorpion. The voter doesn't necessarily feel the effects until the very end of the chain, when the ABC Manufacturing Company Ltd lays off 40 employees or the XYZ Decorators Pty Ltd closes its doors for good.

We are entering or have entered the banana republic zone right now. The unemployment figures do not reflect the true position. We have senior Ministers such as John Button saying that good businesses will go broke. When Ministers of that calibre are prepared to say that, we know that Australia is fast going down the gurgler.

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

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I should like to comment on some general aspects of the Estimates Committees, which I found to be a very useful part of the parliamentary process, although the system can be improved. As was indicated earlier, we should allow all shadow Ministers to participate. That seems

to be a logical extension of the process and would avoid the situation we have now whereby shadow Ministers must often sit in the gallery and try to communicate with those members actually on the Committee.

I believe in the Committee system generally in Parliament, but would like to see the system of Committees extended further. I do not believe that that will happen in any fundamental sense or be as productive as it could be until we break down the somewhat over-zealous retention of some aspects of the Party system. I believe that we would all benefit from being less tied into a hard and fast Party system. That will not happen until the major Parties free themselves somewhat from the economic groups with which they have been traditionally associated.

That will not happen overnight, but it would be desirable and we would see less nonsense, hear less petty point-scoring and see less hot air generated in this place. In relation to the Estimates Committees, I believe that we should encourage the public to come in and observe their operation much more than we do. This applies also to Parliament in a general sense. If you look at the exterior of this building, there is nothing terribly inviting to encourage people to come in, other than a small notice board.

I believe we should encourage people to come in and observe Parliament, including the Estimates Committees, in operation. I am not suggesting that we trivialise Parliament in any way, but we should encourage the public to come in and participate and encourage them, as many obviously do, to submit questions to be asked by elected members during the Estimates Committees. I do not want to go into the tourist aspect too much at this stage, but I believe that Parliament has much to offer in respect of tourism (as well as to local citizens) in encouraging people to come and view the proceedings, not only to see the Committees but to see Parliament in general in operation.

On a lighthearted note, I believe that we could establish something such as a small tea room. It could be a profitable little enterprise to offer a cup of tea or something to tourists and visitors. In fact, it could sell such things as Norm's Nibbles, Gordon's Gateaux, Peterson's Peerless Pumpkin Scones and cups of Bruce's Beaut Bonox! More seriously, I believe that there is a need to encourage the public to take part much more than has been the case.

While talking of the Estimates Committees, I believe that the chairpersons of the Committees with which I was involved (the members for Napier and Elizabeth) were very fair overall. In a partisan Parliament we will never be totally happy with the chairpersons, but I believe that they did a fair job, as did the Ministers. I like to give credit where credit is due.

I believe that the Ministers of Transport, Education and Employment and Further Education were very cooperative. I expected a little more from some of the answers but, in general terms, the Ministers were cooperative and forthcoming with their answers. In relation to some of the specifics of the Estimates Committees, some items were of concern. I do not want to repeat all the detail, but in the correctional services area the major blowout in the cost of workers compensation premiums by 600 per cent was of great concern to me.

I believe that the Estimates Committee played a very useful role in highlighting that increase. The Minister of Correctional Services has been fairly positive in the performance of his role, but it is a rather sad commentary that prisons in South Australia have been one of our few growth industries, both in terms of new buildings and in terms of the number of prisoners in our prisons. The indication from the Minister is that this trend will continue. I find that

rather disturbing. I believe that the Parliament should consider why this is happening and do something about it.

I have subsequently had answers from the Minister to some of the other specifics that were raised. The Minister of Transport was asked questions relating to the standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne rail line. He has indicated that to do the job properly would cost up to \$500 million. We should be moving towards that. I am a great believer in the rail system. It will not happen overnight—we are talking about large amounts of money—but I believe that it will be a good investment which will stand us in good stead for years to come not only for environmental reasons, which are important, but for sound economic and safety reasons. I encourage the Government to do all that it can to persuade the Federal Government to come to the party on the standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne rail line.

The Minister also indicated that consideration has been given to extending the Glenelg tramline. I believe that Adelaide has a great opportunity with its land to extend that tramway system. The Minister indicated that the preferred or most likely option is to extend it to the Adelaide Railway Station at an approximate cost of \$3 million. I regret that some years ago we ripped out our tramline system, with the exception of the Glenelg tram system. I believe that, with the latest technology, we should be moving to re-establish light rail within the metropolitan area. Again, it will not happen overnight. It will be a costly exercise, but I believe that we should be moving in that direction.

Other specific things that arose in the Estimates Committees were significant. The planting of trees along major arterial roads in the metropolitan area is essentially the responsibility of councils. I am pleased that the Department of Transport is encouraging and supporting this idea. In the Adelaide metropolitan area many arterial roads are still very bare and barren. I applaud the department and support the Minister's tree planting program, not only in Adelaide but in country areas, along major arterial roads. I believe that was a positive indication that was given to us in the Estimates Committee.

As regards graffiti—I know that the member for Albert Park has a long-standing interest in this matter—I do not believe that the Government has moved vigorously enough. I have noted that, in the past few weeks, there has been an upsurge in graffiti in the city and suburbs. I should like the Government to follow some of the leads that have been taken in Victoria which were announced recently; for example, making graffiti a specific offence and requiring people to clean off the graffiti, and reducing to 17 the age at which someone is treated as an adult. I have raised this subject before, but the Government should pursue the matter somewhat more vigorously than it has done in the past.

Moving into another area, I asked what was the total expenditure on Aboriginal people in South Australia in respect of programs. I received the answer the other day and was amazed to learn that in 1989-90, if one adds together Commonwealth and State expenditure on programs for Aboriginal people in this State, it amounts to almost \$100 million. I am not saying that the money should not be spent: what concerns me is whether Aboriginal people and the wider community are getting value for money out of that large expenditure. We have about 14 000 Aboriginal people in South Australia, so that is a lot of money to be spending. It works out at approximately \$7 000 per head on programs to assist them. I was pleased to hear the Minister, in the Estimates Committee, say that he was establishing processes to look at the effectiveness of all spending on Aboriginal people to make sure that it was

effective. I welcome that. I think that is a positive approach and, like many other things, it probably should have happened several years ago. I would point out that, as regards the expenditure on Aboriginal people via programs, the answer indicated that those figures were 'undoubtedly an underestimate of the total expenditure'. Therefore, we are looking at a figure well in excess of \$100 million.

Reference was made in the Estimates Committee to the proposed merger of some of our existing tertiary institutions to form the new third university, a development which I welcome. However, there is concern that in the legislation establishing the third university it is proposed to have an appointed council. I do not believe that is the way to go. It is not the way to establish the credibility of a university to have an inaugural council which is appointed, because I think that it tends to demean the university processes. I hope that the Government will re-think that one and that, via Parliament, we can change it.

As regards other positive things which emerged in the Estimates Committee, in response to a question that I asked about apprenticeships, it was pleasing—and this was reinforced yesterday—to note that the number of apprenticeships has increased in South Australia in recent times. It is worth applauding that development, because we should be training and giving our own people the opportunity to acquire a trade and a skill. We could go much further in that area, but that growth is most desirable and welcome.

As regards education, I concur with what was said earlier by the member for Hayward. I believe that our State education system is facing a crisis in terms of teacher morale. The problems that have been highlighted in recent times by teachers in their work-to-rule campaign are not only the reflection of monetary aspects, important as they are: they are a reflection of the frustration that teachers feel in the education system. Whilst I am not an advocate of inquiries for the sake of inquiries, I believe that we and the Government need to take a very hard look at the State education system in terms of the directions in which it is going, what is happening within that system in terms of teacher morale and other related aspects. We need to give more autonomy to school councils to manage more of their own affairs and to look after their own resources with suitable financial assistance. The whole question of State education in South Australia needs to be looked at very closely. As I indicated earlier, it is not an exaggeration to say that there is a crisis in our State school system.

I asked questions in that same Committee, as did other members, on other aspects of education. One related to specific programs for boys and what the department was doing for boys. The answers that I have been given subsequent to the Committee are, I believe, non-answers. I do not believe that the Education Department is doing a lot specifically for boys. I applaud what it is doing in the main for girls—I think that is very worth while and necessary—but the department should not overlook the widespread learning disabilities and behavioural problems that many boys have within our school system. There is no suggestion of opposing programs which assist girls or women simply because we are also seeking programs which will assist boys and adult males.

One of the concerns with the Education Department which surfaced in the Committee, and which followed from what the Auditor-General had to say earlier, related to the number of committees in that department. Something like 169—these are the ones which were identified—operate within the department. That is committees gone berserk. It was interesting that the Minister's subsequent answer indicated that he was unable to tell me too much about the commit-

tees because it was too costly to do so. I believe that, when a Minister and his department cannot put a quick handle on the committees that are operating within the department, it is an indication of the seriousness of the problem. I think that that speaks for itself.

The issue of cleaning might seem to be a rather mundane topic but, when the Auditor-General suggests that millions of dollars could be saved by improving cleaning contract procedures, I believe the department should move quickly to follow that recommendation. As a result of a question during the Estimates Committee, the Minister in reply admitted:

The current long-term estimates of such conversions could ultimately generate a cost advantage of approximately \$2 million per annum.

If that \$2 million were to be redirected into educational programs or classroom situations, one could do quite a lot with it. The worrying thing is that a lot of these concerns have been raised over many years but very little has been done. The Government and the Ministers have often been too slow to act. I look forward to the Minister in this case moving quickly to initiate savings in that area.

Another matter in which I was particularly interested during the Estimates Committees was the provision of car parking, drop-off zones and road crossings at schools. I believe that there is still a very unsatisfactory situation whereby the Education Department does not provide adequately when it constructs a school; it does not provide those facilities as other developers are required to do, and the Government should do something about that. Getting children to and from school safely and ensuring their protection at school, and the reasonable movement of parents both within and without the school in terms of transporting children should, I believe, be taken more seriously by the Education Department rather than its opting out, as has often been done in the past, and leaving local government to pick up what is often a very difficult and dangerous situation.

I do not accept as being satisfactory the answer that was given to me subsequent to the Committee hearing. I will continue to pursue the matter of safe access to and from schools as well as the adequate provision of parking areas and drop-off zones.

The Estimates Committees were an interesting and fairly intense experience. As I said earlier, I think it would be much better if we could eliminate some of the petty point-scoring and excessive partisanship which I believe often detracts from questioning not only in those Committees but also in this House on many occasions.

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

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr VENNING (Custance): As the new boy, and a rural member, the subject of my speech today will be rather obvious. I appreciated the opportunity and the experience of serving on the Estimates Committees. It was a unique experience for me to participate in members' examination of Ministers and their departmental officers. Nevertheless, the subject of my contribution today, as on many occasions during the Estimates Committees and, more particularly, in my maiden speech in this House a few months ago, is the rural crisis. All rural industries, subsequently rural businesses and communities, and ultimately the economies of

South Australia and Australia, are in trouble. Much has been said today and yesterday about the crisis, and I will try not to be too repetitious; hence, my speech will be shorter than I had planned.

Why, all of a sudden, is there a rural crisis? It is not sudden, it is just that all at once people realise the magnitude of the problem that has been brewing for 20 years. For 20-plus years the productive sector has been ignored by all Governments. The most efficient producers in the world who grow more with less—7 per cent of whom produce 60 per cent of the State's wealth—have, to say the least, been taken for granted. The end result was inevitable, and now we have arrived. Factor by factor, element by element, this sector has been brought to its knees. We all know the problems of rising costs of production; that has been a problem for years. This was always offset by buoyant commodity prices in at least some of our products at different times. However, we all knew about the time bomb that has three degrees to set it off. Rising costs, as I said, have been with us for years, and the smartest farmers in the world have been incredibly innovative in remaining viable. But, what we have most feared has happened: all commodity prices have crashed at the one time. Those two factors have set off the alarm bells, and we are reeling. All but a few will be badly affected.

But, what of factor No. 3, which has not been much discussed in this House today or yesterday—that is, drought? Today's crisis has not been brought about by seasonal conditions. Australia generally has had a run of good seasons and, dare I say it, we must be looking at a dry season soon. If this year had been dry, or if next year is dry, what would that do to this already serious crisis? I cannot bear to think. I ask members to reflect on the probability and effects of this. Minister Arnold's statement yesterday I thought, with respect, was a total non-event. Given the build-up over the week, I thought that something major was up but, alas, it was pitiful. All it deserved was page 3 coverage in this morning's *Advertiser*. I welcomed the increase to the RAB's lending rate as well as the commercial rates for loans from \$100 000 to \$150 000. But, that is piffling when one considers the total problem. I also appreciated the comments on social justice in that statement, especially as they related to rural youth and country women.

As I said, we have arrived. The situation is grave and the prospects are even worse. Members opposite say that they know and are sympathetic, but they also say that times are tough and ask what they can do about it. Why are we where we are today? It is not because of bad seasons, not because of a poor performance by producers and unproductive sectors and not because of the world economy as such. The problem is not industry based. It is purely that Australia has had bad government for years. As I said, for 20 years we have been running down our productive sector for the sake of short-term political expediency, short-term goals and quick fixes. We have had good news politicians, politicians who are renowned for their lack of courage to make hard decisions. Australia was the lucky country. It is full of resources and resourceful people, and the crisis should not have happened.

Many members in this Chamber do not realise the gravity of the problem. They think they do. However, if they were to go out into the producing areas of this State and meet the families, check their financial records and speak to their bankers, they would all be shocked. What will it be like in 12 months, especially if it is dry? We have been poorly managed for years. I am new here. I am a rural person and, more importantly, a producer. It frustrates me as a politi-

cian, to say the least, to see how inevitable and futile it all has been, and what we are doing about it.

Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture had a clear path to take. He should have called on the Federal Treasurer to immediately revise his economic strategy. Interest rates and, hence, the Australian dollar, have brought this problem to a head. Blind Freddy can see that. How can his strategy work? We cannot sell any of our products against this self-imposed handicap. Our products are nearly 25 per cent too dear for our overseas market. It is this, not our floor price, that is killing our wool sales. If we dropped the wool price by a further 100c, it would make little difference. The Australian dollar is too high, and everyone knows it. What is more, people know it will come down so buyers are waiting off. I will read from an article which quotes a friend of mine, Mr Andrew Inglis, who is President of the Grains Council, as follows:

A reduction of 3 per cent in interest rates, and a corresponding fall in the exchange rate to about \$US0.75 would:

Reduce annual repayments by about \$4 500 on an average wheat farm debt of \$151 000 . . .

I suggest that is a small debt—

Increase the value of Australia's 16-million-tonne crop by about \$260 million (by \$16.20/tonne for Australian Standard White); and

Increase the price of coarse grains, oilseeds and grain legumes by \$68 million, \$10 million and \$28 million respectively.

This would inject in excess of \$500 million into the grains industry and the Australian economy, which equates to over \$10 000 on average for each of Australia's 50 000 grain growers.

The cost imposed on grain growers of providing assistance to Australia's inefficient industries was about \$8 000 per farmer (\$400 million for the industry), despite marginal changes in levels of assistance to some secondary industries.

Mr Inglis also called on the Federal Government to offset fuel price increases by forgoing the windfall profits on petrol excise from present high oil prices.

It is time to bite the bullet before we get the bullet. I am amazed that the world's greatest Treasurer can go along this path, stopping dead our vital exports and filling us with cheap imports. I heard the statement yesterday. I acknowledge and accept the call for a bipartisan approach. The Minister could begin by reinstating the primary producer registration concession, which was removed in the budget. Will he bring it back? It is certainly not the time to play politics, and we will not do so if the Minister, the Government and the Premier as Federal President of the Labor Party are prepared to be realistic, tough and genuine in their approach.

The Federal Government's policy should be changed in many areas. There should be a substantial reduction in interest rates and the exchange rate, a faster pace of micro-economic reform in all industries, increased pressure on the United States and the European Community to cease trade war hostilities, and the provision of adequate Rural Assistance Scheme funds. The financial situation of the grain industry could be improved by about \$1 billion if the Federal Government reduced its reliance on monetary policy and applied the same level of micro-economic reforms to Australia's inefficient industries as has been applied to the rural sector.

Our Minister should call on Mr Keating and urge him to rethink his strategy urgently. He should call for a national meeting of the Agricultural Council, that is, all State Primary Industry Ministers and staff, and spearhead a change of direction. He should not shrug it off as being too hard for us. He is a capable and respected Minister. He needs to lead with pressure on Mr Keating. We all do. Farmers and all sectors of the community need to let Mr Keating know of their plight and their frustrations. Only yesterday I spoke to Mr Don Phitzner, President of the UF&S, and urged the

UF&S to consider organising some kind of demonstration in which people of all walks of life, particularly rural people, can participate and express their feelings on the matter in a passive way.

At the moment, it seems nothing is being done, except for members receiving countless calls from electors in a very anxious and frustrated state of mind. They need the opportunity to demonstrate their feelings, to express their frustrations. The UF&S will consider this at a special meeting next week. I would support any move in this direction, whether it be in Adelaide, Canberra or both. We as politicians need to be seen to be sympathetic and serious in our endeavours to assist in a bipartisan way.

We all know that the solutions are difficult. The Australian dollar must be pulled back after interest rates are lowered. We know that it will affect us all. Our standard of living must fall, but so be it. We must all suffer hardship to ensure the overall good of our country's future. A bipartisan approach is the only way, but we need strong leadership. A banana republic is the stark reality. We have heard that before. We will all pay an enormous price if this is not solved quickly. Unions will have to be more flexible and suffer with all of us. Senator Button is correct. So many good Australian enterprises are going to the wall, and the result of all this, put simply, is that we cannot compete.

We have to borrow at high interest rates. We have poor commodity prices. We have to compete against cheap imports at home. Can blind Freddy see it? Why do we allow products to be dumped in this country to compete with our own? I refer to Taiwanese jam, New Zealand cheese, South African apricots and Brazilian juice. The list goes on for ever. I ask members to contemplate the plight of the individuals involved. I can relate first-hand because I am closer than any member to the thoughts of many of these people, especially the graingrowers and woolgrowers.

I ask members to contemplate the graingrower in a few weeks time sitting in his harvester cabin—sadly nowadays usually imported—doing the most pleasurable work, that is, seeing his lovely crop pouring in the front and the grain box filling behind him. It is a great feeling. It is the activity I will miss most by being here. It is a very satisfying feeling, a feeling of achievement and success, but this year it will be a different feeling. All the work, all the good management, the good crop in the paddock will leave a sour taste. The grain is worth little over half what it was worth last year. Because we have paid our bills on borrowed money waiting for the first crop payment to come in, we all know that the costs are way up on last year.

As one stands on the machine each morning and puts in the fuel, one realises that that cost alone will be staggering. Most machines use between 20 and 30 litres an hour. I ask members to work that out at today's prices. How does that make them feel? Another problem is that many farmers will be up for a large tax bill at the end of this financial year, but many have not realised it yet. Most had a good year last year and spent up on restocking, replanting and buying new lambs, not realising that they will have a large provisional tax bill to pay late this year from this year's income.

Before closing, I raise the plight of country business: machinery retailers, stock agents and other small town businesses. Business has come to a halt. Repairing old headers is still continuing, but who is buying new ones? Dealers are stuck with expensive trade-ins and there is little interest in them. They are eating up interest every day. This interest bill, the high cost of wages and the lack of business is a most depressing situation. This depression can be identified by just walking into a rural garage workshop. There is very little activity, with no, or very few, new machines being

prepared for the crop. We need these people as much as we need our farmers, but we have already lost many of them. We need to retain those who remain. I will speak again on this issue on another day. How many of them are still operating and holding their loyal staff, I do not know. How they can continue, I again do not know.

In my maiden speech, I spoke very highly of the quality of John Shearer's design and the equipment it markets, but we all read with regret last week that John Shearer's premises are for sale. Let us hope it is only for taxation purposes or a restructuring of the business because if it is going out of business we will all be upset.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Whatever it is, it is not a good sign. I only hope that John Shearer is able to survive one way or the other. Is it any wonder real people are completely disillusioned? They are the forgotten people. These problems are coupled with the day-to-day problems of which all members are aware, including the education of rural children with schools closing and Austudy being put out of reach. Rural health services are closing or being curtailed. Country rail services are all under threat, of course, with many to be removed. Country roads are in an advanced state of disrepair, with very few new works in progress. What will all this mean? The problems will be compounded for us all. People will leave the rural areas and seek employment in the cities—in this case, Adelaide—and all these problems will be exacerbated. Country services will close and city services will be overloaded. Whatever happened to the Government's decentralisation policy? Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker, the rural industry made this country what it was. The beasts of burden have carried this country, but the horse is now lame and we must get off its back and cure its illnesses, so that it can go on making Australia great.

I apologise for the negatives of this speech, but they must be expressed. We can and must be positive about our future. I accept and reiterate the Minister's call for a bipartisan approach. It is on, if he will lead. I appreciated the Premier's acknowledgement during his speech this afternoon. He knew that the facts were putting were true. If only there was not so much politicking. If only he was more forthright in his answer to the question asked yesterday. Surely he could have reiterated his earlier answer in this crisis time.

I was most encouraged to hear Mr Lloyd O'Neil, the Federal member for Gray, speaking on the radio and taking a joint approach with Mr Neil Andrew, the member for Wakefield, on the Austudy program. What Mr O'Neil said was most encouraging, and I give him full credit for that, as it will encourage us all to set an example. Mr Keating, who has the power to change our direction, must be encouraged to take the hard decision. We must all patiently suffer the effects while we rebuild our industry and economy, returning Australia to the status it once enjoyed. Then we will all be proud to be Australians, people of the lucky country.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This evening I will refer to the conduct of the Committees as well as address a few concerns I have regarding the areas of recreation and sport and family and community services. With respect to the conduct of the Committees, several members have raised the performance of one of the chairpersons, namely the member for Napier. During the debate, I recall members lauding you, Mr Deputy Speaker, as Chairman of Committee A, and I think all members agreed that you did an excellent job. Such praise was not quite so forthcoming for the member for Napier, and some members were not very kind at all.

Indeed, on Wednesday afternoon, the Speaker had to stop one of the members and accused him of actually reflecting on the Chair because, of course, the member for Napier had been in the Chair during Estimates Committees B. Maybe we should think about how we conduct these Committees in the future. If a Committee is conducted in such a manner that the Chair incurs the displeasure of the members of that Committee at 4 p.m. or 5 p.m., for instance, the members of that Committee really have no redress at all. If they believe that the Chair is biased or pompous in his attitude, their only redress is to take on the Chairman, and the Chairman would immediately adjourn the Committee to the next day and all questioning would cease.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, is not the honourable member able to take up these matters with a substantive motion, and should he not be addressing himself to the actual motion before the Chair?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The terms of this debate are particularly wide. While it is true that the honourable member could raise such issues in a substantive motion, it is not out of order to raise those hypothetical points here. Naturally, I am sure that the member for Morphet will not transgress the Speaker's ruling of the other day and not reflect on the Chairman.

Mr FERGUSON: Just on a point of clarification, Sir—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It had better be a point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I will make it a point of order, but I do not really want to because I do respect your position—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proceed with the point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: The point of order is just how far may a member go in criticising the Chair when in fact that person did have the opportunity—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not making a point of order. There is no relationship to the Standing Orders here. The member for Morphet.

Mr OSWALD: As I was endeavouring to say, the only redress that a member has during the Committee is to bring the Committee to a halt and raise the matter in the Parliament the next morning. By doing that, questioning for the rest of the day ceases, so quite clearly that course of action is not taken because the rest of the line of questioning would be lost. There has to be some mechanism by which a protest at the performance of a chairperson can be lodged without having to lose the rest of the day's questions. I put that matter to the Standing Orders Committee for its consideration.

The members for Albert Park and Henley Beach took me to task for my speech when the Committees were set up. I do not retract from the concern I expressed at the time: that the Ministers before the Committees handed out Dorothy Dix questions. The member for Albert Park proceeded to deliver his usual abuse which we have now come to expect from him, and I might say that, by the very nature of his remarks, it is obvious that I touched a sensitive area and made some distance with him. He became very abusive and accused me, among others, of having been given Dorothy Dix questions by shadow Ministers whom I was representing on the front bench on that occasion.

Everyone knows what a Dorothy Dix question is, except apparently the members for Albert Park and Henley Beach. A Dorothy Dix question is one which is handed to a member by a Minister so that, having been asked that question, the Minister can proceed to give a considered reply, knowing in advance that the matter has been researched and he has the correct answer. Because I as a shadow Minister asked a question on behalf of another shadow Minister (who gave

me the question to ask), there is no way that the member for Albert Park could say that that was a Dorothy Dix question. It is a ridiculous allegation or imputation on the honourable member's part. It demonstrates the mentality of the man that, because he had nothing else to criticise us for, he chose that particular line of comment.

It is no secret that during the hearings of the Committees last year the then Minister of Agriculture (and I have seen departmental dockets that have been handed to us which prove it) circulated a letter from his office asking for questions to be prepared by the staff, to be handed out to the Labor members of the Committee so that they could ask questions. That is certainly Dorothy Dix questioning. Where shadow Ministers are given questions to ask on behalf of other members it not Dorothy Dix questioning. If Government members were so bereft of issues to attack us on during the Estimates Committees that they had to take on me and some of my colleagues over that matter, I would say that it is about time they shifted from the Treasury benches.

I now refer to a couple of matters that were raised during the Estimates Committees. I refer to sporting facilities. It is pretty clear that in all areas of Government in this State, whether relating to economic or social aspects, or to recreation and sport areas, the Government's whole plan has collapsed. I have never seen such an example as in the areas of recreation and sport. The Minister of Recreation and Sport was at pains to ensure that we all understood that he did not mix politics with sport. However, we saw it in the AFL negotiations. He went to Melbourne and went on radio in Melbourne. He came back here and trumped up a Treasury document, which was supposed to be anti-Port Adelaide going into the AFL. He denied it when I challenged him on air that it was a political document. In his view, it was perfectly timed to try to influence things. He then went out and made some fairly grandiose pre-election promises, which came to light during the Estimates Committees. Of course, after the elections were over, all these promises that were made before the elections have come home to roost as being absolutely fraudulent.

I will give a couple of examples. I think the best one is when the Minister of Recreation and Sport went down to a soccer game and, over the microphone, promised the new stadium. He said, 'Elect me and I will build you a stadium.' He then contacted every Greek and Italian club with the same message. Of course, after the election the sports administrators of soccer were invited to the Minister's office and told that all bets were off. Those people have been betrayed. It was put out for one particular reason, that is, to capture the ethnic vote in the seats of Norwood and Unley. It may have been effective in capturing the ethnic vote in those seats, which may have had a higher Greek and Italian population. However, I can tell the Minister, the Cabinet and this House that the Greeks and the Italians have felt betrayed over this. They have told me to my face that they have never been betrayed so much in their lives. They know the political motives behind the betrayal, and they have indicated that they will not support the Labor Party again.

I concede that the Minister has done some excellent work in the areas of recreation and sport, and, although I do not always philosophically agree with him, he has not been a bad sports Minister. The fact of the matter is that the wheel will turn on him because he has betrayed the soccer fraternity, the southern regional sporting complex people and those who are supporting it, the hockey people and partially the baseball people. It has now become apparent from the Estimates Committees that he has betrayed the Women's

Memorial Playing Fields Trust by pre-elections and allowing meetings to take place. Some 14 women's teams use those grounds. They went through the exercise with departmental officials of planning club rooms and improvements to the facilities, and I understand that since the Estimates Committees they have been told by George Beltchev, who wrote to them, once again, as with hockey, baseball, the southern region complex and the hockey grounds down at Brighton, that all bets are now off with the Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust. I am not too sure how many promises are left, but the reality is that all those bets are off.

It is of concern that organisations that are pre-planning large events are being left high and dry. It is well known that the world youth soccer championship was to be played here in 1993. We had a verbal tussle with the Minister in trying to get him to even admit that it was 1993. He said that they would be able to have their competition, that it would be run at Hindmarsh and that it would be able to be run because it would be in 1995, all plans having been put in train. We were able to convince him that, if it were to be in 1993, something would have to happen in 1991 or they would not get their competition.

Last Friday night at the soccer presentations at the Hyatt hotel, I spoke to the Australian President who made it very clear that unless something happened there in 1991 to demonstrate that those facilities would be in place, there would not be any world youth soccer championship in Adelaide. Once again, if that does not happen it will be a betrayal—a betrayal that this Government will have to live with when it sits in Opposition after the next State elections. People underestimate the sporting fraternity. They are a reasonable group, they listen and, if they are promised something, they expect it to be delivered. I hope that everyone will learn out of this debacle that we have had foisted upon us by the Government not to go out promising, pre-election, massive sporting facilities if the goods cannot be delivered.

Another area of interest was the Minister's explanation for cutting out the local facilities funding, which used to be around some years ago. I agree that if there is only a small pool of capital there will be difficulties in maintaining such schemes. However, I cannot understand why the Minister does not go to Foundation SA and talk to it about the provision of some small capital grants to help clubs. It is a scheme that I would support; it is a scheme that would be popular; and it is something that I think the Government ought to address. It is not something that can wait until the Liberal Party comes into power in three years time; it is something which should be addressed, and Foundation SA is the obvious body to which to go.

I now refer to the Government's proposal to put 800 plus video machines into the casino. Two things are happening in this State. First, there is the proliferation of TAB auditoriums. The gambling dollar is being absorbed because the TAB is out into the hotels, there are increased lottery agencies, club keno and newsagent keno. Superimposed upon it about 800 video poker machines are about to go into the Adelaide Casino. We are told that, because the casino cannot run at a profit with what it has, these additional machines must be put in there to assist with its profitability. If 800 video machines operate as expected in the community, with an expected turnover of \$250 million, although it could be argued, I suppose, that some of this will be new money, by and large most of this money will be the same gambling dollar.

We all know that we are going into hard times. However, we will see a diminishing gambling dollar. We have recognised outlets for gambling. We are having this proliferation—not by coming first to the Parliament—and I asked

the Minister at the time, 'What provision has been made to protect the racing industry?' If \$250 million comes out to prop up the Casino, and all these other proliferations of gambling, there is no protective mechanism for TAB turn-overs and money going back to the three racing codes. Very soon we will have shortages in payments to the codes, and that will affect stake money, racecourse development and so on. It is a subject that the department has not addressed, but it should be addressed as a matter of urgency.

I should like to refer to a matter in the area of family and community services, that is, the fact that it is very evident to me that the department has not geared itself up for the depression that is about to bite in this State. I took advantage of the recess to visit the community welfare offices in the Iron Triangle, and I also made inquiries elsewhere. It is patently obvious that in the budget we have just processed no money was set aside to increase the resources of those offices that will have to contend with the demand from a rural community that will be desperate for help.

That is criminal. The Port Pirie office, to use it as an example, is battling to do a good job. Three of its staff are on stress related leave, which means that the office is operating with temporary staff, as they have to keep the positions open in case the permanent employees want to come back. In other cities some offices are working with temporaries, but the department is understaffed for the work expected of it.

Offices are being closed, resources are being shuffled around, and senior staff and other workers who have been with the department for some years are burnt out, yet they are trying to keep the flag flying—it is quite intolerable. The Government should be addressing this matter. I know that the department—in fact, the whole Government—is in a state of panic over its resources at the moment. It does not know what it will do next year.

Of all the departments, the Department for Family and Community Services should not be suffering any cuts. The Government should be increasing the department's staff and shifting resources from other departments that are more affluent in order to meet the brunt of the recession that is about to bite deep into this community. The Minister argued that he has just put on 20 additional staff and said, 'That solves the problem—go away.'

I will not go away. It is all very well to put on 20 additional staff at the top end, but at the same time other staff are suffering stress related burnout, some staff are resigning and others have just had enough. Overall, there is not much change in the manning structure of the department. It needs assistance and support, but this Government does not intend doing much about it.

I remind the House that we are going from a recession into a depression. The Department for Family and Community Services is set up to help country and city people alike. Its resources are not geared for recession. If the Government does not do something about it within the next few months, it will have a disaster on its hands and will have no excuse whatsoever. It has been warned.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I am pleased to join in the debate on this motion. These were my first Estimates Committees, and they have been quite an experience. I want to refer to a piece of theatre that took place just before the Estimates Committees started and another one straight after. The first occurred in this Chamber one evening when the Secretary of the National Union of Workers arrived to sit in the Speaker's Gallery on the Opposition benches, accompanied

by the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister of Labour.

In terms of theatre, I still cannot figure out whether it was pantomime, tragedy, black comedy or just a farce—or, possibly, a combination of the former and the latter. The second part of the theatre I witnessed in relation to the Estimates Committees occurred yesterday and continued today, when each of the members opposite who stood up to speak parroted on about the same thing, repetition after repetition about economic woes, trying to tie in the Premier, as National President of the Australian Labor Party, as being the cause of all these economic woes.

They all looked like members of a graduation class from the Scales School of Deportment! I could imagine that Mr Scales wrote the script for them. It would be like an amateur theatre director saying, 'I've given everyone their lines: can they get them right without a prompt?' I do not think that they did. One thing they failed to suggest in relation to the economy of this country, one of the major reasons why we are having problems with the economy, is the entrepreneurs who have been operating over the past 16 or 17 years, aided and assisted by financial organisations and some bodgy bankers in the system.

The reason why no member opposite mentioned that is that the activities of those bankers and financial operators and entrepreneurs is the very pith and essence of Liberal Party philosophy: 'Go out and make some money; let's go out and cheat and rip off', and what demonstrates it—

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr McKEE: Thank you for that. What demonstrates that that activity is the pith and essence of the Liberal Party is the fact that one of the greatest culprits is its Federal President. John Elliott, Federal President of the Liberal Party, is responsible for removing in excess of \$2 billion from the economy of this country. Let us look at some of these people. We have the Bond Corporation—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McKEE: He was, too. The Bond Corporation was responsible for removing \$2.7 billion; and Elders IXL and Elders Resources in excess of \$2 billion. Ariadne and a few of the other people who are practising the philosophy of the Liberal Party believe that nothing can go wrong for them. Bond is quoted as saying, 'Okay, the company's gone down the tubes but my private company is fine. I'm happy: I have several million dollars. I can live on my yacht.'

There is a flow-on effect to the small business people who are caught in the buildings these so-called entrepreneurs cannot pay for, and they cannot pay for the goods and services provided by small business people. As a result, those small business people, in turn, lay off carpenters and workers all because of the manner in which the cowboy entrepreneurs have been able to operate in this country over the past 15 years.

In case some members opposite do not know how the system operated, I will tell you. Back in the late 1960s the first thing that Bond undertook was something he did not have the deposit for. He went to some financial organisations in Sydney and they gave him the money to start off. He sold the land in Perth really quickly, even subdividing it without council approval. The finance corporations charged higher interest rates than the banks, then skimmed a little more off the top to put in their own pockets. It was a nice, happy, rosy little deal between crooks. In the 1970s the banks suddenly realised that these financial corporations were making so much money out of these entrepreneurs that they ought to get in on the act. It is no good members referring to the deregulation introduced by the Federal Labor

Government being party to all of this; this has been going on for 15 years.

In the late 1970s it grew out of all proportion. When the banks decided they wanted a market share, they went out and bought finance corporations themselves. We only have to look at the Bank of Adelaide here in the early 1970s. It had the FCA as its financial arm, and the board of directors of the Bank of Adelaide comprised the cream of the establishment of this city. They were all Liberal Party members and supporters, and they all went bust through this sort of activity. But no-one on the other side of the House wants to mention that when talking about the economy of this country. They have a very selective memory.

An honourable member: All from the Adelaide Club.

Mr McKEE: They were all from the Adelaide Club, as well.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, is the honourable member allowed to refer in the manner in which he has to people who are not able to defend themselves and are not in this Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not recognise the point of order. The honourable member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE: As a further example of how these people have been roting the economy of this country, when they needed to raise, say, \$1 million for a development, they would go to one of the finance corporations or one of the merchant or trading banks and, instead of asking for \$1 million, they would inflate the price of the property to \$1.5 million to get the full \$1 million, thereby getting around whatever laws or responsibilities the banks had about lending money to people with equity in the properties they wished to develop. Can one imagine an ordinary worker with a wife and three children and with a paltry \$2 000 or \$3 000 in the bank who wants to borrow enough money to put a roof over their heads doing this? The banks would show them the door. But, that does not occur with these people. In today's *Financial Review* the following article appeared:

A Victorian Supreme Court judge criticised modern lending practices yesterday—

and listen to this—

during a hearing involving Burns Philp Trustee Co. which lent a developer \$24 million through Estate Mortgage Managers, based on—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is indulging in a no-confidence motion against the Prime Minister of this country, and I think it is inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order? The Chair is becoming more and more concerned about the frivolous nature of some of these points of order. Standing Orders are very clear on points of order, and they must relate to the Standing Orders of this House. I would ask members to at least read the Standing Orders, which do not cover the issue raised by the honourable member.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on another point of order. I draw your attention to the fact that we are noting the Estimates and that nothing the honourable member has said so far relates to that. My point of order relates to relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order raised has relevance. However, this is a very wide-ranging and loose debate. I have a list of members who have been speaking now for several days, and members from both sides of the Chamber have raised matters that I think are far more wide than the matter currently being raised. Therefore, the point of order is not taken. The honourable member for Gilles.

Mr McKEE: I can imagine how it hurts to have it exposed that the Liberal Party supports these sorts of activities by

these sorts of people. Members opposite talk about the damage that is being done to small business, yet these entrepreneurs do not pay their bills, resulting in those small businesses it represents going to the wall. The member for Custance, being a new member, spoke about rural matters, which is appropriate because of his electorate and background. As I said earlier this year, what the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister of Agriculture ought to do is drive across the Leader's property to the property next door to see Ian McLachlan because, when he was the head of the National Farmers Federation, he raised \$15 million to fight a few unions in the courts. The farmers are letting its own members, who gave that \$15 million, go down the gurgler. Why not give some of that money to the battling farmers?

There are battling farmers; we are aware of that. But, the National Farmers Federation, which supports farmers, is sitting on \$15 million and will not put its hand into its pocket to support them. What about giving farmers interest-free loans out of that \$15 million which was collected to knock off workers in the courts? I wonder what interest rate has applied to that \$15 million. I would bet that there is much more than that amount now, even if it was invested at only 10 per cent for the past two or three years. The situation is that the National Farmers Federation has \$15 million in the kitty, and its members are being forced off the land when all they need do is see Ian McLachlan and say, 'We are members of your federation. Help us out with some of the money you are sitting on in the bank.' It is a disgraceful situation, yet members opposite complain about the Labor Government! What a joke! I know that members opposite do not like hearing these sorts of things, but they are all true.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): This debate began with a speech that was notable for its degree of prolixity. Things have sharpened up as the debate has proceeded. I would like to compliment all members on the vigour with which they have approached this most important piece of legislation. I commend it to the House.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I seek leave to make an explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: In his contribution to the debate just concluded I believe the member for Walsh misheard a comment that I made, and I would like to put the record straight. The member for Walsh said that in suggesting that the Auditor-General become a more integral part of the Estimates Committees I misunderstood the processes of those Committees. I hope that his hearing was defective and not his wit, because he entirely misunderstood and misrepresented what I said. I would like to again place on the record the words that I used in the debate as recorded in *Hansard*. I said the following:

... while I understand that the Estimates Committees are not, in fact, select committees, on the advice of senior and learned members in this Chamber I believe that they could be treated as such. I suggest that such a procedure should be adopted for next year, since Standing Order 335 provides:

Whenever necessary, the House may give committee power to send for persons, papers and records.

I suggest this because I think that an important adjunct to the Estimates Committees could be the Auditor-General's being asked to attend before this House. The Auditor-General, quite clearly, is an officer of this Parliament and works closely with this Parliament through the Public Accounts Committee.

I will not delay the House by further referring to what I said, but quite clearly that is at variance with what the member for Walsh suggested I said. I did say that the Public Accounts Committee is a valuable part of the work of this Parliament, and I reiterate that; I believe that. However, I tried to make the point that I think this Parliament should be about open and effective government, and asking the Auditor-General to attend before this Parliament as part of the select committee process could be a further adjunct to open and accountable government. What I had in mind and what I thought I had made clear in the speech was that the Auditor-General, as an officer in his own right, could, under Standing Order 335, attend this House and could be examined by a select committee of both Government and Opposition members.

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. In the Long Title—Leave out 'the Environmental Protection Council Act 1972 and'.

No. 2. Page 2, line 13 (clause 3)—After 'pollutants' insert 'or quantity or quality of pollutants produced or brought into circulation'.

No. 3. Page 3, lines 26 and 27 (clause 6)—Leave out 'and, where appropriate, disposal of waste to land'.

No. 4. Page 4 (clause 9)—After line 23 insert subclause as follows:

(2) No person may be co-opted as an additional member of the Council except after publication in a newspaper circulating generally in the State of a notice seeking nominations or applications from any interested bodies or persons and after consideration by the Council and the Minister of the persons (if any) nominated or applying in the manner and within the period specified in the notice.

No. 5. Page 4, lines 27 to 41 (clause 10)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert the following subclause:

(2) The Committee consists of—

(a) the Chairman of the Council;

(b) whichever of the following members of the Council the Council appoints as a member of the Committee:

(i) the member of the Council appointed as a person with knowledge of biological conservation;

(ii) the member of the Council appointed as a person engaged at a university in teaching or research in a field related to environmental protection;

(c) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated;

(d) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry S.A. Incorporated and the South Australian Employers Federation;

(e) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy Incorporated;

(f) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Minister of Fisheries;

(g) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council Incorporated;

(h) an officer of the Public Service of the State appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Minister of Health;

(i) a person appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Local Government Association; and

(j) such other members of the Council or other persons as the Council may, from time to time, with the approval of the Minister, appoint to the Committee.

No. 6. Page 4 (clause 10)—After line 41 insert subclauses as follows:

(3) No more than one-half of the total number of members of the Committee may be persons employed in the Public Service of the State.

(4) At least one member of the Committee must be a woman and at least one a man.

(5) No person, other than a member of the Council, may be appointed to the Committee pursuant to subsection (2) (j) except after publication in a newspaper circulating generally in the State of a notice seeking nominations or applications from interested bodies or persons and after consideration by the Council and the Minister of the persons (if any) nominated or applying in the manner and within the period specified in the notice.

No. 7. Page 5, lines 8 to 10 (clause 11)—Leave out subclause (3) and insert the following clauses:

(3) A delegation pursuant to this section does not prevent the exercise by the Council of the functions or powers delegated.

(4) Where functions or powers of the Council are delegated to the Committee in accordance with a requirement of the Minister, the Council may not vary or revoke the delegation, except with the approval of the Minister, but if no such requirement has been made the Council may vary or revoke a delegation at will.

No. 8. Page 7, lines 33 and 34 (clause 20)—Leave out 'not more than one year expiring on a common day fixed by the Minister' and insert 'one year'.

No. 9. Page 7, lines 35 and 36 (clause 20)—Leave out 'from the day on which it is granted until the common day fixed by the Minister' and insert 'for the period for which it was granted'.

No. 10. Page 9, line 16 (clause 26)—Insert 'in the *Gazette* and' before 'in a newspaper'.

No. 11. Page 9, line 21 (clause 26)—Leave out 'set out'.

No. 12. Page 9, line 22 (clause 26)—Insert 'set out' before 'the name'.

No. 13. Page 9, line 23 (clause 26)—Insert 'set out' before 'the location'.

No. 14. Page 9, line 25 (clause 26)—Leave out 'and'.

No. 15. Page 9, line 26 (clause 26)—Insert 'set out' before 'such details'.

No. 16. Page 9 (clause 26)—After line 27 insert:
'and

(d) invite public comment.'

No. 17. Page 14, lines 23 to 25 (clause 32)—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert 'not contravening any conditions of the licence fixing standards in relation to the discharge, emission, depositing, production or disturbance of pollutants by the licensee'.

No. 18. Page 14 (clause 32)—After line 25 insert subclauses as follows:

(1a) A condition of the kind referred to in subsection (1) may not be imposed in respect of a licence except at the time of the grant or renewal of the licence.

(1b) The Minister may not, by a licence condition under subsection (1), require the lodgment of a bond or a pecuniary sum of an amount greater than the amount that, in the opinion of the Minister, represents the total of the likely

costs, expenses, loss and damage that might be incurred or suffered by persons as a result of the failure by the licensee to satisfy the conditions of discharge or repayment of the bond or pecuniary sum.'

No. 19. Page 14, lines 31 to 43 (clause 32)—Leave out subclauses (3) and (4) and insert subclause as follows:

(3) Where a licensee fails to satisfy the conditions of discharge or repayment of a bond or pecuniary sum lodged with the Minister, the Minister:

(a) may determine that the whole or a part of the amount of the bond or pecuniary sum is forfeited to the Marine Environment Protection Fund;

(b) may apply from the Fund any money so forfeited in payments for or towards costs, expenses, loss or damage incurred or suffered by the Crown, a public authority or other person as a result of the failure by the licensee;

(c) may, in the case of a pecuniary sum, on the expiry or termination of the licence and when satisfied that there are no valid outstanding claims in respect of costs, expenses, loss or damage incurred or suffered as a result of the failure of the licensee, repay any amount of the pecuniary sum that has not been forfeited to the Fund.'

No. 20. Schedule 2, page 21—Leave out subclause (1).

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I express one word of disappointment in terms of the way in which the Marine Environment Protection Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Environmental Protection Council, will be appointed. I believe it would have been in keeping with the whole package of environmental Bills to have had the option of three people being nominated from the organisation, of which the council chose one. However, I am not prepared to further hold up this Bill, because it is vitally important. I thank everyone for their participation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is inappropriate to have this matter before us at such a late hour, but I congratulate the other place on the changes that have been made to the Bill. I am also pleased to note the change in the mind of the Minister as to the appointment of individuals to the overseeing committee. They will not be part of the general council without the specific expertise that the Opposition demanded originally. The Opposition is disappointed that there is no date by which the Minister and the Government has to comply with the regulations relating to the removal of sludge from our gulfs, but that matter will be pursued at a later stage.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 October at 2 p.m.