

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 21 August 1991

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FINNISS SPRINGS STATION

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN**: Finnis Springs was acquired at the request of 19 Arrabunna traditional owners to protect the area as an Aboriginal site. This action was in accord with the ministerial powers under section 30 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act. The action was requested by the Arrabunna people in view of the likelihood of lands passing from Aboriginal control through a proposed public auction on 23 August 1991. In addition to the request from the 19 traditional owners, I received strong representations from the (Aboriginal) Kuyani Association, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and the Arrabunna Peoples Committee of the Aboriginal Community Affairs Panel, all seeking some sort of action that retained the Finnis Springs lands under Aboriginal control.

The Aboriginal Heritage Branch has assessed the area as having many mythological sites of significance to at least five tribal groups of Aboriginal people. The Aboriginal people were never physically dispossessed from that land and have maintained a long, continuous association with the station, since the beginnings of European settlement in the region in the late 1850s. The area is also recognised by the Geological Society, the Nature Conservation Society and The Friends of the Earth as having nature conservation significance.

The South Australian National Parks Foundation recently offered the Government \$50 000 to assist with acquisition in view of what the foundation saw as rare flora assemblages, archaeological and anthropological values and important geological formations. A spokesperson for the Arrabunna people (and a pastoral lease shareholder) approached me in May 1991 expressing concern about the proposed sale of the property and expressed interest in a joint management arrangement between the Arrabunna and the Government as a National Parks and Wildlife Act reserve.

Joint management between Governments and Aboriginal people is becoming increasingly common in Australia with the Kakadu and Uluru National Parks the better known examples. I was therefore prepared to explore the Arrabunna request of May, although a great deal of consultation was necessary within the community and it was not possible to develop a community view until late in July 1991. On 12 August 1991 Cabinet considered the matter and decided to acquire Finnis Springs for Aboriginal heritage reasons as requested by traditional owners on the understanding that a joint management approach would be developed under the framework of the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

Turning to the honourable member's question, I am sure that he will now realise the unique and difficult circumstances surrounding these lands, and to suggest that this outcome is a threat to other pastoral leaseholders is a suggestion of gross insensitivity. My trip to Finnis Springs was in fact coincidental to the above deliberations. I was

being shown the mound spring area as part of a general inspection of the far north-east. For that part of the visit I was accompanied by one of the department's Aboriginal liaison officers, who is also a Finnis Springs shareholder and traditional owner.

Following the Cabinet decision of 12 August, I formally wrote to the Finnis Springs Pastoral Company advising it of the Government's intentions. The time delay relating to resumption action the honourable member is complaining about is, in fact, the process as prescribed in the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989. As a courtesy, I also informed the auctioneers of the Government's decision. The question of compensation and the amount to be paid will be dealt with in the proper way in accordance with the Act, and I can confirm that those shareholders who wish to sell the property will be compensated.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The **SPEAKER**: Yesterday the member for Hayward rose on a matter of privilege and alleged that the Minister for Environment and Planning had misled the House. I undertook to investigate the matter and to give a ruling. Having now investigated the material the member for Hayward provided to me, and having perused the transcript of the events, I am not satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been made out, and I rule accordingly.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling for questions, I inform the House that questions otherwise directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken by the Deputy Premier; questions directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction will be taken by the Minister of Labour; and questions directed to the Minister of Emergency Services will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

PAYROLL TAX

Mr **D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is directed to the Treasurer. Is the State Treasury forecasting that unemployment in South Australia could reach 11 per cent and, if so, will the Treasurer reverse the increase to State payroll tax introduced last year, because payroll tax is a tax on jobs?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The predictions and the basis on which the State budget is formed obviously are influenced by the Federal budget. Despite the proximity of the release and finalisation of our budget to the Federal budget, obviously we are looking at those forecasts to see how they relate to our own estimates. That exercise is going on at the moment. Obviously, the outcome will be contained in the State budget when produced next week.

NATIONAL PACKAGING GUIDELINES

Mr **HAMILTON (Albert Park)**: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide information on progress made towards establishing national packaging guidelines for Australia to reduce wastage of valuable resources and to avoid the cost of landfill disposal?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As members may know, I have pushed this whole concept of having national packaging guidelines that meet community demands and to reduce the amount of natural resources we are using and, I put to this House, are wasting, through such things as packaging, and I refer particularly to excessive packaging. At the Australian and New Zealand Environment Council meeting in July this year, it was resolved that packaging guidelines that established national targets for the reduction of packaging waste through a combination of conserving raw materials, minimising waste and improving the environmental aspects of packaging production, their use and disposal, should be agreed to.

Kerbside recycling in urban areas is seen as a vital part of realising the targets, and I point out that targets have been set on a national level. Targets are set in terms of reductions to the packaging waste sent for disposal, with an eventual goal of 50kg less for every person in Australia by the end of the year 2000. That, I believe, is certainly a target worth working towards.

Progress will be monitored against the amount of packaging waste produced in 1991. Thus, the first task is to establish a database that will allow identification of waste stream contents, trends in disposal practices and progress in meeting these targets. It is essential for Government, industry and the community to work together in applying the three Rs of our environment: we must reduce the amount of resources going into packaging; we must reuse those resources where possible; and we must recycle to the total life cycle of packaging. It is vitally important that we adopt this approach.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree with the New South Wales Labor Leader, Mr Carr, that the Federal Government's decisions to accept a 10.5 per cent unemployment rate and to charge \$3.50, going up to \$5, per person in relation to Medicare are indefensible?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know whether 'to accept' such a rate is the right expression to use. The Commonwealth is predicting a 10.75 per cent unemployment rate. It is a very high rate of unemployment; it is an unacceptably high rate of unemployment. In my comments on the Federal budget, which I described, I think rightly, as a gloomy document in terms of its predictions, I said that what is most important in relation to those predictions is how long that peak unemployment is expected to remain.

If it presages a major reduction in unemployment and a massive improvement in the economy, some damage will be avoided. But if it means that there will be a larger pool of people unemployed for longer, the impact in economic and social costs and morale will be quite devastating. Things are already difficult enough as it is. I believe that the one element missing from the budget that could make quite a difference to this outlook would have been a firm declaration that real interest rates should be reduced.

I have been saying this for some weeks now. If in fact one looks at the gap between inflation and the level of interest rates, one can see why that can be said. If the Commonwealth is saying that it has now cemented in a low rate of inflation (and there is some evidence that this may be the case) and if it couples that with a prediction of very minimal growth in our economy this year and with a reduction in business investment, the only area of investment increase I think that is identified is the private housing

market, which is very good and obviously will be some help in maintaining some employment and demand, but it is not predicting an increase in the non-housing property market, and I think that that is quite appropriate. Already far too many dollars have been wasted in that area. But, in terms of productive investment in manufacturing and other businesses, that is a very gloomy outlook indeed. If those are the predictions, I cannot see why the Treasurer is being so cautious about the interest rate outlook. I believe that that is the element that could put some confidence back into the economy, get that productive investment moving again, and in turn mean that, if we do see unemployment peaking at that sort of level, it goes down very quickly indeed.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VIOLENCE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General. Can the Minister indicate the process being followed in South Australia to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the National Committee on Violence? The National Committee on Violence, chaired by Professor Duncan Chappell of the Australian Institute of Criminology, reported last year. The report contained 138 recommendations dealing with violence reduction. The first recommendation stated:

The Federal, State and Territory Governments should each nominate a body to coordinate implementation of the recommendations of the report. These bodies should report annually to the Prime Minister, Premier or Chief Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her most important question, which goes to the very heart of the well-being and health of our community, particularly of our young people. Operation Paradox is being conducted in South Australia this week whereby children, particularly through the assistance given to them by their schools, are being asked to telephone a designated number if they believe that they require assistance with respect to matters relating to their own safety and well-being, particularly emanating from their own home environment. That is a very successful program, which has been conducted now for a number of years, and I very much appreciate the support of the South Australian Police Department, the Department for Family and Community Services and our schools in unearthing child abuse in our community and providing assistance to those young people who cannot call upon their parents and others in their family environment for help and assistance when it is most needed in their lives.

The report referred to by the honourable member is a most important report. The South Australian Education Department accepts the recommendations of that report related to education. Indeed, as the honourable member said, there are many other recommendations and I know that they are being worked on by the committee which has been established at the State level, the Violence and Crime Working Group of the Coalition Against Crime, and which is coordinating all departmental responses to the report. That working group is chaired by Ms Kym Dwyer who was also a member of the National Committee on Violence that brought down those recommendations. I will be pleased to obtain a more detailed report from my colleague the Attorney-General about the matters raised by the honourable member.

COMPULSORY SUPERANNUATION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Does the Premier agree that, while compulsory employer-funded superannuation may appear

to be desirable in principle, in fact its effect will be to increase unemployment and force many South Australian businesses to close? If so, what representations will he make to the Prime Minister to reverse this short-sighted announcement?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The crucial point is whether or not the superannuation payments are traded off against wage increases. In other words, there need be no overall increase in cost to employers if the amount is a substitution for what might otherwise have been granted in ordinary wage applications. Looked at in that way, it is actually a very productive thing to do. I do not think that any members would argue against the fact that superannuation should be available much more widely than it is. In the long term it will help our social security systems. It will provide an appropriate safety net for workers. Therefore, in principle, I would be very surprised if anyone, including the honourable member, would object to that.

One aspect of the decision announced in the budget does cause me considerable concern. I believe that little account is taken of the situation as far as the States are concerned in respect of this. All States offer an adequate superannuation scheme. In the case of South Australia, we have a good superannuation scheme. It is voluntary, which means that many of our employees have not taken it up, but they are entitled to do so. It has a fairly high cost. If in addition we have this comprehensive compulsory scheme imposed on us, there will be very high extra costs. At the very least, I would have thought there could have been some consultation between the States, particularly in their role as substantial employers who do offer superannuation to their workers, before such a decision was announced. I am critical of that. I will be making representations to the Prime Minister accordingly on that matter and, in so doing, outlining the cost implications for us and asking what the Commonwealth intends to do to assist.

FAMILY SUPPORT MEASURES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise whether submissions made by the South Australian Government on relevant Federal Government family support measures, such as family allowances and Austudy, have been addressed in yesterday's Federal budget?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise that they certainly have been addressed in the Federal budget. They follow the submissions made, in the first instance by the Premier to the Prime Minister in a series of proposals aimed at addressing the serious rural problems that South Australia and the nation have been facing this year. Among those issues identified were not only income support measures, rural assistance and other areas for promoting our trade and looking at compensation for lost sales but also those measures of family support that for various reasons saw rural families not getting a fair deal. The point was made in respect to both family allowance supplement and Austudy payments that so many families, just because of their apparent asset richness, were being denied the opportunity to get even those areas of income support. As a result of that and of other submissions the Federal Government received, it did announce changes yesterday, and we are pleased to see those changes that have been announced.

In the family allowance supplement arena, under the new rules if a family has assets above the existing limit, which is \$347 500—in other words where they would cut out on any family allowance supplement—they may still be eligible if their net assets are below \$600 000 and their income is

below the married benefit rate of \$13 078, which is, of course, adjusted for the number of children, and if they had limited available funds, that is, less than \$10 000 for couples or \$6 000 for singles. That, then, would enable them to receive \$26.50 per week for each child under 13 years of age, and \$38.65 per week for each child between 13 and 15 years.

Likewise, there have been improvements to the Austudy scheme whereby student assistance through that scheme and the assistance for isolated children scheme will be improved and simplified, including the introduction of a hardship provision so that the present assets test, effectively \$695 000 for farm and business assets, will no longer apply if a student's parents or spouse are receiving social security or veterans' pension or benefit, or household support under Part C of the rural adjustment scheme.

I think they are two areas in which we can see that improvements have been made. Clearly, there are still other issues that we would want to have picked up, and we will continue to make the necessary submissions. However, we are pleased to see in this instance that those submissions that have been made have been addressed in yesterday's budget.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier amend the WorkCover Act to ensure that any compulsory increase in superannuation is not used by WorkCover to increase its employer levies, as we are now the only State in Australia that includes superannuation in a levy calculation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question of the inclusion of superannuation in WorkCover legislation was, of course, covered at the time the legislation was going through and I think has been referred to in this House on a number of occasions. In terms of its implication on the present arrangements announced by the Federal Government and its costs involving WorkCover, obviously that needs to be addressed by the WorkCover board. In terms of legislation, I would have thought that the appropriate place for that matter to be discussed or canvassed would be in the select committee, which is currently meeting on that issue.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS

Mr GROOM (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. With the appointment of Mr Paolo Nocella as Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission as from 1 July 1991, does the Minister see or intend a changing role for the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I would say that the proper term is probably an amplification of the role. Following the change to legislation covering the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission in 1989, members will recall that the area of trade involvement and economic development was included as a new and equally important objective for the commission to follow. Now the appointment of Paolo Nocella as the Chairperson of the commission helps fulfil that objective, because not only does he bring excellent community credentials and is well received among the many communities in South Australia but also he clearly has significant commercial expertise. I have been pleased to note the comments made by the member for Bragg supporting his appointment to that position.

One of the things that we are already looking at is closer working relationships with a number of those Chambers of Commerce existing in South Australia which have very strong connections with various countries overseas: for example, the Italian Chamber of Commerce, which is, of course, the organisation from which Paolo Nocella came; likewise, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, formed not so long ago.

There is also the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce and the Middle East/Australian Chamber of Commerce, and just recently we have seen the establishment in South Australia of the Hellenic/Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, South Australian Chapter, with which I have already made contact, as has Paolo Nocella, to consider the ways in which we can help them do the work they are doing to promote further trade and investment between Greece and Australia.

In reality, that has meant that these chambers have actively sought to promote trade and investment opportunities. For three years running we have been able to assist the Italian chamber by participating in Italian trade fairs, and I have had the privilege to attend two of those. Likewise, it has been suggested to the Hellenic/Australian chamber that the Thessalonica trade fair should be targeted and, if it is doing that, we would want to work with it to help in that regard. Likewise with the other chambers around the place.

That is not to be taken as in any way undermining the other legitimate roles of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. That charter of community development, social awareness and understanding of multiculturalism remains as important as ever and has now been amplified, not replaced, by this new additional focus on economic development and trade related areas. I believe that Paolo Nocella's appointment will serve us very well in helping to achieve that amplification.

INTEREST RATES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): As the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer have ignored the Treasurer's calls for a cut in interest rates, does he believe that South Australia's interests would be better served by having Mr Keating as Prime Minister until the next Federal election?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a frivolous question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If that is a matter of great public importance in the current situation, it says very little for the Opposition, which just wants to play the fool with our economy in this House. It shows what sort of importance it attaches to this time. I have already covered a reasonable and serious question on that issue in the context of the budget, and I made my views clear. The Federal Treasurer, in the budget that he brought down, said that he was going to maintain a tight monetary policy, and he did not give any indication of this reduction that I believe is necessary. All of that has been covered. I think that the member's question is pathetic.

FARE EVASION

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Transport tell the House whether the incidence of fare evasion on trains has changed since the introduction of the policy of off-board sales of tickets only? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House I shall briefly explain. On Sunday last,

the shadow spokesperson on transport was having a quiet day and decided to put out a press release alleging that one in 10 of adult—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Are you withdrawing leave?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, Sir. I ask that leave be withdrawn as the honourable member is reflecting on a member in another place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Transport.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition is even more childish than usual today.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Petulant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition is more childish than usual.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am trying to be very quiet indeed. I do not want the member for Bright crying. If ever I get up and say anything, I keep thinking that he is going to burst into tears.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am being very gentle.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister to answer the question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was pleased, but not surprised, to see that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw had got it wrong again. Her allegations that about 10 per cent of train passengers were not purchasing tickets or having their tickets cancelled by the Crouzet machines—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon? You will have to wait and see. It was asserted that 10 per cent of train passengers were not paying or were not having their tickets cancelled by the Crouzet machine. I think this is a dreadful slur on the honesty of train passengers. The overwhelming majority of people in South Australia are honest and law-abiding and, if they are obliged to pay a fare, they do so. However, for that very small percentage who are not honest, from time to time inspectors check tickets on our trains, buses and trams. I have some firm data to give to the Chamber; not a wild guess like the Hon. Diana Laidlaw made. In a 20-day period from 21 July to 11 August 1991, 46 334 rail passenger tickets were checked, field supervisors issued three offence reports and 491 'pay later' rail cards; that is, just over 1 per cent did not have tickets.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will give more empirical evidence that may satisfy the member for Hayward. On two mornings in late July we had a blitz and checked 10 000 passengers. On the first morning, 150 passengers (1.5 per cent) did not have tickets; on the second day of the blitz, every single one of the alighted passengers had a ticket—a 100 per cent success rate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We do. They made their presence very visible indeed. Prior to the introduction of the Crouzet system—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—the estimate, which was compiled from blitzes, the same as we have had from time time, was that about 3 per cent did not pay. So, the fact that sales have gone entirely upward for trains has made

no difference at all to the number of people who are attempting to cheat the system. In fact, the position has improved enormously, and we are very pleased about that. I think it shows the efficiency of the STA, the basic honesty of people in Adelaide and also the benefit of buying multirip tickets as opposed to the old system of buying tickets on board—it is now much cheaper not to cheat. I thank the member for Price for his question and I am very pleased to confirm that the spokesperson in this area for the Opposition has got it wrong again.

ASIAN SEX TOURS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Is the Minister of Health aware of the grave dangers to the South Australian community represented by so-called sex tours to some Asian cities operating out of Australia, given that this State is the only one in which HIV is a non-notifiable disease?

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! 'Question' has been called.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! 'Question' has been called. The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As to the gravamen of the question, the decision has been made that HIV will be a notifiable disease. I believe that it is only a matter of a certain amount of clerical work being gone through before that is published in the *Gazette*. So, that matter is resolved. As to the other matters, I would have thought that the Federal authorities had some responsibility in relation to the health of people coming in and out of the country, so I think I should certainly take up the matter with the Commonwealth authorities. I thank the honourable member for the question because we are fortunate in that, because of education campaigns and a reasonably responsible attitude on the part of the public, at this stage HIV-AIDS has not shown up significantly in the heterosexual population.

Of course, there is no guarantee that that situation will not change. It is also true that the predictions that were made for the HIV-AIDS epidemic a few years ago have, fortunately, not come about, and that the incidence of this epidemic is considerably lower than many feared. Again, there is no guarantee that that situation will be maintained, particularly if the sort of irresponsible behaviour that has been outlined by the honourable member occurs, and there is a sense in which it is very difficult for the authorities to stop it from happening.

I will take up the particular matter of the possibility of health checks in these circumstances with the Commonwealth authorities. In the meantime, I have given approval for the decision that the honourable member has requested to be given effect to, and I understand that it will be in very short order.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASING POLICY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Following the introduction in November last year of an environment purchasing policy by which a 5 per cent price advantage is given to products that contain 50 per cent or more recycled material, will the Minister inform the House of the impact this policy has had on Government departments?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his long interest in the whole concept of recycling and its importance for South

Australia. It is an opportune time to address this question, because August has been officially designated throughout South Australia as recycling month. As some members would know, this morning I launched the first ever Recycling Trade Day in South Australia.

Recycling Trade Day, in fact, is a joint venture between the South Australian Waste Management Commission and State Supply, and aims to promote the use of recycled products, particularly within Government. I am delighted that the honourable member has asked me how successfully we are proceeding with the implementation of our recycling policy but, first, I should like to inform the House that over 50 suppliers are supplying environmentally sensitive goods and services at the exhibition that is currently taking place.

Since the Government introduced this purchasing policy, the number of available products in the State Supply warehouse in this category has doubled to some 60, and sales have increased from \$600 000 to over \$1 million. State Government departments and agencies have already used more recycled paper in July and August of this year than they did for the entire 1990-91 financial year.

In addition to the increased sales, various departments have successfully trialled recycling schemes, including the use of retread tyres and recycled oil. I urge not only all Government departments, and all Ministers to cajole their departments, but also the private sector and local government to move more and more into using recycled products, because I believe that this is one way of combating the recession in South Australia. We will have a whole range of new areas of technology, new industries and new opportunities for employment.

ROUGH CUT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Does the Minister of Employment and Further Education deny that in August of 1990, and 10 months prior to the date the Minister claims yesterday he was first told of allegations about Rough Cut, he was telephoned by a Mr Neil Mallard and advised of allegations of financial mismanagement in Rough Cut? The Liberal Party has a copy of a statutory declaration signed by a Mr Neil Mallard, a former member of Rough Cut, who states that he made a telephone call to the Minister in approximately August 1990. The declaration in part states:

In this conversation I mentioned that I was ringing on behalf of members of Rough Cut Inc (where I'd previously been a member) who believed that the Rough Cut Skillshare was being financially mismanaged.

The Liberal Party also has a copy of a statutory declaration from the former Chairperson of Rough Cut Inc., Ms Michelle Jennings, which says that in about August 1990 Mr Mallard informed her that he had spoken to Mike Rann and informed him of Rough Cut Inc's concerns.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted once again to be able to respond to these issues, because the honourable member is leading absolutely nowhere. In fact, let us detail the inaccuracies of the so-called allegations over the last few days. Last week the member for Light stated that I gave a cheque for \$30 000 to Rough Cut Skillshare in November 1989. That was a lie. It was implied that this was not a genuine Government grant but an elaborate publicity stunt. That was wrong. These allegations were based on a statutory declaration from a person who was apparently present when I presented this \$30 000 cheque—that was wrong—and who noticed that this \$30 000 cheque was pinned to Frank Kinnear's wall. That was wrong, because there never was a \$30 000 cheque.

The member for Coles implied that I had been personally involved in the administration or management of the Rough Cut Skillshare project. She was wrong, because it was Legh Davis. The member for Kavel again mistook the ten person advisory committee for the management committee of Rough Cut. He was wrong. Yesterday the member for Light again did not check his facts in relation to his question; he again referred to a \$30 000 cheque. In fact, there was not one. He claimed that I had indicated that the money had been given to Rough Cut Inc. and not Rough Cut Skillshare. That was wrong.

'A scrutiny of Rough Cut Inc's bank accounts showed no cheque for \$30 000', said the member for Light. That is because there was no cheque for \$30 000, and the \$30 000 in grants was made in two stages to Skillshare, not to Rough Cut Inc. Members opposite wonder why we call them the easybeats, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Leader stated that I was personally advised of these allegations against State officers in August 1990, and that was wrong. Everyone in Elizabeth and Salisbury knows that since about the middle of last year there has been a huge bun fight between two factions in Skillshare and Rough Cut in that organisation in Salisbury. It is a bun fight of accusation versus counter accusation. The Deputy Leader said that an officer of my department was also advised of these allegations in August 1990. Certainly my officer met with Michelle Jennings and others in, I am advised, July 1990, but there were absolutely no allegations involving State funds at that time. The Deputy Leader got it wrong again yesterday. In terms of any allegations against State officers and State funding of this issue, the first time it was raised with me was in June this year, as I have detailed in this Parliament.

Mr Speaker, I know why this matter has been raised. The Leader of the Opposition, who does not have the guts to ask the questions himself, was very angry last week because we detailed facts about leadership problems within the Liberal Party. We also detailed the fact that the Liberal Party in this State pays voters \$30 a head to tell it why they do not like the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! This has no relevance at all in terms of a response to the question. I also draw the Minister's attention to the use of certain words. The word 'lie' was used. I caution the Minister about the use of that word. He should be very careful about the content of his response and the words he uses. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In concluding, I point out that the first time specific allegations were made against any of my officers was when this group of liars and snoops came to see me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I am not referring to members opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! I just cautioned the House about the use of certain words. I feel that the use of those words was—and I will not use the words 'in contempt' of the Chair's ruling, but members should be very cautious about using that word again. I think that the Minister has answered the question.

STATE DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology respond to claims that his department is developing Adelaide at the expense of regional South Australia. The South Australian Regional

Development Association publicly released a submission recently claiming that the Government was neglecting economic development in the regions. This claim has subsequently been used by members of Parliament as fact. Can the Minister clarify the situation?

Mr Venning: Listen to this one!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I know that the member for Custance will listen with great interest to the answer to this question, because he knows that the figures included in the SARDA submission were incorrect. The substance that they brought to my attention in a very constructive meeting that I had with a number of members of SARDA certainly merits further work, and we are doing that work with them in terms of having the most effective regional policy under our South Australian State Development Fund.

The actual figures contained in the letter that was circulated, which have been picked up by a number of members opposite in their Address in Reply contributions, despite the fact that the figures have been corrected by a letter that I wrote to the *Advertiser* and despite the fact that they are entitled to get these figures themselves and find them to be wrong, are as follows. First, SARDA stated that only \$200 000 was spent by the Government on regional development committees. The facts are that, in the last financial year, that figure was \$680 000, and I gave an undertaking to the deputation that came to see me that I would be prepared to see that amount doubled if there was a matching of funds from local government for that extra amount, in other words, to take the \$680 000 up to \$1.2 million if additional funds above that were then put in by local government. I do not believe that that is anywhere near the \$200 000 that has been cited.

Secondly, the point has been made that we have only 2½ officers working on regional development and the rest work on Adelaide. The reality is that no officer's job in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology is to work on development for Adelaide. Their job is to work on development for the State—the whole of South Australia—and they have been doing that. Some officers are particularly targeted to look at areas outside the metropolitan area, but no-one—zero, nil—is allocated to work just on developments in Adelaide.

I point to the number of innovative and promising developments which have happened over the years and which, in some cases, are still in progress as examples of what that department has been able to do. The rare earths project in Port Pirie, which is still in its developmental stages, has actively involved the department. The Tioxide submission, which saw Whyalla selected as the site for a tioxide plant in this country above a number of other possibilities, was a result of work with the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. There are also a number of projects in the South-East, and I know that the members for Mount Gambier and Victoria (the Leader of the Opposition) will concur. I also refer to the Murray Bridge cheese factory, the Boral aluminium extrusion factory at Angaston, and a number of other projects.

Sometimes some projects do not come to fruition, and that happens in the Adelaide metropolitan area as much as it happens in regional communities. I am pleased to note the presence in the gallery of His Worship the Mayor of Port Lincoln, and he will know that we have talked about a number of projects.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My apologies, Mr Speaker. I am pleased to say that we have been pleased to work with companies that might want to develop projects in that

particular part of the State as well. In fact, I was involved in discussions with some investors. Unfortunately, one project was not able to come to fruition for want of equity, but nevertheless we stand ready to work with anyone who wants to come and talk about propositions in different parts of the State. Indeed, they are more substantive investment proposals than the kind of catfish farming idea which is the best that we hear from members opposite. Those figures that have been quoted and reiterated by a number of members opposite are not correct, and it is about time they realised they are not correct and discussed the real figures, not the fabrications that they have chosen to believe when they know they are wrong.

Members interjecting:

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

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Does the Minister of Water Resources support the decision to allow Australia Newsprint Mills to develop a newsprint brightening or de-inking facility at Albury which will increase salt discharge into the Murray?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is one of the items that will be discussed at the forthcoming Murray-Darling Ministerial Council meeting to be held from Friday week; it is a matter that I have asked to be included on the agenda. The South Australian State Government has supported the building of a recycling newsprint plant at Albury.

I have personally visited the site and met with the principals of the company, and that is the Government's position. In the interim the company moved to implement a brightening plant and sought the concurrence and permission of the New South Wales Government, specifically the Planning Minister in the previous Greiner Government, to discharge into the Murray River. South Australia made very strong representations, which I led—and at a departmental level as well—opposing the increase of any salinity (or, indeed, any other form of chemicals or substance) being discharged into the Murray River and, therefore, coming across our border.

As a Ministerial Council, we then agreed that, if interim approval were to be given to the specific conditions to be laid down—if it could be given so that the company itself would work towards offshore disposal of the effluent (for example, wood lotting and other means of disposing of this saline effluent)—we would not be opposing a very worthwhile project involving the establishment of a newsprint recycling plant that had given us a guarantee that it would take a substantial amount of newspapers from South Australia.

After the election of the second Greiner Government, a new Minister of Planning was appointed (the former Minister was defeated), and I believe he was asked by his department to approve this application that the previous Minister had been considering, although he probably was not fully informed of the representations and the conditions that the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council and Commission had asked to be taken into account. He gave not an interim but a full approval for the brightening plant to go ahead.

Indeed, the way in which the company itself found out about that decision was by reading it in the media. I found out about it and contacted my counterpart in New South Wales, and we were able to inform the officers of the Minister for Environment, who did not even know that his

colleague had taken this decision. In other words, I believe what happened was just very bad coordination and a very bad decision-making process. Subsequently, I have written in the strongest possible terms to the new Planning Minister. I have sent copies to all members of the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council, and I believe they are working very hard to try to come up with the conditions that will apply to this discharge.

I look forward to a very free and frank discussion on this matter next Friday week. I want to make clear that South Australia is not opposing a recycling newsprint plant: we are demanding—as I believe we should be—the highest possible standard of effluent discharge. We are asking the company to move as quickly as possible in this matter and, from my discussions with Ros Kelly late last week, I believe the company feels that it may be able to come up with a closed system which will ensure that it does not discharge into the Murray River.

We have invited ANM to come to the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council meeting and address Ministers. I look forward to hearing what the company has to say about this very sensitive area. It is important, and it is important that we get it right for South Australia with respect to both the establishment of a new recycling newspaper plant and preserving and protecting the quality of water that comes into South Australia.

TRAIN PASSENGER NUMBERS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether the recent train strike had any perceptible effect on the number of train passengers?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It has always been the case in the past that, whenever there is a train strike, apart from the inconvenience at the time, one of the most serious effects is the ongoing loss of patronage on the trains.

I have been impressed that upon the ARU for a number of years. This train strike was particularly difficult. It was protracted, as everyone knows, and it was over a fundamental principle of who runs the trains—the STA or the ARU. There was clearly a necessity for greater security on the trains not only for STA personnel but for the passengers. If anyone casts their mind back, they would remember the quite horrendous publicity for many months before that dispute about people who were assaulted on trains and who claimed they would not travel on trains because they felt insecure.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is correct. They felt that way with some justification. The level of assault was unacceptably high. The strike was protracted, but we finished with an agreement that has seen the phasing in of transit officers on all trains at all times. We have about 36 at the moment compared to about 60 guards. It will be only a very short period before the balance is tipped towards transit officers as guards leave and retrain into something else.

I think that the public, who were extraordinarily patient during that dispute, have shown their commitment to the rail system and to the new system of transit officers. We are already having very favourable comments by passengers about their perception of their personal safety on the system. In particular, they feel that on trains where transit officers are in place for their security the graffiti and the hooliganism, whether from young or older people, have diminished considerably, and that is correct. I am very pleased that it has been only a short time since the dispute ended, but it

appears that on this occasion at least the rail system has not lost any patronage.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is not true.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In fact, there has been a slight, but nevertheless welcome, increase in the number of passenger journeys that have taken place on the rail system since the strike ended compared to the period immediately prior to the strike. To coin a phrase, one swallow does not make a summer. Nevertheless, in this case it is particularly pleasing that the immediate drop in passenger journeys that we have experienced in the past has not occurred on this occasion since this dispute. It is our intention to rebuild the rail system in this State and we will do that by, first, making the trains safe.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is a waste of money. If they are not safe, we cannot complain about people not using them. We are in the process of making trains safe as regards people's personal safety. We will also make them reliable. The unions are cooperating on this. Also, we will maintain the affordability of the system. Promotion of rail is taking place extensively in a number of electorates of Opposition members. All areas surrounding particular stations and lines are being letterboxed and given timetables, and in some promotions they are being given free tickets so that they can try the rail system. The promotion is very worth while. It is extraordinarily expensive for the taxpayers to run our suburban rail system, but we are determined to make that system successful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MFP CORPORATION

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Premier. What assurance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order; and the member for Albert Park is out of order.

Mr BRINDAL:—can the Premier give that the person who is appointed Director of the MFP Corporation will have extensive private enterprise managerial experience and that candidates from overseas will be sought and scrutinised before a choice is made?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: It has been claimed that Mr Bruce Guerin, a very senior public servant who is close to the Premier, is a favoured candidate, and this is causing disquiet amongst those in the business community who support the MFP proposal.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a completely unsubstantiated statement on a number of counts, chief of which is that the appointment of such a person as Mr Guerin would cause this kind of concern when Mr Guerin has actually been one of the chief driving forces behind the whole concept of the MFP, the Adelaide application and the information utility, which has, in fact, drawn together the major computer company players in this country in a way that has never been achieved before.

So, I find it extraordinary that the honourable member can, out of the blue, start casting aspersions in that way about an extremely senior and capable public servant. In relation to the MFP Corporation, it will need to be estab-

lished by legislation. Of course, we will be moving to interim arrangements: we must have interim executive and management arrangements, and they will be announced progressively. I can assure the House that those positions will be occupied by people with considerable competence and ability.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety advise the House of any measures being taken to reduce the number of workplace injuries in the timber industry?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am pleased that the member for Gilles has asked me this question, because I assisted WorkCover to launch a new program aimed at cutting the number of people hurt when working in the timber industry. The sector program for 1991-92 aims to reduce injuries in areas ranging from forestry and logging to milling, pulp production and even timber sales. This program is in line with our Government's commitment, given at the last election, to target all high risk injuries.

The injury rate in the timber industry is extremely high. In 1989-90, 35 per cent of workers in the timber industry suffered work related injuries. This means that people going to work in the timber industry had better than a one in three chance of being injured each year they worked in that area. That could even include the loss of a finger or a hand. Along with the human and family suffering that that caused, the compensation claims alone cost \$3 million a year.

The program is being carried out with the cooperation of employers and the union involved in that industry. It will give the timber industry a chance to reduce its injury rate, something that will eventually lead to levy rate reductions and smaller WorkCover bills. Under this program, WorkCover will provide resources and expert help for groups of employers and workers to help them tackle their problems. The industry's workers and employers will drive the program and develop industry prevention strategies themselves. If this program is successful, it is a strategy that will be used in other industries in South Australia.

ROUGH CUT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education explain the discrepancy between his statement today about a cheque for \$30 000 which, according to the Minister, did not exist and a report in the Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler *Messenger* of Wednesday 22 November 1989 (three days before the election) in which it is stated:

The State Government has handed over a \$30 000 grant to help pay wages for about 10 instructors.

The report includes a picture of the Minister involved in the cheque payment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This question was answered both on Thursday and on Tuesday, and if the member opposite had listened he would have realised that we tabled the cheques: one for \$12 000 and one for \$18 000. The press release that I issued in early October announced \$30 000 worth of grants.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Exactly: \$12 000 and \$18 000 add up to \$30 000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have something very serious to tell the House. Allegations of misappropriation and diversion of funds against the sponsoring agent of Rough Cut Skillshare, the federally funded body, are being investigated by the Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training, by Price Waterhouse and, I understand, by the Federal and State police. I understand that senior members of the Service to Youth Council, the sponsoring body, have been interviewed by the police.

However, I am unable to inform the House whether the Hon. Legh Davis, a long-time board member of the sponsoring agency and the Chairman of the finance committee, has been interviewed. Certainly, I would implore Mr Davis, if he has any information about the illegal misuse of Government funds by an agency of which he is a board member, immediately to contact the Australian Federal Police. That is his clear duty.

I have some other information concerning another member of the Liberal Party. The group that is making the allegations, one of whom is being investigated for dishonesty and was sacked for dishonesty from his previous job, issued in May a newsletter in which it said that it went earlier this year to see Mr Rob Lucas with these allegations, and he—unlike me—failed to inform the police.

BUILDING SITE SAFETY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety inform the House whether any moves have been made to address the problem of injuries caused by falls on building sites? I understand that falls are the number one killer on construction sites and that, since January 1989, 11 of the 17 deaths on building sites have resulted from falls.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: One of the most vexing problems on construction sites is the safety of the work force. I pay tribute to the employers and the trade unions in that area for the work they have done in assisting the State Government to compile a strategy, and to develop codes of practice and regulations to reduce the number of injuries in the construction industry. I find it appalling that, when we are discussing such serious matters as people being hurt and killed, people on the other side should laugh about the great—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear any laughter and cannot make a ruling on it. I ask the Minister to answer the question.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am appalled that people should see mirth in this matter, and I hope they will treat it as serious. Even though the construction industry employs 6 per cent of the work force, it makes up 20 per cent of people who are hurt in falls from heights. Putting up structural steel work involves the use of heavy machinery and tools to build the basic framework of a building or structure.

This code has been developed jointly, and highlights the need to design out the risks in placing structural steel work. The best way to prevent falls is to cut the need for people even to work at heights. The code also gives practical guidance on training, the use of equipment and safe procedures. It also tackles problems such as the lifting and transportation of structural steel work and the problems of instability while building. The commission will also be developing a code in respect of safe work on rooftops, and will address height risk in the building industry.

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS (ADDITIONAL LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the first and second schedules of the Maralinga Tjarutja Lands Rights Act 1984. The first schedule defines the boundaries of the Maralinga Tjarutja lands and the second schedule is a diagrammatic map of the lands which identifies the roads to which the public have access under section 20 of the Act. The total area of the Maralinga Tjarutja freehold land is 76 420 square kilometres. This Bill will transfer an additional 3 600 square kilometres of unallotted Crown land to Maralinga Tjarutja.

It will allow the incorporation into the lands of unallotted Crown land between Maralinga Tjarutja's southern boundary to a distance of 100 metres from the Australian National railway reserve for the entire length of the lands. When the original land title was drawn up, the southern boundary of the lands was defined by the map references for the Woomera prohibited area which left a buffer zone of approximately seven miles between the rocket range and the railway line. There are no discernible boundary markers on the ground to identify where the buffer zone begins and ends. By adding this section of unallotted Crown land into the title, the southern boundary of the Maralinga Tjarutja lands will be clearly defined by the railway line reserve.

The area south of Maralinga to be included in the title contains several sites of significance to the Aboriginal traditional owners, including the vast ceremonial/trading areas around the former fresh water soaks, burial sites and mission settlements. For many centuries, Ooldea was a meeting place and ceremonial site for the people from the Great Victoria Desert and beyond. In fact, it was one of the most important trading areas for clan groups from the Kimberleys in Western Australia and from central Queensland, as well as for the Pitjantjatjara clan groups to the north. Ooldea was widely referred to as an 'Aboriginal metropolis'.

The cultural and social fabric of the traditional nomadic peoples who identified with Ooldea was tragically destroyed by white settlement, particularly with the construction of the railway. The railway workers and other early white visitors to the area exposed the Aboriginal people to illnesses which destroyed their health, to a lifestyle which destroyed their traditional methods of survival, and exposed them to vices such as alcohol, with devastating effects.

The sinking of wells at Ooldea to satisfy the needs of the steam engines destroyed the natural water soaks forever and that is an enormous tragedy. Christian missions established at Ooldea exposed these nomadic people to a settled, dependent lifestyle. Education and religious values which challenged traditional cultural practice and spiritual belief systems changed their lot forever. To add to the dilemma and confusion of these people, the missions closed without providing acceptable alternatives and virtually left the Ooldea people in a cultural vacuum. In 1953 the area was closed off to the traditional people to make way for the British nuclear testing program, effectively destroying the cultural and trading interchange with people from distant places.

Over the past decade the Maralinga people, in their quest to go 'home', have exercised their spiritual imperative to care for the Ooldea area and to protect the ancient burial sites from intrusion and desecration. We will never be able

to make up for the mistakes of the past. However, this Bill will in some measure help to redress the injustices of history. The Bill will also address two anomalies that have been identified with the existing boundaries.

First, the Bill will redefine the southern boundary to enclose the Commonwealth prohibited area (section 400). The Commonwealth land contains the Maralinga village and the former nuclear test sites. Some of the land area in section 400 is extensively contaminated with radioactive materials, plutonium in particular, used by the British during the ten years of trials. The area also contains quantities of waste materials, some of which is still highly radioactive, buried at several localities throughout section 400.

Secondly, the Bill addresses some changes in descriptions of the lands which have occurred since the passage of the original legislation in 1984. Currently, the eastern boundary of Maralinga Tjarutja land follows 133 degrees longitude and, like the current southern boundary, is not identifiable by markers on the ground. The Bill proposes to extend the eastern boundary to the fence line of neighbouring Commonwealth Hill pastoral lease and further north to the dog fence. The Commonwealth Hill fence is currently some 700 metres from the current Maralinga Tjarutja boundary. The Bill clears up this anomaly by removing this narrow 'no-mans land' north/south strip of Crown Land.

In addition, since the passage of the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act in 1984, the section which formerly comprised the bulk of the lands, section 1446, has been redesignated as three sections: 1485, 1486 and 1487. The latter sections are those which appear on the title to the lands which were transferred to Maralinga Tjarutja. This Bill will bring the description of the lands in the Act into line with the description which appears on the title.

The titles to the Maralinga Tjarutja lands were handed over to the traditional owners in December 1984 by the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and my friend and colleague (the member for Norwood) and the Premier. The handover ceremony was the culmination of negotiations between the Maralinga Tjarutja people and my predecessor over many years. The elders, particularly the old people who were born on the lands or at Ooldea before the missions closed, wanted to return to resume their way of life and to revive their culture and traditions. They wanted to get away from the social environment they have experienced since 1953 in towns and settlements, where the authority of the elders has been destroyed, their stories forgotten, and their health and lifestyle compromised.

A group representing the traditional people have now resettled on Maralinga lands and are working towards fulfilling these aspirations. This Bill therefore addresses matters of basic human rights and social justice. In fact, the issue of land ownership is a matter of cultural and spiritual survival. The intent of this Bill meets one of the basic cultural aspirations of our Aboriginal citizens identified by the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody.

In presenting this Bill, I wish to acknowledge the positive and bipartisan way in which Aboriginal affairs has been dealt with in South Australia. The amendments contained in the Bill have been recommended by the (bipartisan) Maralinga Lands Parliamentary Committee. The committee has visited Ooldea and in its reports to Parliament in 1988 and 1990 recommended that the entire Ooldea area should be transferred to Maralinga Tjarutja to ensure that the area is appropriately managed and protected from intrusion and vandalism. The member for Eyre, who is a member of the parliamentary committee, is a strong supporter of the return of Ooldea to Aboriginal ownership because of its uniqueness and importance to the Aboriginal people, and I salute him

and pay tribute to his work on that committee. In fact, all members of the committee have strongly supported the Maralinga people, and my immediate predecessor, the member for Napier, has played a very strong role in this work, as has the member for Stuart. All members of the committee have been most helpful in ensuring that this Bill reached this stage. I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 substitutes the first and second schedules to the Act. In the first schedule, section numbers describing the lands which the Governor may grant to Maralinga Tjarutja have been changed to include an additional strip along the southern boundary of the lands, and also to reflect changes in the land description which occurred after the passage of the Act in 1984. In the second schedule, these changes are shown in a map which depicts roads within the lands to which the public have access. The map also depicts the realignment of a portion of the eastern boundary to correctly show the boundary between the Maralinga Tjarutja lands and the neighbouring pastoral property.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 August. Page 332.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Supply Bill authorises the allocation of \$1.2 billion to meet Public Service salaries, wages and ongoing costs until November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be completed and assent received. This is the second of two such Bills that we debate each calendar year. The earlier one, allocating \$850 million, was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year, according to the Treasurer's second reading explanation, and I assume that he means of the financial year. I understand that in the first two weeks of this current financial year—in other words, in the first two weeks of July—the State was in real financial trouble and was busy going to various authorities borrowing as much money as it could, because it faced a severe cash flow problem. If the State is in that type of financial mess, it is about time Parliament insisted on receiving a little more information than we receive at present.

The second reading explanation takes up only a few lines in *Hansard*. When it all boils down, we are giving out \$1.2 billion while we have no idea of the state of the Government's finances. The last information we received from the State Treasury was dated 24 June, and it contained statements of the Consolidated Account for April and May. Here we are in August, and we have no idea of the financial situation as at 30 June.

In that statement of the Consolidated Account, receipts and payments for May 1991, the Premier as Treasurer stated:

Present indications are that Government revenue will fall short of budget estimates for 1990-91 by about \$75 million. The major contributing factors include an estimated reduction in stamp duty receipts from property and motor vehicle sales and transfers of

\$33 million, and reduced revenue from financial institutions duty anticipated to come in \$17 million below budget forecast.

When we read figures like that, we wonder how we can rely on any financial document presented to this Parliament by the Government? How can we rely on any financial statement made by the Government to this Parliament? Therefore, it comes back to what I said earlier: how can we approve such a payment when we are not aware of the full financial situation? In that statement, the Premier also said:

The results for the first 11 months of the financial year show an excess of payments over receipts and borrowings of \$269 million.

So, at the end of May last financial year, we were \$269 million in the red. If we look at the Consolidated Account statement, we find a provision of recoveries from the South Australian Government Financing Authority of \$270 million, so we assume that that \$270 million was arranged by SAFA and put into the Consolidated Account. Even so, there is still an expected shortage of approximately \$75 million.

The Government made an allowance for increased wages and salaries during the last financial year of \$126.6 million. That amount is more than reflected in the payments of some of the large departments. This is what annoys me: a sum of \$1.2 million is allocated for salaries and wages for the next few months, and about 81 per cent of the total operating cost goes towards salaries and wages and related payments, so the number of people employed by the State is immense. The budget for the Health Commission was \$1 billion, but at the end of May the Government had already spent \$967 million with an anticipated payment of about \$90 million for the month of June. The Education Department budget was \$1.4 billion. Already \$1.378 billion had been spent, and another \$94 million to \$95 million would have been the payment for June, so that department would have been well over budget.

The annoying aspect of the Education Department is that schools in the western suburbs are being closed, yet the department continually loses about \$300 000 a year in overpayments to teachers that it is unable to recover. The department cannot even say how many employees it has on its payroll. I have been trying for more than 10 years to obtain an accurate figure of the number of people employed by the Education Department, but the department has no idea. If the Department loses employees, how many schools has it lost in the past few years? You have not even had the decency to respond to my invitation to look at the Camden Primary School. That is another argument for later in this debate. I am very annoyed to think that you do not care about education.

The Camden Primary School was built thanks to the insistence of Hugh Hudson, who did much for education in South Australia, yet here we have another Minister of Education wanting to take it away. It is a crying shame. You are destroying another community, just like you destroyed Fulham. You took away the Fulham Primary School and gave half the land to your mates, without even auctioning it. That was absolutely disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Hanson that the term 'you' is not acceptable. All members must be referred to by their electorate or the office which they hold in the Parliament. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: The child, development and care budget was \$53.8 million. Already, \$50 million had been consumed as at the end of May. It was assumed that that would probably have exceeded the budget as well, as would have the budget in relation to the protection of persons, their rights and property, which was \$402.8 million. A sum of \$376 million had been expended at the end of May, and it

is assumed that about \$40 million was spent in June. The State Transport Authority would have required \$130 million to keep the trains and buses operating, and that department would have been almost on budget. For assistance to local government not elsewhere covered \$72.4 million was allocated in last year's budget and, as at the end of May, the State had allocated to local government \$73 million. It is assumed that about \$15 million or \$16 million would have been spent in June, so that line would have been well over budget.

Everywhere we look, in relation to the payment side of the budget for the last financial year, we see that the Government was in trouble. The budget estimates were wrong in many instances. That is why I keep coming back to this principle: here we are in August, the second month of the new financial year, the budget has not yet been brought down, we are starting to consider payments for this financial year, but we really do not know what the situation will be.

I have always maintained that the budget in procedures should be commenced in February, and debated in and passed through this Parliament by the end of June, so that, when the financial year starts, everyone would know the situation. At the same time, I have always criticised the stupidity of the Federal Government in bringing down its budget in the third week in August. If the Federal Government could get its act together and let the States know in January or February where they stand, the budget could be wrapped up before the end of June; we would know exactly where we stood at the commencement of the new financial year.

As it is, and as the Premier said in his second reading explanation, the budget will not be assented to until November. We will then find that, come December, January or February, Government departments will spend like a man with no arms to try to get rid of the money so that it is all gone by the end of June. That must be one of the greatest examples of wastage. It is a costly process, because there is a huge surge to get rid of the money that has been allocated to the various Government departments.

No incentive is given to Government departments to hold onto money or to spend it wisely. If there is a surplus, those departments should be allowed to carry over that credit to the next year. That can be done but, of course, nobody wants to do it, it is too hard so why bother about it? Why bother about bringing in general efficiency? It is just too hard, and they do not seem to be able to manage it.

That brings me to a point which I have been making for quite some time and which was reinforced recently at a Public Accounts Committee conference in Darwin: it is high time we had whistle blowing legislation. This would really put the cat amongst the pigeons. Many public servants are concerned about what they see going on within their departments on a day to day basis. If we had whistle blowing legislation whereby public servants could come before the Public Accounts Committee or could approach an officer of the Parliament or members of Parliament to point out what is going wrong, after having informed the head of their department and the head of the department not having taken any appropriate action, I am quite sure we could save the taxpayers of this State tens of millions of dollars.

I am quite sure that the State Bank would never have got itself into its present situation and, if there were any problems with the SGIC, they could have been clarified a long time ago and that is just two statutory authorities. Whether we refer to the E&WS Department, the Education Department or any other Government department, a number of public servants have come to me over the years and asked, 'Look, what is going on?' If I were to consider the statements

they have made to me, and if I were to repeat some of those statements, their job would be put on the line. Government departments do not seek to resolve the problems that have been referred to me: a witch-hunt is conducted to try to find out who passed on the information to a member of Parliament.

Question on notice No. 13 to the Minister of Transport states:

1. Was a former employee of the Highways Department . . . re-employed in one of two positions previously made redundant with the Emergency Services section and, if so, why?

2. How many classified and reclassified positions have been created in the department within the past six months and why?

3. Is there evidence of roting being undertaken by creating new or reclassified positions prior to the offer of redundancy package offers and, if so, what action is being taken to prevent excessive redundancy payments and, if none, why not?

Question No. 21 is similar. Question Nos 52 to 62 are directed to various Ministers and question No. 99 makes a similar reference to SACON. Those questions are on notice for a reason—and I do not want to do in any particular public servant. There seems to be a theme running through the Government's reorganisation. Sure, the Government review committee is restructuring some of our departments and looking at wastage and mismanagement. But true to form—and I have seen it now for the past 21 years—the Public Service has a wonderful defence mechanism: it reclassifies certain positions and it makes other positions redundant. What really happens is that some people are moved sideways, some are promoted and some, given the latest trend, are reclassified to a higher level and then made redundant. Of course, the benefit in the latter case is super-annuation: one has to occupy a position for only a few weeks and one is the beneficiary of a nice, neat redundancy package.

That is not good enough. It is high time we had a full disclosure. The Government review group should be looking at this type of organisation. The brilliant Mr Guerin and his Government Management Board seem to be wanting to review everything and trample over some of the work of the Public Accounts Committee. I challenge Bruce Guerin and his team in the Public Service to come out and honestly answer those questions that are on the Notice Paper. I do not want the answers that we have already heard in the royal commission where it is a game to answer questions on notice or questions that are asked in Parliament by members of the Opposition, and it is a game to try to fudge what members of Parliament are seeking. It is not on.

The challenge is to the senior public servants, to manage their departments responsibly and properly and to tell Parliament, through answers to my questions on notice, the facts. And that should be done within the next few weeks. I will not wait for two years, as I have had to do in relation to some questions on notice. That is an absolute disgrace. I do not know what has happened to my favourite Minister, the Minister of Tourism; she has not answered any questions that I have directed to her. There must be something wrong; she must have a sore wrist.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Hartley says, I am never here. May I remind him that I have been given a very responsible job by my Leader to represent the State on probably one of the most important committees ever put forward by the Government. If the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Commonwealth Games Bid Committee pull off the bid for the 1998 Games, I shall remind the member for Hartley that that achievement will probably keep him in his electorate until the year 2000. He will be able to come along as a spectator at one of the best Com-

monwealth Games that will ever be held in Australia, and it will be viable.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Good: I am pleased that everyone else is behind me. I take it as a serious challenge for the State to prove that we are doing something for the youth, in fact for all the people, of South Australia. I will accept any opportunity to do anything in a bipartisan way for my State, because I am very proud of South Australia and I want to see it continue to go from strength to strength, even though we are in a financial hiccup at the moment. We do have financial problems, but there is nothing that cannot be overcome; there is nothing that cannot be resolved. We have a small enough State and Government to be able to manage these problems as they occur. That is why I make the challenge to people like Bruce Guerin and his Government management body to get on top of this problem and assure me that there is no roting in this reorganisation within the Public Service.

Comparing some of the figures, it is disappointing that inflation in South Australia is 4.7 per cent when overall in Australia inflation is only 3.4 per cent. I hope that it will continue to drop, but without creating immense unemployment. In South Australia unemployment is now 10.4 per cent, whereas in the whole of Australia it is 9.4 per cent. The Federal budget estimates that unemployment may go to 10.75 per cent, which is extremely disappointing. If that occurs, I hope that the projections that unemployment in South Australia may go to 11 or 12 per cent will not occur.

In the forthcoming budget and within the allocation of this \$1.2 billion we must ensure that there is funding to provide employment opportunities for all South Australians, particularly the youth unemployed. Some 26.6 per cent of young South Australians are out of work. A quarter of all young people are unable to obtain reasonable jobs. In Australia the rate is 21.6 per cent, which is still far too high. It is a great shame and a reflection on all of us that we cannot overcome the problems to create employment opportunities for our youth. A waste of a generation is occurring by not providing employment opportunities, be it through the Government, local government or private enterprise. We must do something to ensure that young people are given the opportunity to obtain employment.

One of the great success stories of South Australia is our technical and further education colleges. There should be more opportunities through them to provide employment and work experience for the young people of South Australia. If we can overcome those problems, this State will truly become a great State.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The \$1.2 billion we are appropriating under the terms of this Supply Bill is reported to be only \$60 million more than last year. I wonder how much extra the Treasurer would have collected had he not increased taxes and charges. In one of the shadow portfolios for which I have responsibility, fees for shack owners have gone up by more than 1 000 per cent in some instances. It is increasingly difficult to support a Bill which appropriates funds for a Government which constantly ignores the interests of people outside the metropolitan area in locations where it does not and cannot win an electorate. Yet that is what it is doing, and it expects me and other members who represent such electorates in rural South Australia to accept that our constituents will have to pay more and more for less and less. The story is: axe and tax. The Government cuts the service and increases the taxation.

It is tragic because, in effect, what results is that the green shoots on a hedge, if we can look at the bureaucracy in

those terms, are trimmed off, but the dead wood inside the hedge remains. It is the dead wood that ought to be trimmed. It is more difficult, and Ministers would get their hands scratched getting into the hedge to clean it up, but I am sure that if they showed they had the courage to be good husbandmen of their patches and responsibilities they would soon learn the necessary technique to do that. As it is, some of the branches that they are taking out of the hedge are branches of services essential in those rural areas, yet they know that they are of no consequence in electoral terms.

Why should the E&WS maintenance depots in rural South Australia in general, and my electorate in particular, be closed and in other places drastically reduced in staff? It is at that end of the bureaucracy that service is delivered. The Government should be clearing out the people in departments who are there on longer-term projects from which there is no immediate benefit. They are continuing to be a short-run burden for a longer-term program at such high interest rates that I doubt there is any justification for retaining the program as it stands. The staff structure needs to be reviewed and changed on that basis. The services are essential. The things done behind the scenes in the departments which are said to be for the longer-term benefit of the service provider, but which are of no immediate consequence in the field, ought to be reduced.

I have mentioned that, given the high interest rates that we have to pay at present, it is highly unlikely that the amount being invested in those programs will provide us with a real rate of return on our investment. Obviously, in these stringent times, they are unnecessary by comparison with service providers. If a water main bursts in the E&WS network of mains in country areas, greater quantities of water will go to waste, greater damage will be done to council roads in all probability and other private property and greater inconvenience will be caused to those people connected to that reticulated supply before it can be fixed than would otherwise be the case. Instead of closing those essential depots, the Government should look for its savings within the bureaus at their core rather than at their extremities. The alternative is to offer those services to somebody who is prepared to contract to provide them. It may be that the people who would get that contract would be those who are currently among the permanent employees of the department.

Members know of my concern about the decision to close the Pinnaroo and Geranium Area Schools' secondary components and convert them into primary schools. Notwithstanding the fact that extra staff were promised at Lameroo, those staff were not provided. I now understand that was just a sweetener because the extra staff are now to be removed. People in other country areas, who were being sold the idea of consolidation of their secondary school components from two or more area schools to one central location, need to take heed of what has happened in that instance before agreeing to any such programs. It is high time that the Government said what it meant, meant what it said and delivered. It does not. For instance, we find that there have been cuts in staff and funding in rural schools, thereby reducing the curriculum options available.

As I have told the House previously, we need to remember that over 60 per cent of families in the Murray-Mallee area will have negative incomes this year. Children from the Coomandook Primary School cannot go to the Cleland National Park, simply because the day's outing is too expensive and they cannot afford it. That is a consequence of a rapidly arising problem for which it should have been possible for the Federal Treasurer to plan.

After all, he has the economists and the resources of the Federal Treasury and the Reserve Bank at his disposal to know what the impact of certain changes would be on people in various parts of Australia who rely on different industries for their income. He must have known under the economic strategies he was pursuing what the consequences for rural people would be. They have suffered those consequences now and there is nothing there to pick up. Clearly, their children are being dramatically disadvantaged in comparison with children in the metropolitan area who, in many instances, would not even know that there was a recession, let alone the depth of that recession as it is affecting rural communities.

Less than three months ago a machinery dealer and maintenance business in my electorate employing 15 people closed down. Those people lost their jobs. There just is not money available now in those communities to continue to support the essential infrastructure. As I said, the Government is cutting its expenditure in the wrong place by taking it away from the point at which the service is delivered, because by doing that not only will it inconvenience the people to whom the service is being delivered and increase its own costs through the extra damage and loss sustained as a consequence of that policy, but also it will end up reducing the population in those communities to the point where, in some instances, it is falling below the critical mass essential to maintain the fabric of a community of that kind.

We have a problem in country schools of getting language teachers to teach compulsory subjects. The department continues to appoint teachers to schools without regard for the mix of subjects that should be taught in those schools to which they have been allocated. I guess the time will come when the Government will wake up and provide a change in the administrative approach to education and allow communities to be financed from the public purse to provide their own education system within the framework of guidelines and to hire and fire their own staff, so that teachers who at present drive every day, for instance, from metropolitan Adelaide to Coomandook and back every night would not do anything so stupid. It is greenhouse unfriendly and it is dangerous, because it is an hour and 40 minutes' drive one way and it removes the teacher from the midst of the community. The teacher does not have any interaction with or commitment to the welfare of that community beyond the time spent in front of a class in a classroom. It is crazy! It would not be the case if the teachers related to the local communities in which they work as their employers rather than to a huge Government bureau. We are nuts if we continue with the present model.

Rural people in these stringent economic times are simply going broke. If they work harder and smarter they will go broke less quickly, but they will still go broke. Members of their families, the elderly and youngsters, have no access to public transport. Father works long hours trying to hold down a part-time job as well as doing all the farm work with the help of mother, but if one of the elderly members of the family or a youngster needs to see a doctor they cannot, because there is no public transport to take them—they are simply stuck where they are. There is less and less likelihood of their being able to find someone in the community able to help them out as the Government removes paid servants from those communities.

Consider the idiocy, for instance, of closing roads in the electorate between midnight and 6 a.m., yet that is what the closing of ferry services will mean. The amount of money the Government proposed to save by that policy was not simply the wage that would not be paid to a ferry

operator on that shift: it also involved the cost of providing a security officer to drive to the ferry site to ensure that it was not being vandalised or having things stolen from it (a recurrent cost) plus the fixed capital cost of building a security compound on one or other side of the river that could be locked up to prevent vandals and other miscreants getting access to the ferry.

It would have been simpler and a lot less inconvenient to open the Birkenhead bridge and to leave it open. It would have saved a hell of a lot more money. Not many people would be inconvenienced by that course of action, because the distance to go around at Birkenhead, compared with the distance to go around if living in a community that depends on a ferry for its roadway, is so much less.

Another crazy thing was when the Government stood by senselessly and mindlessly and allowed the rail passenger service through Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend to be closed down without making it possible for the buses that carry people along the same route to go into those towns to allow people to alight or embark, to go from, say, Murray Bridge to Mount Gambier or return. The bus simply did not stop in the town. How many members in this place would put up with a situation where their constituents had a bus service which ran four times a day and which left them six to eight or more kilometres from their homes, even though they live in an urban area? Not too many, I would suggest; they would pretty smartly apply for additional buses to increase the provision of services as well as to extend the routes into the area in which the people were living so that they did not have to walk, at the most, any more than about one kilometre. I have heard other members in this place complain on behalf of their constituents about situations in which people had to walk a kilometre or so along unsealed roads, would you believe—such was the complaint. Yet, most of the roads people have to traverse in country South Australia are unsealed and will never be sealed.

We have problems with very high youth unemployment creating tremendous pressure on law and order agencies, yet we have the pending closure of a police station. There are no police on the Narrung Peninsula, a situation that I hope will be resolved in the very near future. Police presence on the Narrung Peninsula in the community adjacent to Point McLeay and the township of Narrung is absolutely essential. No-one who has lived there and who understands the situation would deny it. Everyone to whom I have spoken, even though they may not live in the district any more, but who have some experience and knowledge of the locality, understands this. It is crazy that the Government should even consider such a proposal.

Let me look at another aspect of the problem, that is, regional development. We know that 27 per cent of the population lives and works in regions outside the greater metropolitan area, yet generate well in excess of 50 per cent of the total exports from our State. There is a lack of planning, of infrastructure provision and of relevant information and opportunities that would easily and successfully make it possible at much less expense to accommodate a greater number of people in the regions than is the case at present.

Government policies that are based on Public Service advice have encouraged the continuation of growth in Adelaide, but that has been at the expense of the regions, including the area that I represent. The State Government Planning Review consists of a body of 45 to 50 experts, all of whom are fully funded by South Australia's taxpayers, including people who live in my electorate, yet regional

South Australia did not have a representative on the Planning Review committee—not one out of those 45 or 50.

The Planning Review is another recent example of the interests of regional South Australians being neglected by a city-based or city-oriented Government taking advice from similarly minded experienced people. I support this Bill, albeit reluctantly, and seek the Government's assurance that it will take heed of what I have spoken about in the course of my remarks, will stop wasting money and will start spending it where it is to be spent responsibly, and allow the regions and the people of communities such as that which I represent at least to maintain a standard of living and a lifestyle that will be for the benefit of all South Australians, since that is where most of the prosperity comes from.

Regional communities are seriously disadvantaged by the Government's present policies and by the services provided. Too often they are concentrated in the metropolitan area. If the Government continues to ignore these pleas made by me and by other members from rural South Australia, it will have demonstrated that it cares more for political expedience than for public interest and statesmanlike necessity.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill. As we all know, this is an administrative procedure that will allow funds to be made available for the Public Service until such time as the budget has been dealt with by this House and by the appropriate Estimates Committees. Of course, everyone knows that the figure mentioned in the Bill is a stab in the dark (or a reasonable assessment, if I can put it that way) in respect of the money required to enable the Government to pay the appropriate accounts until the budget is finally dealt with. This debate is also an opportunity for members to express either concerns or praises, whichever the case might be, at the way in which the Government is heading with its fiscal management. I believe that at this time every member of Parliament should be standing and expressing the views of his or her electorate as to what they think of the situation and of where we are going.

No-one could stand here and say that he or she is proud of where we are going, because of the massive debts that have been foisted upon the Government by some of its statutory authorities. The argument then arises as to whether the Government must accept responsibility for that. It is those debts that worry me. Certainly, they worry my constituents, many of whom believe that we and our children—and, probably, their children—will be obliged to pay for those debts for decades to come. This problem has really arisen only in the past 12 months or two years, although some would argue that it has been building up over a longer period than that. However, the real gravity of the situation is only now coming to the fore, and one could question whether we know what the real implications and seriousness of the situation are. What we do know is that the present generation and the next will be saddled with a financial problem which is not of their own making but which is something they will have to wear because of the irresponsibility of a few people at this time.

Following the opening day, I asked the Clerks of the House to provide me with copies of the regulations pertaining to my electorate at that time and those that would have effect within my electorate. I regret to say that I received a bundle approximately 100 mm thick, which I am not allowed to display in the House, and most of which related to increased charges. These increased charges are the price we as citizens of South Australia must pay because of the problems to which I referred a short while ago. Almost every one of those charges is against business, against the

person who wishes to have a go and against the employee, from the point of view that every increased charge comes at the expense of job opportunities.

One could never quantify exactly where that stands but, because of the downturn in the rural sector, the job opportunities in my own electorate roughly equate to the unemployment figure at the present time. When the rural economy was buoyant, farmers had the funds to buy the extra fencing and extra water reticulation schemes, to buy paint for their sheds, to build new fences and to buy capital improvements. However, the suppliers of those goods are now without a market.

Of course, that filters into the capital city area. Practically no machinery manufacturers are now left in this State. Those who are left are only small timers and, by comparison, are employing only a fraction of the workers they would have employed a few years ago. This is the nub of the problem: we must turn around the emphasis of the Government and its ideology to provide some incentive, some encouragement, and some ability for those who are prepared to work. The Government will not be able to provide job opportunities, given its current direction. Many of the problems related to that are caused by the restrictions, the regulations and those matters to which I have already referred.

The regulations confronting us are many and varied, and some of them are for a good purpose. Some have come about because a very small minority of the community has abused the system and, as a result, regulations must come in and the rest of society must pay. Let us take the instance of an average employee earning, for example, \$20 000. By the time we add WorkCover, and if they are in an employment position of some risk—and in this case I refer to a farmer—the levy could be between 7.5 and 13.5 per cent, which is the highest I have heard so far although, no doubt, other farmers are on higher penalties. There are also occupational health and safety requirements, work safety practices, superannuation, leave loading, long service leave, payroll tax, sick leave and 1 per cent for a levy on training. All these factors add up to about 33 per cent of the value of the wages paid to the average employee. That is without including the income tax component, which comes out of the employee's salary. If we pay an employee a wage of \$20 000, the employer must earn another \$6 000 just to pay all the extra charges and extraneous matters relating to the employment. That means that, before someone can employ another person, the employee must be able to earn for his employer the cost of the wages plus 33 per cent.

Of course, many other industries pay a much higher WorkCover levy. I believe that in the mining industry an employee must earn for his employer three times his salary to be able to justify his employment. These are the issues that this and the Federal Government can address if they are of like mind and wish to work out how to assist industry and how to assist those persons prepared to have a go.

Some might argue that it is the Government's responsibility to create jobs for individuals. I think that in every area where the Government has become involved in employment of a speculative or enterprise nature there has been disaster. The areas that have been mentioned are the Scrimber project, the Timber Corporation, SGIC, the State Bank, and the list goes on; and we are now hearing stories about WorkCover. People with the necessary expertise in the field are available for employment if they are given a reasonable chance to operate. Unless we come to grips with that situation we will not get anywhere.

There has been talk about value-added products. In theory it is great. Everyone would like to think that the raw product produced in this State could be value added before it leaves

our State boundaries or goes overseas. Before that can happen, though, we must have a change in work practices—the very issue to which I have been referring. It is no good—and I refer again to the rural scene—our farmers being the most efficient producers of food and fibre in the world when we have the most inefficient and costly processing sector that one could expect to find. It is a ludicrous situation whereby Australian farmers can produce the raw product that must then be sent overseas to be processed, and then come back to a consumer market within Australia. One could find example after example of where that is happening. It is happening in the agriculture and fishing sectors, and no doubt it is happening in many other areas where a raw or primary product is produced.

I need to draw some scenarios to the attention of the House, just to put that into its correct perspective. Members in this House could be, in the main, wearing suits of a woollen nature varying in price from \$400 to \$600, and some might even cost more than that. The actual raw product component of each of those suits is probably about \$5. So, we could quite conceivably argue that less than one per cent of the manufactured product of the suit that members are wearing would be the price paid to the farmer. When we have such inequalities we must surely wonder where we are going.

We all know that the wool industry has suffered a massive downturn in the past two years, but not one member has bought a suit or ladies outfit one dollar cheaper, even though the raw product has been available at one third of the price or even less than it was just 18 months ago. The same applies to wheat. The wheat price to the farmer has dropped by a third, but the price of a loaf of bread has not dropped. The price of a loaf of bread and a suit of clothing is generated by the manufacturing and distribution costs, which have grown out of all proportion. Unless those matters are addressed, the problem will continue.

Much has been said about the present plight of the rural producer, and that is so because of the inability of the Australian Government to be able to match the subsidies of America, the EEC and Japan. We just do not have the population base to match those markets. However, we must make sure that we are fair in our analysis of this. An Australian manufacturer of motor vehicles is selling motor vehicles overseas cheaper than it is supplying them to consumers in Australia. That scenario will have to be addressed before we get anywhere.

These restraints and scenarios are well documented in today's media coverage of the Federal budget. Much of what happens in the next ten days will depend on the Federal budget that has just been handed down in Canberra. I implore the Premier to make some adjustments so that we can turn around what, I believe, are inequalities in the Federal budget. Page 23 of the *Advertiser* shows a pie chart entitled 'The Budget Pie'; it shows who gets what. Social security and welfare gets 33.9 per cent; health gets 13.5 per cent; administrative service gets 3.1 per cent; defence gets 9.3 per cent; foreign affairs gets 1.8 per cent; public debt is 6.2 per cent; employment is 1.7 per cent; housing is 1.7 per cent; assistance to other Governments is 13.2 per cent; law and order is 1 per cent; culture and recreation is 1 per cent; transport is 1.4 per cent; education is 8.1 per cent; and, industry assistance is 3.6 per cent.

I see nothing there of any real significance that indicates any real consideration for the primary producing or manufacturing sectors. Just about everything I have mentioned goes to the social welfare/community welfare sector. Not for one moment am I suggesting that we should necessarily cut back in those areas. I totally believe that where com-

munity welfare and social welfare is justly deserved it should be paid, and paid without any problem. But, there should be a clamping down on the abuse of services that has taken place so that there can be some equality and redirection of funding back towards the areas where jobs can be created.

I was very concerned that that should be the case; that there was very little or no mention of the agricultural sector in the Federal budget. The Federal budget does nothing to promote the producing sector or to alleviate the current economic crisis. The prediction by the Federal Treasurer of an inflation rate of 3 per cent and an unemployment level of nearly 11 per cent, while at the same time accepting that there could be a 4.5 per cent wage increase, hardly shows that the Government is taking a responsible approach to the recession. The Federal Government has overlooked the fact that, despite lower world exports and lower world markets, the agricultural sector has done more towards addressing the economic crisis than has any other sector within the Australian economy. There was a 9 per cent increase in production and an increase in volume of agricultural exports, and although the net income was down the efficiency of the agricultural sector has been well proven under extremely difficult circumstances.

The Federal budget has done nothing to assist that or to assist the primary producers and the manufacturing sector to be further able to improve efficiency or export competitiveness. Effectively, the Government has done nothing to boost trade, improve foreign debt and the competitiveness of agricultural industries to help keep the farmers on the land. However, the Federal Government did—and I think that this should be recognised—honour an earlier commitment to pay \$31.2 million in 1991-92 to the wheat industry for compensation in respect of the trade sanctions against Iraq. I think the history of that is well known—certainly to the farming sector. The Australian farmers were caught up in the embargoes and sanctions against Iraq at the time of the Middle East War, and much of our wheat had been forward sold and in some cases had even been paid for. That money was sitting in US banks but, because of the sanctions, could not be passed on to the Australian Wheat Board eventually to filter down to the farmers. So, much of that cost has been borne by the farming community, including the loss of interest and money made available to them.

The other matter to which I have been referring is the wrong direction in which I believe the Government is heading. The Federal Government has announced that over \$800 million will be spent in the next five years to improve capital cities. Surely a redirection of that money into the producing sector would give better value for money, create far more jobs and make better use of the existing resources in the country areas. We could better utilise those resources and at least cost to the Government of the day, be it Federal, State or local. All these issues are of grave concern to me. They are of grave concern to the people who are trying to make a go of it, people who are trying to get on with the business of earning a living and creating a better lifestyle, hopefully, for following generations.

My greatest concern at this moment is that the actions of the present State and Federal Governments are saddling our future generations with a debt of immense proportions that they will never be able to work out during their lifetime. As a result of the actions of Governments over the past two or three years, these people will have a commitment for their lifetime. They will never be able to see the light of day unless dramatic action is taken by Governments of the day to ensure that the producing sector, be it manufacturing, primary or any other, has the ability to create

wealth and generate income, thereby creating job opportunities and boosting export earnings—and so the cycle continues. I support the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I support this Bill, with some qualification. I wish to take up the theme of the relevant application of public moneys by the Government of the day, this Government in particular. If the people have entrusted this House, and through this House the Executive Government, with their governance, and if we from them exact dues in the form of taxation, they have a right to expect that their taxation is applied in a manner which is relevant and pertinent to society as it exists today.

In developing that theme, I wish first to touch on the MFP, as have many of my colleagues. Like so many of them, I totally support the vision embodied in many aspects of the concept of the MFP. It is a bold, forward thinking and sharp initiative of this Government which could serve this State well into the decades ahead. If it can be translated from a vision into reality, this Government will deserve plaudits for its action, as I believe will any subsequent Government that takes up the issue of the MFP.

I want to dwell a little on some of the remarks made by the Premier earlier in the thinking on this matter. He stated that the MFP should never be considered 'MFP Gillman'. It was and should always remain 'MFP Adelaide', with the Gillman site being some sort of minor focus. I believe that Adelaide itself—everything about this city and the metropolitan area—was to be part of the concept of the MFP. I and many members of this House would support the Premier in that concept. Therefore, I am worried that, as the thinking about the MFP has developed, the focus seems to have gone back more onto the Gillman site. Those words of the Premier, which I hope were prophetic—that the MFP embraced Adelaide and not just Gillman—somehow seem to have been lost in the information and later bulletins that have come out. The Premier espoused that, if we are to have a multifunction polis and to develop technology in this State, it should encompass the whole of Adelaide and not merely a specific enclave developed on land that is now waste, however good that development in time might of itself prove to be.

For that reason, as a community we should not be focusing entirely on the proposed developments at the Gillman site: in this place and in all public forums we should be giving much more attention to the document entitled '2020 Vision'. Again, I commend the Government for that document. I note that members opposite are very silent today. They are usually vociferous in claiming repeatedly that members on this side do nothing but bucket the Government, but so far today I have done nothing but give the Government credit, and I ask that members opposite note—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is not faint praise: it is sincere praise, and it is properly meant. I believe that '2020 Vision' also does credit to the Government. All members on both sides of the House would acknowledge that there are probably aspects of that document which they would question or challenge or say perhaps do not serve the needs as they perceive them. No document is entirely without fault, but it has vision, promise and shows some flair.

The plans that I saw for the District of Price were stunning. The plans for my own area and, in particular, for Westfield Marion, were absolutely commendable. The only people who seemed to have some reservations about them were the management of Westfield, because the plans seemed to show ponds, lakes and green areas all through their vital retail sector. I suspect that they were not quite clear how

they would make a buck out of a pond and a tree, whereas they know how to do well out of retailing.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: They were caught on the horns of a dilemma. Indeed, the member for Mitchell interjects that perhaps we should have catfish in the ponds. Perhaps we should. We have heard much about catfish in this House—much maligning of catfish—but if members opposite cared to read what my friend and colleague the shadow Minister of Agriculture had to say about catfish, they would find much profound and interesting information. People such as Gallileo were just about burned at the stake or hung for making profound and prophetic statements. Members opposite need to remember that, when people of vision, such as my friend and colleague, put forward a solution which might not be an ordinary solution, they should not be trammelled for their troubles. I have heard some preposterous positions taken by members opposite, but I do not always interject and tell them how silly I think they are.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am asked by the member for Napier—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps we could return to the Supply Bill.

Mr BRINDAL: Certainly, Sir. I think the member for Napier would be embarrassed if I gave an example. Returning to the MFP Adelaide, if all members in this place believe in the concept of the MFP and believe that it can become a reality, they should all get behind the Premier and demand as one in this House that the whole community should benefit from the MFP. I am sure that the member for Mitchell will concur with me when I say that the areas down south would be well served by, and could well serve, any future development of high technology in Adelaide. Our electorates, and the electorates of Walsh and Fisher, are well placed in that a major teaching hospital, one of Adelaide's principal universities and a quickly developing science and technology park, which is currently focusing on the Sir Mark Oliphant building, are sited within or near them.

I remind members on the Government benches, especially the Executive Government, that we do not live in an undeveloped section of Adelaide. We have the infrastructure, the services, the schools, the retail centres and the areas of housing that would be suitable for the sort of redevelopment that might take place in an MFP.

I call upon this Government, if it is genuine about making the MFP concept a reality and developing the concept of MFP Adelaide, to look to the areas south of Adelaide as well as to the Gillman site; it should look to areas such as my electorate and the others that I have named which have teaching hospitals, universities and other facilities already in existence so that MFP Adelaide might become a reality throughout the metropolitan area and might serve the whole community of South Australia, those in the south as well as that small group who will be destined to live in the Gillman area.

In addressing the Supply Bill and the application of moneys by the State, I believe the MFP is relevant because moneys will be applied to the MFP, as we have already heard. I also believe that the structure of government should necessarily be examined in the context of any Supply Bill, as should the responsibility that this House must exercise in seeing that the economy is properly nurtured and developed.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: It is your go now.

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

Mr BRINDAL: As I have said, this Government has a responsibility to nurture the economy so that the economy, on which the Government and the people depend for their income, is properly developed. In that context, I record my abhorrence—and the abhorrence of other members on this side of the House has been recorded—of the present unacceptably high levels of unemployment, especially among our youth. I do not think there is any member in this House, political differences aside, who could view other than seriously the number of young people who may well be for their lifetime consigned to an employment scrapheap because they cannot find a job now and, by the time the economy picks up, they may not be deemed as being suitable for employment. In other words, there could be a group of people who will never work through no fault of their own but because we as a society got the formula wrong at this time in our history.

It is a danger of the MFP—which, I repeat, is a good idea, but every good idea has inherent dangers—to which I would specifically draw the attention of members of the Government that, as the MFP moves us and, indeed, as the developments in society move us towards a high technology society, society in itself becomes imperilled. Members opposite would realise and would claim, probably with some justification, that the union movement had much to do with the creation of a middle class a large proportion of which is based on relatively highly paid production workers and people who are skilled and work at the means of our production. They may claim, I believe with some—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If the honourable member will give me an equal chance in his speeches, I will give him one in mine. As I said, the union movement may claim some credit for the development of a middle class of highly skilled production workers. However, one of the problems with the development of high technology in robotics—and I believe this can be seen very well near the District of Napier in the GMH plant at Elizabeth, which involves high technology and which is very highly developed—is that it now relies less than ever on that very skilled class of worker who was once the backbone of companies such as GMH. At the same time as technology is increasing, the capacity of people to find employment within those high technology industries is decreasing. This is a worry, which I believe Government and all members of this House should start to address; they should consider the possible ramifications quickly.

As technology develops and as there are fewer places in factories for the highly skilled to work, the concurrent development is towards the service industries. Members opposite would know that the service industries have not been traditionally highly paid. The girls on checkouts and the people who do the jobs associated with service industries are not the highest paid. We can see a development of experienced workers and high-tech industries. The people whom those high-tech industries employ will be very well paid. Other people will move into service industries and, if the traditions of our society continue, those people will be comparatively lowly paid.

The danger is that the middle class (and I think it is a proud feature of Australian society that we have not had a huge super-rich class or a huge super-poor class—we have been largely a middle class society) is diminishing and will further diminish, and that the very technology that we seek to employ will, in fact, polarise our society. It will create a group of haves and have-nots. More tragically, it might create an underclass of underprivileged who will be in true need as perhaps has never occurred before in our society. I think that is a serious problem to which all members of

this House should direct their attention. In fact, it is a problem to which all members in all Parliaments in this country should direct their attention.

Members opposite can ask, and quite rightly, what should be done about it. Members opposite can also comment that that was the position of the Luddites—to get in and smash the machines, because the machines were the source of all evil. I am not saying that that is the case or that we can turn back the clock but I am saying that we as a group in this Parliament have a responsibility to the people to examine these matters carefully. If society shifts in that direction, we have a responsibility to ensure that the shift is such as to give maximum social justice to all people in our society. That is an underpinning principle of this Government. We are told that time and time again.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I cannot let that remark go unchallenged. Members opposite say that we are on the wrong side of this House. It is not true to say that social compassion is the prerogative of a Labor Government or of anybody who votes Labor: social compassion is a prerogative of all members of this House. Many great Liberals have been socially compassionate, and they will long remain so. That is perhaps why we, after the next election, may be sitting on the Government benches and not on the Opposition benches.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: There is no doubt, as the member for Napier says, but I will rely on the people to make that decision, and I will not pre-empt their decision. We are asked what we will do about the matter, and I do not pretend to have all the answers. I came here today to share the question with members opposite in the hope that together we can act like a Parliament and come up with some good and decent solutions. I believe one of the solutions is for the Government—and again it is in the context of this Supply Bill—to look at the structure of Government departments. I believe that too often—

Mr Ferguson: What is your policy in relation to this matter?

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

Mr BRINDAL: Too often in the past Government departments have come into being for good and sufficient reason; they have been created because there was a reason for their being created. The problem, once a Government department is created, is that it creates its own reason for being. Further, as any member opposite will know, once a Government department has been created, it is very difficult to get rid of it. It finds a thousands things to do and a thousand more things to do and then finds every reason under the sun why it should never be modified and never cease to exist. In a sense, the Cabinet becomes entrenched, the departments become entrenched, and they jealously guard their power, privilege and personal influence. If we are to address matters which will confront society in the twenty-first century, we must first address matters related to the structure of Government and of the bureaucracies which serve Government. Until we do that we have an entrenched bureaucracy which is looking at a snapshot of society, which is perhaps already irrelevant and out of date and which will not serve the people well.

In that context, I remind members opposite of Ozymandias. If members recall—I know that the member for Napier will, because he was probably travelling with Shelley on this trip—when Shelley visited—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Henley Beach is not going to repeat his interjections. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: When Shelley was visiting the regions of Egypt, he came upon two vast and trunkless legs of stone standing in the desert. Around the vast and trunkless legs of stone was a shattered and half buried face, and for miles and miles around there was nothing but pristine sand. The words on the plinth were very prophetic:

My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:

Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!

I close with that to remind the Government that in days to come all that might be left will be the pyramids of their public servants and little more. I hope that this Government does not lead the people down the same road as those people were led so many centuries ago.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In the time allotted to me I want to address some aspects of the Federal budget as it relates to the State budget because, as the Premier acknowledged in answer to a question put to him this afternoon, the State budget has to be adjusted and amendments made as a result of the Federal budget. I dare say that many amendments will be made to our State budget in the next week, but we will see just what they are in a week and one day.

Unfortunately, critical issues were not addressed in the Federal budget. The most critical issue, which again the Premier acknowledged, was high interest rates. For year after year the rural sector has been suffering worse than most other sectors because of high interest rates. We are seeing up to 80 per cent of rural people—farmers—being declared unviable with the current commodity prices, yet the Government refuses to bring interest rates down any further. In countries, such as Japan, there are interest rates of 3 and 4 per cent and in America about 8 per cent. Few, if any countries, have interest rates higher than 10 per cent. However, we continue with interest rates of 13 and 14 per cent and, with the addition, some 16 per cent. It was a great disappointment to me that the Federal Government refused to address that critical issue. We could look at it as though the Federal Government had said, 'People are falling off the cliff all the time; we shall have to put still one more ambulance down the bottom.' However, it has refused to build a fence around the top of the cliff to stop people falling off. The bandaid measures keep coming.

As well as high interest rates needing to be addressed, the high dollar continues. I acknowledge that some of the high dollar factors are out of our control, but generally speaking the free float of the dollar has been a dirty float. Therefore, we are not seeing the real value of the dollar reflected on our markets.

The third key ingredient is that of high taxation. Again, the Federal Government refuses to tackle this problem. High taxes affect not only the rural areas but the industrial and business sectors and people right across the board. There is little incentive to earn more money because one knows that one will be taxed at 47 cents in the dollar, and company rates are very high as well.

The Federal Government did put forward some of its bandaid measures and I should like to address a few of those which were highlighted in supplementary information provided to me last night. I notice that the assets test has been modified for family payments. The Minister of Agriculture addressed this factor in Question Time today, and

he also addressed the fact that there has been some modification to the assets test for Austudy. I have not had a chance to look in fine detail there, but in the family payments there has been some lowering of the criteria. Therefore, it will mean that some farming families can gain benefits.

I notice that the money for rural counselling programs has been increased for the coming year. We could say that it is about time, because it was highlighted a few weeks ago when the rural counsellor in the Riverland had to close her books because she could not take any more clients. She had been operating beyond her normal capacity and no help was forthcoming. It appeared that no more money was forthcoming, so she closed her books. Therefore, for some weeks new clients have not been able to get rural counselling services. I guess that incidents like that seem to be necessary for the Federal Government to act. At least it has acted in this budget to provide an extra \$2.6 million across Australia. I do not know what share South Australia will get. I guess that it will be relatively small. At least it is an addition. One would hope that in the long term rural counselling will be able to decline, but in the short term it is obvious that it must increase because of the state of our rural economy.

A new scheme to assist business in rural areas was announced. Some \$1.8 million per year for the next three years is to be provided to fund a business adviser for rural areas scheme. I am pleased to see that this scheme would offer advice and assist farmers to establish other enterprises, but it would also assist farmers out of farming. What is the use of providing incentives for farmers to get out of farming and at the same time providing more money through business advisers who say, 'We will try to set you up in some other enterprise', when we have record unemployment at present? The idea is fine, but I believe that we should be doing everything possible to keep the farmers on the land and not allow them to go off in the first instance.

A new rural business extension service is provided in the Federal budget. At long last, the Federal Government is recognising that we are in a recession. I do not know that it has yet used the word 'depression'. Most people in rural areas are using the word 'depression' because they realise that is what we are in. It was acknowledged last month that we are in the worst recession in living memory. In other words, most of us have not experienced a worse period than we are experiencing right now with massive unemployment and a massive depression.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: You heard me at the very beginning say that key things that were supposed to be addressed were not being addressed. I am now looking at the bandaid measures which I accept will prevent some of the blood flowing quite as much as it was. The new rural business extension service will begin operation in 1992-93, so I guess Mr Crean will take credit for it in this budget and again in a year's time when it actually starts operating. The concept is there, and I acknowledge that.

The rural adjustment scheme, involving assistance for farmers, is highlighted in this budget, and \$160 million was allocated in April. I for one and the Opposition as a whole have had a lot to say about the rural assistance scheme, and it is noted that some \$57.5 million has been allocated in the 'Quit the farm' sector (Part C). That is not very nice; it amounts to 39.38 per cent of the total allocation and indicates that the Government realises that a huge percentage of farmers will be allocated to the section 'Quit the farm'. As I said earlier, this should not be the case. The Government should be doing everything possible to keep farmers

on the farm rather than saying, 'Okay, they will have to get off and the sooner they get off the better.'

Mr Blacker: Who will they replace them with?

Mr MEIER: Well said! We are getting fewer and fewer farmers. We need to acknowledge that over the past 10 years we have had a decrease in the farming sector from 20 000 to about 12 000 or 13 000. Now, the Federal Government and members on the other side of this House say that there needs to be a further cut of 25 per cent. I say that there should be no cut at all and that the Federal Government has completely ignored the cries of the farming sector.

The Federal Government is allocating additional money to a rural access program. That is fine. It says that the rural access program will improve access to education, training, employment, health, social and other community services. Surely, TAFE is doing all it can at present. We have a situation in which State Governments are allocating less to health. On the one hand, the Federal Government says, 'We will give money to this access program', but on the other hand the State Governments are cutting funds back.

There is a variety of initiatives in the budget, some of which are old news. I highlight the interest subsidy for wool commission, which was detailed many months ago but has been re-released in the budget. I refer to the payments to grain industry from Middle East losses, which was brought about at the end of last year and refined a little earlier this year, but which is contained in the budget plans. The one positive thing is that land care will be looked at. There are many bandaid measures in the Federal budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I would like to address a subject that was first raised briefly in this House a few days ago by the member for Gilles, who shares the distinction with me of having visited the French city, Montpellier, a multifunction polis by South Australian standards, but a technopolis, or technopole in French. The honourable member seemed to think that the construction in South Australia of a similar type of city, an MFP or a technopolis, would be the answer to South Australia's problems. I am not so sure.

In the United Kingdom between the First and Second World Wars cities called model or garden cities were first envisaged as a solution to the then industrial and slum problems emerging from that 1930 depression period. Welwyn Garden City is one that immediately springs to mind. In postwar United Kingdom the name changed but the principle was still very much the same. A number of cities called satellite cities emerged, essentially across the southern belt of England from Bristol through to the north bank of the Thames. Bracknell and Basildon in Essex are a couple of cities that began as model cities, creating new and much more attractive settlements for people than the bombed out slum areas that had been left as the debris of the Second World War. Integrated within those cities were, of course, emerging industries.

In France, a similar concept has emerged in modern times. Of course, it is nothing new: it is simply a better way of housing and accommodating people adjacent to industry and commerce generally of a more advanced technology than the lifestyle that they had previously experienced and an attempt to prevent long distance travel, which is the bane of everyone's life these days. So, we have in France a wide variety of technopolis, in some cases constructed brand new from the ground upwards, such as Sophia Antipolis, which is just outside Nice. They are really an enhancement

of the design of Technology Park in South Australia, but they are much more sophisticated, with housing accommodation and advanced technological enterprise settling there—just one city with one aim in mind.

In Montpellier we have a different concept, and this is where I find myself at odds with the member for Gilles, who seems to think that he found in Montpellier a formula for South Australia. If one looks around the world at this type of construction, one finds that there is not really a formula. One has to find one's own solution and, while we may model some of our ideas upon those overseas, I suggest that South Australia's ultimate destiny will be to come up with something completely new, something that suits the needs of South Australia.

The MFP at Gillman may not be that solution, because, as I mentioned in my closing remarks—I ran out of time in the Address in Reply—the MFP at Gillman is condemning the northern and southern suburbs of Adelaide to a fairly dismal future. In those suburbs we have a conglomeration of housing with very little industrial concentration. The people there literally have to travel the length and breadth of the city in order to find employment and, of course, in today's financial and economic climate, with very little success. They have high unemployment rates.

At Gillman we are looking to establish a multifunction polis that will not resolve the problems for the northern and southern parts of Adelaide. It will not address the problems of rural South Australia, which has its own element of high unemployment and little or no industry in the majority of cases. Instead, we are looking to establish village settlements with enclaves of intellectual groups that will gravitate towards the specific industries that are designed to be accommodated in those small villages. The numbers of 300 000 down to 50 000 vary tremendously according to which Government publication one reads but, as I said, there is no real formula or recipe.

Whatever we call it, Gillman will not answer South Australia's problems in respect of those housing settlements in the northern and southern parts of the city that are simply crying out for industrial development. I ask the Government to re-think the decision and to decide whether it cannot do two things; first, establish new industry—high tech industry, if designed—in the northern and southern suburbs on the adjacent land that is still unoccupied and undeveloped; and, secondly, look at developing the rural areas of South Australia, such as my electorate of Mount Gambier, which has all the components desirable for settlement in Australia: a sub-mediterranean type of climate, an abundance of water and an intellectual community, many of whom could have gone to university but who have not because of the distance and financial problems experienced by families.

Mount Gambier has a large intellectual pool waiting for technological employment. It has road, rail and air transport and a concentration of industrial road transport second to none in Australia. It has the largest concentration per head of population in the southern hemisphere. It has proximity to the markets in Adelaide and Western Australia, which is a little more remote, but it is certainly closer to the eastern capitals of Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane than it is to Adelaide.

It is ideally placed with power. The interstate power grid is coming through from Victoria to augment the South Australian coal and gas fired power. It also has the recently discovered Katnook gas deposits, which I am quite sure will be further augmented by new finds and which will add a cheaper fuel ingredient to the attractiveness of Mount Gambier as a city in which industry can settle. We have

the Mount Gambier city and district councils cooperating to establish land that has to be available if we are to attract industry, and they are looking to set up designated industrial areas (R1, R2, etc) so that people can look to Mount Gambier and have land readily available.

We have the South Australian Housing Trust, which traditionally has been prepared to cooperate with industry and commerce to provide accommodation on a lease back or purchase arrangement. I suggest that, whatever you look at in Mount Gambier, the aspects are far superior to those at Gillman in Adelaide, and I am purely a parochial, rural, Mount Gambier South Australian when I say that. I have a country electorate that is second to none in Australia in its various attributes. If that policy were to be pursued, it would follow the example set by France, which the member for Gilles never even contemplated.

What the member for Gilles did not realise was that in France and in the United Kingdom, with the idea of setting up satellite towns—metropolises, multifunction polises, technopolises, whatever you wish to call them—decentralisation is a very important key. South Australia has paid little more than lip service to decentralisation. With our multifunction polis concept, we are looking at further centralising in the metropolitan area, the administration centre of South Australia—Adelaide—and neglecting the northern and southern suburbs, neglecting the rural parts of South Australia to which in past decades the Government has repeatedly said, 'We will encourage decentralisation, we will pay subsidies and we will encourage industry and commerce.'

Those baits all seem to have gone by the wayside. You just do not hear of them in either South Australia or Victoria. So, formulas for multifunction polises just do not seem to be on and, perhaps when I have another 10 minutes in a later grievance debate, I can further enlarge upon this idea of Montpellier as an ideal which is to be emulated in many respects but which is in no way similar to the Gillman concept in South Australia.

It is different in so many ways that the member for Gilles completely missed or, perhaps, deliberately ignored—I do not know. However, he is an Adelaide lad and I am a rural South Australian, and I believe that I can put forward a very persuasive argument to the Government to spend on rural South Australia some of that \$12 million that the Federal Government has made available for research, just to examine whether or not we have a very strong alternative concept with regard to the technological enhancement of rural cities such as Mount Gambier.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): During his contribution, the member for Goyder mentioned that there was virtually nothing in the Federal budget to assist rural South Australia or rural Australia. Comments came across the chamber from the member for Henley Beach, and it is unfortunate that he is not here now, because I said that I would respond and tell him some of the things that we would do that are not being done at the moment.

We can look at the situation to which I referred last week, when I indicated to the House that some 27 per cent of the State's population lived in rural areas, yet that 27 per cent contributed something of the order of 50 per cent of South Australia's economy. When we look at the breakup of Government revenue expenditure, we find that 95 per cent is spent in the greater metropolitan area and five per cent in rural areas which, in fact, generate some 50 per cent of the State's economy.

The member for Henley Beach wanted to know what we would do about it. The first thing that we would do would

be to see that the country areas that are producing half of the economy of this State receive a reasonable share of the expenditure by the State Government to provide facilities and to enable country people to be even more productive than they are today.

It is an absolute disgrace to consider that only five per cent of the State's resources available to the Government are spent in country areas. I hope that the member for Henley Beach will take that on board and impress upon his Government colleagues that it is not a fair and reasonable situation. I believed—although falsely—that, because the new Federal Treasurer was formerly the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, he might have had greater insight into primary industries, realising that 50 per cent of the nation's wealth comes from primary industries throughout the country, and that he would have provided some incentives to enable the rural sector to become even more productive.

What the rural sector has been waiting for is a fast track anti-dumping mechanism to enable primary producers, particularly the horticulturalists in this country, to compete on a fair and equitable basis with their competitors overseas. However, there has been no mention whatsoever of a fast track anti-dumping mechanism. As I have said in this House before, I believe that it would be a comparatively simple mechanism to put in place, not in the form of a tariff or subsidy protection but merely in a manner in which, if the Australian Customs Service believes that the local industry is being unfairly disadvantaged, a countervailing duty could be applied and, in the event of the country of origin of the product being able to prove that it was not dumping, the countervailing duty would be refunded.

I see nothing unfair or restrictive in that approach. However, the Federal Government does not seem prepared to go down that path. It leaves the horticultural and agricultural industries with a situation in which they believe that they are being unfairly treated by having to apply and go through a process that takes anything from nine months to a year.

With transport as efficient as it is today, any country wishing to dump can dump all it likes during that period of time, and it is almost impossible for Australia to prove a dumping case against the nation concerned, because the countries of origin make it so difficult for our officials to gain the necessary information. That is why I say that a reverse onus of proof would speed up that process and enable the appropriate action to be taken.

I should like the House to consider the situation of the brandy industry. South Australia originally produced 80 per cent of Australia's brandy, most of which was produced in the Riverland in the electorate of Chaffey. Back in 1972, the Whitlam Government decided to increase significantly the excise, and in the late 1970s the Fraser Government further increased the excise on brandy. Today, Australia produces about one-third of the brandy it produced in 1972, and some 30 000-odd tonnes of wine grapes that used to go into brandy production are no longer required because the industry has been virtually destroyed.

Mr Oswald: The price is four times as much.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As the member for Morphett says, the price is four times as much. Let me just refer to the price. For grapes produced for brandy in Australia, the grower is lucky to receive \$200 per tonne. The Federal Government collects excise of \$2 400 on that tonne of grapes, and that is steadily increasing on a six monthly basis. If anyone in this chamber believes that that is a fair and reasonable approach, with the grower receiving approximate \$200 a tonne and the Federal Government raking off

\$2 400 a tonne, no wonder we are in trouble in this country. If the Government reduced the excise on brandy sufficiently to enable the grower to get \$300 or \$350 a tonne, it would make an enormous difference to the viability of the individual grower, and the reduction in excise to the Federal Government would be very little.

What has happened is that there has been a distinct buyer resistance as a result of the massive increase in brandy excise since 1972, and the collection of excise in real terms has declined by something like 50 per cent. Not only has the Government's revenue declined by 50 per cent but at the same time it has effectively destroyed an industry. There is no market for the grapes. After the last excise increase in the late 1970s the stills at Berri, which was the largest brandy producer in the southern hemisphere, failed to produce a single drop of brandy for four years. In other words, that industry was completely annihilated by the actions of the Federal Government with regard to the level of impost.

Let us look at the imposts on a bottle of brandy and see where that money goes. Of a bottle of brandy that retails for \$16, the Federal Government collects \$7.50 in excise, there is sales tax of \$2.30 and a State Government licence fee of \$1.50—in all, \$11.30 out of a \$16 bottle of brandy goes in some form of tax to the Federal and State Governments. Out of the \$4.70 that is left, the grapes have to be grown, the wine has to be made, the brandy has to be distilled from that wine, it has to mature and be bottled, and there are wholesale and retail costs—yet the consumer pays a retail shelf price of something like \$16. No wonder the industry has been destroyed and we are in such a mess in this country. Until such time as there is some sensible thinking in this country, things will continue to go from bad to worse.

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

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In the short time I have I would like to cover several issues. The first one relates to the transit link to my electorate which was announced this week by the Minister of Transport. I commend him for indicating that next year he will provide a fast express bus service for the Aberfoyle Park/Happy Valley area. At the moment there is a lack of public transport in the area, and I welcome this move for which I have been calling for quite a while. I also welcome the Minister's announcement that he will be extending bus routes through my electorate down to the old part of Reynella. However, I point out that the Government must address, not only for buses but also for cars, the question of access from Darlington to the city. Unless and until the question of the Darlington bottleneck is addressed, there will be congestion not only for buses but also for cars.

I appreciate that with the transit link the intention is to give preference to buses, taxis and cars carrying more than a driver, but the arterial roads system from the south is clogged and is getting worse and action needs to be taken. It could be taken in the first instance in respect of the section that runs from Darlington to Ayliffes Road.

The second point I would like to address relates to the need for police facilities from Aberfoyle Park through to Reynella. I know that the Police Department has land already set aside in Aberfoyle Park. I urge the Government, when considering relocating the Darlington police station, to give serious consideration to establishing a police facility on the land that it currently owns in Aberfoyle Park or, alternatively, in the Reynella area. Either of those locations I believe would be most suitable to provide a better policing facility in the area. That is no reflection on the police but

a reflection on the amount and type of resources with which they are provided.

The third matter I wish to address concerns the Grand Prix which, as we know, has been a successful event in South Australia for many years. As one who has attended the street functions that go with the Grand Prix, I urge the people who are involved in organising it to extend that concept. I am not talking about the car race, but the musical and other activities that occur of an evening. I am not critical of the musical activities that are provided in Hindley Street, but I would like to see the concept broadened so that we could have a wider range of music and drama not only in Hindley Street but in adjacent areas such as North Terrace to cater for a wider audience. I believe that we have the climate for and the interest in such activities. I encourage the people organising the Grand Prix and its associated activities to take that suggestion on board. We have a great opportunity to more effectively utilise the North Terrace/Hindley Street/Rundle Mall precinct for cultural activities associated with the Grand Prix.

The next item relates to the lack of funding for Montessori preschools. As I understand it, at the moment there are about six private preschools in South Australia, including two which are run by Southern Montessori Education Centre Incorporated, and largely through historical developments they are denied funding. I believe that this is an issue that should be taken up by the Government and redressed. I understand that kindergartens or preschools that were operating prior to the establishment of the CSO receive funding, and they are essentially schools set up by church groups. However, there is this anomaly whereby groups such as Montessori and other private preschools do not attract funding. I urge the Government to take up that matter and, in the interests of fairness and equity, consider the situation.

The next issue I wish to speak about relates to a matter which is very close to the heart of the Minister of Water Resources and which concerns the threat to the quality of water in the Happy Valley reservoir. I have raised this issue outside this place before. The Happy Valley reservoir, as we know, supplies approximately half of Adelaide with water but it faces an ever-growing threat from surrounding urban and commercial developments. A bypass system allows street run-off and other stormwater to be channelled around the edge of the reservoir. However, that bypass system was designed years ago to cope with a one in 100 years stormwater situation, and it is now down to less than a one in 20 years capability. Last year the bypass system went close to spilling over into the reservoir.

While I appreciate that the water is filtered and treated with chlorine, the urban development in the Happy Valley basin is putting the quality of that water under increasing threat. I can appreciate why the E&WS Department recently erected barbed wire fencing around the reservoir and planted a buffer zone of trees (for which it is to be commended), but the greatest threat to the quality of the water comes from the possibility of a flash flood. We had a mini one last night, but the potential exists for a more serious occurrence. Potential in that area exists for stormwater with street run-off including motor vehicle oils, leaves, dog droppings and so on to threaten the quality of the water. I urge the Minister and the Government to take that matter on board and do something about it sooner rather than later.

Incidentally, it is not the central thrust of what I am talking about but I ask the Minister to consider adopting a more modern name for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is historical, but it seems a little antiquated and I believe we could come up with a name such as the Department of Water Resources or something similar.

I also want to remind the Government of the need for sporting facilities in the south. The Government would be well aware of the success of the recent league football match down south where South Adelaide was successful against an eastern suburbs team. The match attracted close to 10 000 spectators. It is a matter which is often on the minds of people in the south who feel as though they have missed out, and I urge the Government not to forget the many thousands of people who live south of Darlington. The Government must provide facilities for the expanding youthful population as well as for those who are older, both men and women, and who enjoy sport so that the energies of the young people in particular can be channelled into productive and constructive areas. I believe that would go a long way towards reducing some of the negative behaviour that we see from time to time in some of the suburbs down south.

Finally, I want to refer to teenagers. Members would know of the recent large meetings in my electorate concerning this issue. I have been seeking to have the present anger and concern which exists in the community about a perceived lack of parental rights channelled in a more positive and constructive way so that the present system relating to the control of teenagers can be made to work better. I note that the establishment of a committee to look at some of those aspects is proposed. Parents, children and Government agencies need to be brought together in a way that does not seem to happen now in all situations. It is critical that parents are fully consulted and participate in decisions and procedures affecting their children. I believe that, with some goodwill on all sides, innovative procedures can be adopted so that the present gulf can be breached.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In August this year a headline in the *News* read, 'Huge jump in youth crime'. This is Adelaide, and it is not the sort of headline one would expect to see in a city which is supposed to have good government, a Police Force in control of things and a court system which has everything under its control. The reality is that some of these things do not exist in this State.

We have a situation now where juvenile crime is out of control, and that is because the courts are tied in the way in which they are able to handle juvenile offenders. We have a situation which is quite intolerable, where the Senior Judge of the Children's Court announced in the media that he felt powerless to do anything about the increasing number of children coming before him. A Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Amendment Bill has been introduced into this House on two occasions, but on each occasion it was withdrawn. When it was first introduced, there was such a furore in the community that the department hastily withdrew it, as occurred with the community welfare legislation, because of the problems associated with it.

We have legislation on the statute book that is not effective. We have a Government that is not effective in doing something about amending that legislation. It is interesting to see that the Government intends to move a motion to form a select committee which will meet over the next 12 to 18 months and which will look at the whole question of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, the administration of the Children's Court and other associated matters. When that motion is moved, I will have ample opportunity to develop my arguments in favour of the need for such a select committee.

As legislators, we must ensure that we have a system in this State whereby juvenile crime is not out of control.

When reading the report of the Federal budget in the *Advertiser* this morning, I went straight to the section on unemployment, particularly youth unemployment. To help this situation, we need to do something about the high levels of unemployment in this State. It is a tragedy that the South Australian police are able to publish figures showing that, in March this year, juveniles accounted for up to 50 per cent of break and enter offences relating to shops. That is an appalling figure. Other figures available from the police indicate that 32 per cent of break and enter offences relating to dwellings were committed by juveniles, and 45 per cent of all break and enter offences were committed by juveniles.

Juveniles were responsible for 51 per cent of motor vehicle thefts yet, when we examine the records of the Children's Court we see, for example, that one child was charged with six offences of motor vehicle theft and a further six offences of break and enter but was placed on a bond with supervision by the Department for Family and Community Services. The supervision aspect of that bond is non-existent; no supervision is provided by the department. I am pleased to see that one of the terms of reference of the select committee refers to this area and I have raised this issue on countless occasions in this place.

We should also be concerned about property damage; 40 per cent of all offences involving property damage are committed by juveniles. We must ask ourselves why it is that children are roaming the streets and causing this damage. Much of it must be sheeted home to the family unit. The member for Fisher referred a few moments ago to the concern in the community about the rights of parents. It is true that the rights of parents have been eroded by this socialist Government, which has an obsession that parents do not nowadays seem to be able to discipline their children.

On many occasions I have received telephone calls in my office from mothers in particular who say that they do not know what to do. They do not know whether they can smack their child for what the child has done. The child might have abused its parents and sworn at them, using all the obscene words in the world, and the mother might have put up with it for months, not knowing whether she can do anything about it. While we have that situation in this city, perpetuated by the attitude of some departmental officers, we will not have discipline in households, and it is left to the police to implement their own form of discipline. The police are restricted in their resources and are finding it extremely difficult to step in and fill the gap for the parents in the home situation.

I am pleased to be able to add to what the member for Fisher said, that a support group is currently being set up. Much work has been put into it, particularly by a lady who lived in the country but now lives in Adelaide. She has the names of several women who feel that they have not received the support they deserved from the department, and they will rally together and give themselves the appropriate support in dealing with the department when their children are difficult.

One example comes to mind of a 13-year-old girl who had been chastised by her mother for getting drunk in Hindley Street. The child was vitriolic; she left home but went back and in the end the mother was forced to strike her, but the department stepped in. That is an atrocious situation. Parents have every right to provide discipline and set standards in their household, but it is not being done. I will support the parents so that this can happen.

I saw an interesting television program about two or three weeks ago concerning a young would-be offender who was taken around Pentridge for a day. It is a scheme in Victoria whereby youths go into prison in the morning, they spend

all day supervised by a police officer, except for one hour which they spend in a cell and, at the end of the day, they are counselled by a police officer and they leave. During the day, they are taken to the exercise yard in which there are various long-term prisoners to whom they actually speak. The prisoners tell the youths exactly what conditions are like. To be quite frank, the prisoners scare the hell out of them. The youths are confronted in the yard by homosexuals who make suggestions to them. The police later point out what would happen to them if they were left in the gaol for any length of time. They see the conditions that they will live under.

It is pleasing to note that none of the youths who were interviewed on that television program has re-offended. If any members saw the interview, they will recall how cocky one particular lad was when he went in and how subdued he was when he came out. In the interview he said there was no way he would offend and do anything that would cause him to be put into Pentridge.

In November last year, I floated this idea in the House; I referred to it as the 'JOLT scheme', which I had heard of when I was in New Zealand, where it was apparently quite successful. The Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services, John Dawes, took it upon himself in the press to discredit what I was suggesting. In fact he said that the scheme had been well researched and thoroughly discredited. He may think it has been thoroughly discredited, but I can tell members that it is now one of the most successful schemes in Victoria; one that I would encourage the Government to think about.

There is nothing more sobering for a young fellow who is used to stealing motor vehicles, who's getting very close to going into prison, who's nearing that magic age of 18 years of age, and who has been through the Children's Court system and constantly getting bonds for supervision, than being trotted out to Yatala to spend the day there. I can guarantee that, once those youths have been counselled by a senior officer at Yatala and spent a day wandering around to see what is in store for them, many of them will think twice about it.

The Government should take on a bit of lateral thinking. It should do something new and imaginative: it should not hide behind the select committee and wait for it to provide all the ideas. We can do something about the absolute overrun of juvenile crime in this State at present.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I get somewhat annoyed when I think about the financial plight of the State Government and the missed opportunities for the State Treasury to earn more money than it is earning. I received a letter from a friend of mine who is a sharebroker and who would not mind my reading it to the House. He said:

On 30 July 1991 my nose and undoubtedly every other South Australian broker's nose were put out of place once again by a Government instrumentality.

SGIC for the second time in two months has opted to sell a large parcel of South Australian Brewing Holdings Limited through eastern States or overseas backed brokers.

This time just 13.1 million shares were sold at \$3.14 each, totalling \$41 134 000. Again South Australia missed out on:

- (a) Stamp duty (charged under State legislation at 30c per \$100 payable both by buyer and seller) \$246 804
- (b) Brokers in South Australia (brokerage at a discounted rate of .5% payable by both buyer and seller) \$411 340

... I am getting a complex by being a good State tax paying South Australian. I'm thinking maybe I should move interstate to try and pick up some South Australian business! Please add these comments to the previous correspondence ...

On 5 June the writer, David Baker, wrote to me, and said:

I do get a little jaded with our present State Government and its so-called departments. Firstly SGIC wish to sell 36 million

shares in South Australian Brewing Holdings Ltd. Guess which brokers get the order? One Victorian and two overseas backed brokers, but wait for it—at the time of the transactions the market price of South Australian Brewing was \$3.09. Guess at what price these were sold?—\$2.73. Maybe the persons responsible at SGIC believed Adelaide brokers were not capable of selling such quantity. I believe we could have easily completed these sales if we were given the chance. I also believe Blind Freddy would have had no trouble at the tremendous discount to market at which these shares were sold.

If I remember rightly, the South Australian Brewing Company shares hit \$3.50. I cannot for the life of me understand why SGIC sold the shares at \$3.09, even though it was a large parcel of shares. In all, SGIC has disposed of some 39 million shares in the South Australian Brewing Company, and that has forced their price down by some 30c per share. The local investors who had been loyal to the South Australian Brewing Company would be a little disappointed to see that SGIC had to dispose of those shares and the impact that that has had on the price. The letter continues:

Secondly SAFA yesterday decided to sell 21 per cent of SAGASCO another South Australian company equal to approximately 42 million shares. Right again—an overseas broker gets 40 million to sell, but this time the State Bank brokers get approximately 2 million to sell—the other South Australian brokers are completely forgotten—in this case only a small discount to market—\$2.12 against \$2.30—Adelaide brokers would have had to make three telephone calls rather than two in the case of South Australian Brewing.

Thirdly, the State Government Stamp Duties Department misses out.

In the case of

- (i) South Australian Brewing \$589 680 36 m × \$2.73 × (60c per \$100)
- (ii) SAGASCO \$508 800 40 m × \$2.12 × (60c per \$100)

So, we can see that by placing those sales outside South Australia State Treasury has missed out on over \$1.25 million plus, of course, the brokerage that would have gone to the sharebrokers who employ South Australians. There is something wrong in this State when the State Government will not support local business. However, when it comes to building up the credibility of this State, we want South Australian companies to support us.

I can fully understand why David Baker is quite prepared to stand up and be counted. He wrote to me and asked, 'Hey, what is going on?' Here is somebody who wants to do the right thing for South Australia. He may be representing his own business, but if the business had gone to any other South Australian sharebroker David would have been happy. However, the crux of the issue is that the State Treasury has missed out on \$1.25 million. That is \$1.25 million that we could have done a lot with: we could have saved the Camden Primary School, which the Minister of Education seems to be hell bent on closing. It is a school that is viable.

I will now draw the attention of members to exactly what the Education Department is up to in the West Torrens cluster in the western suburbs area. Earlier this year, the western region put out a report on various schools. The report advised the local school communities that the capacity of the Torrensville Primary School was 200 students, current enrolment was 148 and 51 per cent of the students attending that school were on the free book scheme.

In other words, they had a school card. It costs \$3 862 per annum to educate each student at that school. The Cowandilla school has a capacity of 380 students with 269 students enrolled. Some 49 per cent were free students. The cost of educating students there was \$3 821 per annum. The Netley Primary School in my electorate has a capacity of 450 students. The current enrolment is 182, 25 per cent were on the free list, and the cost of educating a student there was \$3 357—a significant drop.

The Plympton Primary School, which used to be in my electorate but is now in the electorate of Walsh, has a capacity of 320 students with a current enrolment of 179; 30 per cent were free students, and the cost of educating a child there is \$2 827 per annum. The Camden Primary School, which has a capacity of 220 students, has been on the present site for about 15 years and has a current enrolment, according to this report, of 201 students, but it is more like 220. It is almost up to capacity. Only 16 per cent of the students are on the free list and it costs \$3 155 per annum to educate each student.

The Thebarton school has a capacity for 230 students. It has an enrolment of 112, 75 per cent of those students are on the free book list and the cost of educating a child there is \$4 862 per annum. The Richmond Primary School has a capacity of 250 students. Only 121 students were currently attending or enrolled, 32 per cent were on the free book list and the cost is \$3 338 per annum. The Torrensville and Thebarton schools are to merge to form one school. If they merge, the current enrolment on the Torrensville site will still be only 260 students and about 60 per cent of those students will be on the free book list. The Government has opted out and wants to close the Thebarton school and merge it with Torrensville.

The Richmond school, which has 121 students, is to remain because of the special education arrangements with Ashford. The Government is suggesting that Camden Primary School, which is viable, should be closed and relocated on the Plympton High School site. The students will have to go another 600 metres or more and cross two very busy and dangerous roads to attend a high school campus. It is not on to ask primary school students in the reception and first, second and third years to go to a high school campus—

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

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I intend to concentrate most of my time allocation for this debate on looking at this Government's disgraceful failure to recognise the funding needs of the Flinders Medical Centre and, if time permits, I will also refer to the much debated multifunction polis. The southern and south-western suburbs had a population of only 174 000 in 1966, and we have seen that population grow dramatically. In fact, by 1986 it had grown to 280 000 and it has a projected population growth of 324 000 by 1996. It is understandable, therefore, that it is important that the area has a medical facility to serve the needs of that growing and final population total.

The Flinders Medical Centre, as some members may recall, opened in the early 1960s when the South Australian Government, under the fine leadership of the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, recognised the need for a new hospital to serve those growing communities in the southern and south-western suburbs. The first phase of the hospital, which included teaching and research facilities, was opened on 26 February 1975 by Sir Mark Oliphant with the second phase of the centre becoming operational in 1976. In fact, the first patient was admitted on 6 April that year. The phase included, among other things, 320 beds and outpatient facilities. The third phase of the centre, with an additional 180 beds, was completed in early 1978. The fourth and final phase, which was planned to contain a further 200 beds, was cancelled in the late 1970s by that fine Dunstan Government Administration. Now, in the 1990s, we have a 500-bed hospital to serve that growing metropolitan area.

I should like to draw the attention of members to some interesting aspects of the report of the Public Works Committee of 23 June 1976 entitled 'Flinders Medical Centre

Development—Phase IV'. Members should recall that this is the phase that was cancelled by the Dunstan Government. The report, in part, states:

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

Secondly, much of phase IV consists of new developments, and it is because of the essential introduction of new treatment facilities which will be invaluable to the southern areas of Adelaide.

Thirdly, there has been a commitment from the beginning to provide the Flinders University with clinical facilities for its medical school with a current intake of 64 students per annum. Again, by accepted standards, this would justify the provision of some 700 beds.

I remind members that that 1976 report states that Flinders Medical Centre would need 700 beds. Today it has only 500 beds. The problem manifests itself further. I have a draft paper, dated May 1991, entitled, 'Flinders Medical Centre—Feasibility Study to Upgrade the Accident and Emergency Department'. I also received with that paper a summary document dated 15 August 1991 entitled, 'Accident and Emergency Department Upgrade'. It is appropriate that I read into the record part of that document to enable members, particularly Government members, to understand the problems now manifesting themselves there from that very short-sighted cancellation of phase IV of the Flinders Medical Centre. The document states:

As a result of the cancellation of phase IV of the development plan for Flinders Medical Centre, the Accident and Emergency Department is now quite inadequate to meet the needs of the southern urban region of Adelaide. It has reached a point where the provision of emergency services at FMC is seriously hampered by the lack of adequate facilities.

With 57 000 patients attending the Accident and Emergency Department each year, it is as busy as the Royal Adelaide Hospital A&E Department and receives approximately 12 000 more patients annually than the Queen Elizabeth Hospital A&E Department. Yet despite this activity FMC has only 17 treatment cubicles compared with 25 cubicles at RAH and 24 cubicles at the QEH. In terms of overall facilities, our A&E Department is approximately 40 per cent smaller. The major deficiencies of the existing A&E Department have been identified and addressed in a detailed feasibility study.

That was the feasibility study to which I referred earlier. The document continues:

The proposed development will provide the following much needed facilities:

- 25 treatment cubicles; eight more than are currently available.
- separate and fully equipped waiting and treatment facilities for paediatric patients. This is recommended in the Accreditation Guidelines set down by the Australian Council on Health Care. Twenty-two per cent of all A&E attendances at FMC are paediatric patients.

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, if one looks at the Notice Paper for Thursday next, item 8 seems to deal precisely with this matter.

The SPEAKER: There is a notice of motion on the upgrading of emergency services. I ask the honourable member to restrict his comments to the upgrading of emergency services at Flinders Medical Centre.

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, I was simply reading a document into the parliamentary record—not following the lines advocated by the motion. I was simply putting the facts on paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is instructing the honourable member that reference to a matter listed on the Notice Paper is out of order. I ask the honourable member to bear in mind that notice of motion, which refers to money needed to upgrade emergency services at the Flinders Medical Centre. The Chair considers that the honourable member still has a lot of scope on this subject.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The summary states further that the proposed development would provide:

a single medical/nursing work area to observe all adult patient cubicles, thereby eliminating the need to divide staff resources; additional resuscitation room facilities allowing up to four patients to be resuscitated simultaneously.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I thought you just made a ruling on this matter and that under Standing Order 118 you asked the honourable member not to refer to that document.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will again say to the honourable member that he must take notice of the Notice Paper and not pre-empt the debate on that matter. I ask him once again to stay away from the point raised in the notice of motion, which refers to money needed for upgrading emergency services at Flinders Medical Centre.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is interesting, and I think the Flinders Medical staff will find it interesting, to see members of the Government jumping up and down trying to stifle this sort of information being read onto the parliamentary record.

Mr FERGUSON: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is reflecting on members of the Government. I ask you to rule on this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member did comment on members of the Government taking certain action in the debate. I do not uphold the point of order as I do not believe that there was a reflection in what the honourable member said.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The point is that phase IV of the Flinders Medical Centre should not have been cancelled by the Dunstan Government.

Mr FERGUSON: I take a further point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 118, which provides:

A member may not refer to a debate on a question or Bill of the same session unless that question or Bill is presently being discussed. With the indulgence of the House, however, a member may allude to such a debate by personal explanations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair can read. I still do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member was referring to a decision taken by a previous Government. As I recall, he referred to a decision taken in respect of the hospital by a Government of some time ago.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Government is obviously ashamed of its record. It is ashamed to have these points brought out.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): In the short time available to me in this debate tonight I want to raise a number of issues, particularly regarding national parks in South Australia. I am pleased that the Minister for Environment and Planning is in the Chamber. Last week, in answer to a question from the member for Henley Beach, the Minister was very critical of a key issue statement on the environment released by the Leader of the Opposition and me dealing with matters and issues that needed urgent attention. This document is not meant to be a policy document—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, if the Minister had read the preface prepared by the Leader of the Opposition, she would have realised that it was made perfectly clear that this is not a policy document but is intended to bring about further discussion in the community on a number of issues that the Opposition sees as extremely important and needing urgent attention.

At that time, the Minister stated that she was concerned about what we said in that statement. This suggested that the Opposition had a total lack of knowledge of what was happening in national parks and, indeed, in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Minister went on to share with the House a couple of statements from the newspaper. The first statement to which she referred was that the Opposition had said:

Too many parks staff have to spend too much of their time behind desks and are not in the field managing the environment. I interjected at that stage. I bring again to the attention of the House the true facts about this situation. On a number of occasions, the Minister has reminded the House that currently about 17 per cent of the State comes under the parks system. The Minister quite rightly is proud of that fact, just as when I was Minister I was pleased to be able to add to the number of parks, but there has been a significant increase in the number of parks and reserves proclaimed recently. That is fine: I want to make that quite clear. I think that would be a bipartisan approach, but the concern that I and members of the Opposition have is that, while all that land is dedicated under the parks and reserves system, we are not able to provide appropriate management for those areas.

Time and time again it has been brought to my attention—and, I am sure, to the attention of the Minister—that there is considerable concern in the community about the fact that, regrettably, we, the Government or the department that has the responsibility, have not been provided with sufficient resources to enable the appropriate management of those areas. If the Minister had spent the time that I have spent recently—and I am sure she has—talking to park rangers and visiting parks, she would have to realise that many very dedicated people who work in the National Parks and Wildlife Service are concerned—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister asks why we are attacking them. Let me make it perfectly clear, as we have in our statement, that we are not attacking the rangers and the staff of the national parks, but we are very critical of the lack of resources provided by the Government to enable them to get on and do their work.

We will continue to be critical, because I know the situation in respect of morale in national parks, and it is not very good. There is concern because so many of them who are very well trained as park rangers are forced to spend much of their time in their offices. The Minister cannot deny that these people, who should be out managing the parks, are forced to stay behind their desks, filling out forms, preparing reports and everything else. There is very real concern about this matter and, if the Minister does not recognise it, regrettably, it would show that she is not keeping in touch with those people responsible for that position.

The Minister has also spoken about the fact that the Opposition suggested that the rangers and those involved in the parks do not have time to do a lot of work. I have already mentioned that. The Minister suggested that we have been critical of the numerous friends of the parks groups because we have said that it would be appropriate to appoint coordinators to help those people with the tasks they have taken on. I believe that in time to come we will recognise that we must lean more and more on volunteers. I do not think that anyone would deny that. If that is the case, I should have thought that we would have bipartisan support for those 6 000-odd people who are prepared to go out and help in the parks, but it is not just—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There is a lot of mirth from members of the Government. I think that the Minister—but not the backbenchers opposite—realises just how serious this situation is and how much concern is in the community about the lack of support for national parks. I would go so far as to say to the Minister that the Opposition recognises the problems in being able to increase the staff significantly. I do not think that we are able to do that, but it is a matter of determining priorities.

In an excellent publication of investigative journalism called 'Reflections' that has just been released by the University of South Australia—and I hope that the Minister will have taken the opportunity to look at this—under the heading 'Land management is key to protecting Australia, say university scientists'—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I should be very happy to make this available to the Minister. I want to quote what is said in the publication about the national parks situation. Dr Robert Sharrad is a member of the State Government's Native Vegetation Authority, and I suggest that he reflects the feeling of many people in the community when he says that Government and private spending on conservation must increase. The article states:

We're spending about 10 million dollars a year on the South Australian national parks . . . That's roughly what we spend on a single large high school. A budget that size to run areas bigger than many European countries is futile. The weed control budget in the NPWS would be taken up by just one weed eradication program in a medium-sized park . . . and we have more than 200 parks.

I believe that the Government and the community must recognise the difficult situation we face in this State. For the Minister to be critical of members of the Opposition putting forward practical ideas in respect of improving park management is totally inappropriate. I suggest with some considerable force that the Minister and the Government determine priorities to ensure that the goals in respect of conservation measures are reached.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to say one or two things about the national parks in this State, and I want to quote from a letter I received yesterday from Dr Sprigg, a constituent of mine from Arkaroola. He states:

We have plenty of goats to give away. Invasions from across our borders, of course. Our shooters can scarcely keep up. With populations capable of almost doubling each year this means probably 80 000 to be disposed of in the ranges each year, just to maintain the *status quo*.

Unfortunately, most of those goats come from the national park. The letter continues:

Why not give the Aborigines more incentive?—a subsidy for roundup for export and/or pet meat industry?

That is a particularly wise suggestion, because—

Mr Ferguson: Private enterprise should get into it.

Mr GUNN: Unfortunately, if the member for Henley Beach knew anything about the subject he would be aware that people are prevented from going in and shooting them in national parks. His knowledge on this subject, as on many others, is particularly limited. The other matter to which I want to refer in relation to national parks—and I will give members the opportunity to take a decision on this—is that the time has long since passed when the Country Fire Service should be involved in bushfire control and feral reduction in national parks. In view of the ongoing difficulties that have arisen in this area, it is my intention to introduce into this Parliament a Bill to do a number of things. The first is to allow the Director of the Country Fire

Service the total authority to control and manage fires in national parks. Secondly, a careful program must be drawn up to administer controlled burning in national parks.

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

Mr GUNN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I discussed briefly the need for improvements in the management of national parks, particularly the control of feral animals, the need to have an effective fuel reduction program of controlled burning and, in selected cases, controlled grazing. This occurs in many overseas countries and it is something that ought to be put in place in this State. It would save a great deal of effort and money, and would greatly enhance the regeneration of national parks.

On an earlier occasion I indicated my desire to introduce legislation into Parliament to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Country Fire Service Act so that these matters could be put into effect. I believe that local people best know how to manage parks in their area and what should be done to protect those parks against the ravages of bushfire, therefore saving those communities a great deal of time, effort and money. I hope that the Government will accede to my request. There are many examples of where, if there had been adequate fuel reduction programs, a number of bushfires would not have occurred.

Another matter I want to refer to briefly tonight is the question I raised with the Minister of Transport last week in the House concerning the proposed charges for trucks that the Commonwealth and States have agreed to under the new regulations. My concern is that the transport industry in this State will be penalised; that people living in isolated parts of South Australia who rely on their goods to be transported by road will have to pay more in freight. Whatever charge is levied on trucks, whether that be the large commercial operator or the small operator, at the end of the day the consumer will pay.

In this case consumers who live in isolated parts of the State will pay more for the goods and services that they need for their daily lives. When these people send produce to the markets they will pay again, so really they will be paying twice. I am of the view that the charges that are imposed on the trucking industry and the long suffering motorist are high enough now. In fact the charges are becoming a burden on society. I do not believe that we should impose any more restrictions, regulations or charges on these people. It is purely a grab for revenue by Government put forward by bureaucracies that have a desire to expand their sphere of influence and control. I do not believe that these proposals are necessary.

I seek from the Minister a clear and precise analysis of how these charges will apply. There is a considerable amount of concern in the community that only a limited amount of information has been made available. I believe that the Government, which has agreed to this package even though I understand it was with some hesitation, ought to advise the Parliament how these charges will apply. I think that people should know what is in store for them so that they can make constructive and well-considered representations to the Government which, hopefully, will attempt to alleviate wherever possible these new imposts that are liable to flow on across the board.

People in my electorate rely on road transport. They do not have a rail service, and goods have to be carted very long distances. Freight rates are far too high, anyway. Many of the people involved in this industry face severe difficulties because of the high cost of purchasing new rigs and because of other restrictions that have been placed on them.

Every time someone gets in a truck an army of public servants and officials descend upon them with a vengeance. Recently there has been a new spate of vigilance against the trucking industry by Highways Department inspectors, for what reason I do not know. To me, there does not appear to be any logic in what they are doing. I believe it is time that senior departmental officers took another look at the situation and brought these inspectors back into line.

The last matter I want to raise is the reference in the Governor's speech to amendments to the Barley Marketing Act. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will consider that matter very carefully before he proceeds. There is continuing controversy in relation to barley marketing arrangements. The existing Barley Marketing Act and the Barley Board have served the barley industry very well over a long period. No-one would object if there needs to be fine tuning and some changes to keep abreast of modern technology and modern marketing. I know of no barley grower who would object to that.

What they strongly object to is having a decision inflicted upon them without the Government or its representatives taking the trouble to consult them. The Government is virtually saying, 'This is what you will have whether you like it or not.' Barley growers cannot wear that, and I do not believe that Parliament will wear it. The best thing that the Minister could do, if he wants to settle the matter once and for all, is conduct a poll of barley growers. Before the Minister proceeds with amendments to the Barley Marketing Act, I ask him to determine whether board members should be selected or elected, or whether it should be a combination of both. The Minister should then conduct a poll of barley growers in this State to decide the matter once and for all. In my view that will save him many of problems, and it will save a lot of controversy in the industry.

As I understand the situation, a Bill to amend the Barley Marketing Act to impose selection to the board by a committee will not be accepted in another place, and therefore the Minister is wasting his time and causing undue conflict. I believe that the Barley Board still has a most effective role to play in marketing. I support orderly marketing, as I support the continuation of the Egg Board. I will certainly not vote to abolish the Egg Board because it is not in the interests of my constituents and the people of this State. Also, I am concerned about the attacks that have been made on the Milk Board.

If Bi-Lo and other supermarkets are successful in getting rid of marketing boards, they will not worry about the consumers in the months to come. They will select some other group. I believe that orderly marketing and statutory marketing boards, as long as they are run efficiently, serve the consumer and grower very well. They bring stability to the marketplace, particularly in difficult economic times, and they ensure that the growers receive a reasonable return for their effort.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Tonight I want to talk about the impact of the Federal budget and the way it will affect South Australians. When we look at the Federal budget we can be very disappointed because it leads us nowhere. We can also be somewhat content that the Treasurer has not taken extraordinary risks. However, he has lost an enormous opportunity to create the change that this country needs. I will look at taxation reform, because that seems to be the area which will bedevil

the next Federal election and which will prevent real reform of the taxation system in this country.

There are two elements which I would have loved to see in the budget and which I think most Australians would have wanted to see in the budget: taxation reform and industrial reform. Whether it be on the basis of the approaches that have been made by the trade union movement or whether it be in the proposition put up by the Liberal Opposition, I am not too fussed, but I think somewhere in the middle there is a vehicle to change the face of this country. However, we have not seen anything.

Because the Prime Minister is absolutely petrified that he cannot last another term unless he batters the Opposition, he is losing the opportunity for real reform in this country. He is not taking the path which we would expect of a Prime Minister who is in very difficult circumstances. The country is bleeding. The country is falling apart with unemployment levels tipped to reach 10.75 per cent and one million people out of work. The Treasurer and the Prime Minister have determined as a strategy that there shall be no reform, steady as she goes, and hope like hell at the end of the day that everything will be all right. That is simply not good enough.

We as a country have to grow up. We have to get together to sort out the problems rather than taking political stances. Let us be quite frank: the Leader of the Opposition (John Hewson) would be absolutely delighted if the Liberal Opposition's policy on taxation were adopted. It would not concern him that the Labor Party had taken it up and used it for the betterment of the system and for Australia as a whole. He would have been delighted. He is not interested in the politics of the matter; he is interested in improving the lot of this country. Yet, in conjunction with Treasurer Kerin, Prime Minister Hawke has determined that this is a political opportunity to bash the Opposition around the ears, and that will be the main means by which they will try to win the next election. Elections are not won on that basis, and it is about time the Prime Minister understood that. Given the present statistics, if he embraced some of the far reaching policies of the Liberal Opposition, he would go a long way to shoring up his own position and making the next election a real contest, but he has not done that.

I will mention the goods and services tax very briefly as part of a package of overall reform. All members in this House and in the Federal Parliament have said that Australia must produce more quickly, more efficiently and better to compete with the rest of the world. Indeed, the goods and services tax provides such a means, because those items which are shipped overseas are free of a goods and services tax. Of course, those sold in the home economy bear the goods and services tax. Our producers would have a better than even chance of competing on an international level, as do most of the producers in OECD countries. Our exporters are starting with their hands tied behind their back.

One of the frightening things about the present statistics is the lack of investment and confidence in this country. Indeed, when you are down, you tend to get kicked. Overseas investors are looking at the performance of the Australian economy and asking, 'Can we invest in this country given the performance we have seen?'

I referred to this issue in my contribution to another debate; I questioned the confidence in this State and the confidence of people to invest in such areas as the MFP. It is a confidence which must come from within to change Australia's future. If one looks at the figures, one sees that a decrease in investment over the next financial year is predicted. Regarding the non-dwelling sector and plant and equipment, we are talking about an average decrease in

investment of 12 per cent overall at a time when Australia needs that investment more than it has ever needed it before.

We did not see an incentive in the budget for people to invest more in this country or in this State in those enterprises where we need money. We need the money for plant and equipment and to produce more quickly and better, as I said. Real opportunities could have been provided in this budget. Even if the Prime Minister and the Treasurer could not bring themselves to the point where they could embrace a goods and services tax as a fundamental change in our taxation structure, at least they could have addressed the real problem of investment in this country. Unless we start to turn around those figures overseas investors will deny us. They will simply refuse to put their money into Australia, because they do not believe that we can perform. As I said, once you are down, someone is just as likely to kick you, and that is what we will get—a whopping big kick from those people who have previously put their money into Australia, because they lack the confidence that we need to get this country on the road again.

Whilst it was a 'steady as you go budget', it was a budget that did not try to pump prime, and I believe that is the right way to go. For that I do give credit to the Treasurer and the Prime Minister. However, it lacked that certain ingredient that, within six or nine months, will galvanise the economy to some level of improved productivity. We have not seen that, and I am very disappointed. Unless investment in key areas is improved—and that is the nub of the whole future of this country—we will continue to slide down the standard of living ladder which we have dropped down rung by rung over the past 10 years, but particularly in the past five years.

I attended a budget briefing breakfast at which one commentator said that the OECD countries now have a measure whereby they look at performance. They take into account such things as effort in terms of the environment, the input of the social security system and the effectiveness of production cycles—all those elements that make up a total economic community. They provide a rating for all countries that make up the OECD. We thought we were a lot further down the ladder, but three years ago we were rated about tenth. Two years ago we were rated 14th but last year we were rated 16th. We have actually slipped six positions on this all embracing chart in the past two years. That is a horrifying thought.

I believe there are possibilities for industrial reform. If our trade union movement could forget that it ever saw or talked about the Swedish movement, we would have a basis for reforming the industrial system in this country. The trade union congress in Sweden has just taken that country down the path to diminished performance. That is particularly so with respect to the past 10 years. If we can get away from the barriers that have been set up between labour and management and really address the fundamental needs—in fact, at the workplace level it is employer and employee making those arrangements that will assist each other—Australia, and South Australia, can become very rich, and everyone will see it as being in their best interests to work hard and to produce in the most efficient and effective fashion.

There were opportunities in this budget for real reform, and this is the time to do it. It is a bit like the Crows football team: they are starting off slowly, but they will have to make changes. If they make fundamental changes now, they will be a great team within two years. However, if they stay with the same players and play the same game, they

will be also-rans for the next three to five years. We can take up the challenge now. We can change the way we do it. I am not fussed if the Labor Government here or in Canberra actually embraces our policies, because I am an Australian first and I want to see change.

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

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I want to make a contribution as a direct rebuttal to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in this debate. I sometimes have a chuckle when I hear some naive members of the Opposition suggest in this place that compassion towards the ordinary people in our society is not confined to members on this side of politics but is shared by members opposite. Any card-carrying member of the Liberal Party who holds that view has been conned. If they believe that, there is a bridge in Sydney that I could sell them for about \$3. I will quote the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the Opposition's industrial relations policy. It states:

We will introduce comprehensive reforms to the labour market. The key elements will be voluntary unionism or freedom of association in creating an alternative industrial relations stream of enterprise-based voluntary agreements alongside the existing system which will be enforced outside the Industrial Relations Commission by the common law. To become really competitive we have to get rid of all the uncompetitive award baggage accumulated over decades.

That quote is attributed to Dale Baker on 22 May 1991.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McKEE: That means that they will attempt to copy what is happening in New Zealand at the moment. Basically, that industrial policy will force workers to renegotiate with employers a whole list of existing conditions not covered by legislation including sick leave, bereavement leave, travel pay, shift breaks, long service leave, allowance payments and rest breaks.

To put that in context so that members will understand, I will cite an example of a New Zealand employment contract used by Dial-A-Dino's Pizza. The contract contains 20 different conditions, and I will refer to each one so that members opposite, when they talk about compassion for other human beings, know that, if they are ever in a position when they can introduce legislation, this is what they will foist on their fellow human beings. The conditions of the contract, under the New Zealand legislation, state that the hourly rate is to be negotiated. The contract also provides:

2. Payment of Wages—Wages are paid in the week following by direct credit to a bank account of your choice.

3. Holiday Pay—Each pay will include 6 per cent holiday pay.—and currently it is roughly 17 per cent—

4. Penalty Rates—No penalty rates apply to work on weekends or public holidays.

5. Overtime—Overtime pay will only apply after 40 hours work carried out in one pay period. Overtime rates will be set at time and a quarter.

6. Minimum Shift—A minimum rostered shift will be one hour.

7. Termination of Employment—One week's notice of termination will be given by either party. Should the notice not be given, then one week's wages will be paid or forfeited in lieu.

Mrs Hutchison: Shocking!

Mr McKEE: Exactly. The contract continues:

All rostered shifts must be worked during the notice period.

8. Availability to Work—I will make myself available to work rostered shifts as instructed (including weekends and public holidays) and will give at least one week's notice if unable to work a rostered shift. In case of sickness, I will give at least five hours notice.

Mrs Hutchison: So you will have to give five hours notice of a heart attack.

Mr McKEE: Basically, yes. If you have a heart attack, you have to give somebody five hours notice before you can say, 'I'm sick.'

Mr Hamilton: What about if you die?

Mr McKEE: Precisely; we will get to that. That is in here, too. The contract continues:

9. Failure to Attend—Failure to turn up for any two consecutive shifts will be deemed to be voluntary termination at the discretion of the employer.

Mr Hamilton: Even if you die.

Mr McKEE: Precisely. It gets better. The contract also provides (and this is not so bad):

10. I accept that Dial-A-Dino's Pizza is a smoke free working environment and that smoking in store and in the vehicles is prohibited at all times.

That is probably something that we could accept. Further:

11. I will maintain high standards of personal hygiene.

12. I will wear the full Dino's uniform while on duty.

13. I will always be courteous to our customers, and fellow team managers.

Mr Hamilton: That sounds reasonable.

Mr McKEE: That is reasonable. The conditions continue:

14. I will accept instant dismissal for theft or dishonesty, being under the influence of alcohol or drugs while on duty, or wilful abuse of property or vehicles belonging to Dial-A-Dino's Pizza.

What recourse does somebody have if Dial-A-Dino's wants to get rid of them? That person can be told, 'You had your hand in the till' or 'You were dishonest; you took 14 pizzas out and delivered only six.'

Mr Hamilton: And ate 13.

Mr McKEE: Yes, precisely. There is no recourse for the employee given these conditions of employment. The conditions continue:

16. If, while driving a Dino' vehicle, I am involved in a traffic accident in which I am at fault, I will pay half the amount of any insurance excess relating to that vehicle. I will accept automatic deductions from my weekly pay until the amount is paid in full.

Mr Hamilton: Is this a joke?

Mr McKEE: This is a serious example, printed in the *Herald*, of the Dial-A-Dino's current employment contract in New Zealand. The conditions continue:

17. I will pay for any damage I cause to any of the Dino's vehicles through abuse or neglect.

18. I accept responsibility for my Dino's uniform, and understand that, on my resignation or termination, any pay due to me will be withheld until the full uniform is returned washed and pressed.

Mr Hamilton: Does that apply to the managers, too?

Mr McKEE: No; the managers have drawn this up. It obviously does not apply to them: it applies only to prospective employees. The conditions further state:

19. I will not reveal any Dial-A-Dino's procedures, policies, confidential information or production methods to any person or company for any reason, and will sign a confidentiality agreement to that effect.

20. I will return any company property, including documentation and training manuals, forthwith on demand, and within five days of my termination or resignation.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr McKEE: That is correct. This probably has some similarities to the Gulag proposition that we heard in the Parliament last week. That is a current employment contract operating in New Zealand under the current New Zealand Government. Given the statements of the Leader of the Opposition, Dale Baker, on 22 May 1991, that is exactly what the Liberal Opposition has in store for the workers of this State.

All I can suggest to the conservatives is that, if the Federal Liberal Party is to impose a consumption tax in this country, ram it home and not back off because it believes fully in that proposition, I only hope that the State Liberal Party

has the same adherence to its policy—and has the same determination that that is the sort of thing it would introduce if it were elected. I would like members opposite to be honest—which may be difficult—and tell the people that is what they have in store for them now and that is the policy that the Liberal Party intends to introduce if Armageddon happens and the Liberal Party is elected. However, if Armageddon does not happen and the Liberal Party is elected, Armageddon will happen immediately after. It will happen for the ordinary people in this State.

There are more lumps in the industrial relations policy of the Liberal Party than in a new bride's gravy. I hope that the Liberal Party will be honest with the community in South Australia and divulge its policies well before any election campaign so that the people have time to judge and to see what is in store for them under a Liberal Government. I would hope that the trade union movement in South Australia—and I am sure it is—is already aware that the Liberal Party in this State and federally is attracted to these policies. I hope that this policy will be exposed to its own members through its own meetings and forums while it is still able to do that.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr McKEE: Well, no, the trade union movement, I think—

Members interjecting:

Mr McKEE: No, the business people are quietly accepting this proposition. In some cases they are quietly supporting it, because they think that they will have a better working system afterwards. However, if it does come in, and if they are talking about industrial action, they will not know what has hit them.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I listened with interest, insofar as I was able because the honourable member is not always clear in his manner of expression, to what the member for Gilles had to say. Insofar as I was able to hear what he had to say, it seemed to me not unreasonable that any employer should require of an employee in the food industry an undertaking to be honest, clean and diligent. None of those requirements strikes me as being in the least bit unreasonable.

He also suggested that the Liberal Party should be honest in its presentation of its industrial relations policy in the run-up to the next election. I have no doubt whatsoever that that will be the case, but it strikes me as extraordinary that anyone on the other side of the House should have the audacity to challenge the Liberal Party to be honest when so much that is manifestly dishonest has been covered up by this Government over the past 1½ years since the last election and over the preceding three years. For members opposite to talk about honesty seems to me to be something that can hardly be taken seriously on this side of the House.

In my speech on the Supply Bill last night I referred to the downgrading by the Government of the public and environmental health services of the South Australian Health Commission. I referred to the way in which the administrative arms of the Health Commission are still being maintained at their excessive levels and how the service delivery of the Health Commission is being cut to the bone. This is apparent in the clinical services provided by hospitals and health centres, but it is becoming seriously apparent in the public and environmental health services. There were some aspects that I was not able to cover last night due to the time constraints with which I should like to deal tonight.

I point out that when the Occupational Health Branch of the Health Commission was a technical body with the commission it operated on the basis of scientific detachment

without industrial or political bias. Because of its transfer to the Department of Labour, that branch is now separated from many of the technical support services which gave it credibility and which were necessary to identify relationships between workplace exposures and disease.

I acknowledge that safety and health are two separate and largely distinct aspects of occupational health and safety. I do not challenge the capacity of inspectors in the Department of Labour to determine the safety of a workplace, but the health of a workplace is essentially a scientific matter requiring detachment, medical experience and professional knowledge. I believe that that aspect of the commission's activities has been seriously diminished as a result of its transfer to the Department of Labour. The losers in this are the work force in South Australia, particularly women in their reproductive years. I shall come back to that later.

What concerns me is that the Government's cost cutting is placing at risk public health in South Australia. I predict a serious outbreak of infectious disease in this State if the Government persists in cutting the resources of the Public and Environmental Health Branch of the Health Commission. The food and nutrition services of the commission have been savagely cut. As a result, food sampling for microbiological and chemical contamination has been reduced to the point where there is now much more serious danger of food-borne diseases such as salmonella—I point out that three different strains of this organism have been associated with major outbreaks in the last 12 months—campylobacter, shigella and other organisms which occur more frequently.

The environmental surveillance services of the Health Commission have been downgraded. Members will know that hygiene-related diseases, such as hepatitis A and vector-borne diseases, such as Ross River virus, to which I referred last night, require constant surveillance by health inspectors and the maintenance of rigorous preventive measures if they are to be controlled. Yet in South Australia many human waste disposal systems, like septic tanks, are no longer inspected to ensure proper installation and function to prevent disease.

I also point out that there has been a cessation of many mosquito control services in the Riverland to prevent mosquito-borne diseases. It only requires the right climatic conditions this summer for both food-borne and insect-borne diseases to result in a serious outbreak of infectious disease, an outbreak which could be prevented if the environmental surveillance services of the commission were maintained at the appropriate level.

Last night I referred to infectious diseases. I mentioned tuberculosis, which is still a significant problem in this State, particularly among Aborigines and migrants. Hepatitis A and B continue to prevail, with increased levels of hepatitis A in recent times. There have been recent outbreaks of measles in South Australia. As a consequence of severely reduced staff levels, these diseases, as well as food-borne diseases and outbreaks of Legionnaire's disease, cannot be investigated properly. I would think that any Health Minister who had, let alone the public interest at heart, his or her own political survival would be absolutely committed to maintaining the capacity of the Public and Environmental Health Division of the Health Commission to fulfil its role and function properly.

Last night I referred to the cancer register and also to the birth registry. It is the Birth Registry Division that monitors outcomes of pregnancy in South Australia. Members will understand that, because of economic conditions, pregnancy risk factors are spiralling for many reasons, including increasing numbers of single mothers—one of the greatest

risk factors to any baby is the fact that its mother has no partner for security and support—low birth weight babies—and the two often go together—premature babies, multiple births through IVF, mature age pregnancy and home births for ‘at risk’ women. The relationship between pregnancy outcomes and environmental influences, from things such as spray drift from pesticides and herbicides and exposure of women to environmental impacts in previously unknown occupational settings, requires careful monitoring of infant and maternal health to ensure that risk factors are kept to a minimum. For example, VDUs are a known risk factor. However, the monitoring of these risk factors is seriously threatened as a result of the cuts in the Public and Environmental Health Division.

I reinforce, because I am sure the House is already aware of it, that community concerns relating to environmental health issues are increasing, not decreasing. I nominate factors such as food additives, contaminated land sites, radiation exposures, agricultural chemicals, genetically manipulated organisms, toxic algal blooms, electric and magnetic fields around high voltage power lines, lasers, pesticides and injury hazards. These are just a few of the issues that need to be addressed by the division. Without the necessary scientific staff these issues cannot be addressed properly. The division is faced with an expanding and increasingly complex workload, but a rapidly dwindling staff establishment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member’s time has expired. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): While I have been sitting here suffering through this Supply debate and the Address in Reply, the thought that has come to my mind has been, ‘With what can I compare the quality of the speeches of the Opposition?’ The thing that came to mind was a poem that I was taught during my school days. I am sure that you would know this poem, Mr Speaker, because you would have had a similar education. Just to refresh your memory, Sir, I should like to read the first stanza of that poem:

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herd wind slowly o’er the lea,
The ploughman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.

That comes from Gray’s *Elegy in a Country Churchyard*. All the doom and gloom that we have heard over the past couple of days reminded me of that poem that I learnt at school.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: They are awake. Not only has there been doom and gloom—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON:—from the Opposition but we have not heard one positive policy from it. How could members opposite hope to form a Government if all they do is stand up and whinge all day and make knocking speech after speech with not one positive policy? If they follow the same form that they have followed in the past—even before election day—we will not get one policy. If they expect to get into power we will have to see the colour of their money. We have to see what they are going to do.

I was particularly impressed by the style of some of the speakers on the other side. I have to praise the member for Hayward for his honesty, because he stood up and told us that, as a member of the Opposition, he was entitled to have two bob each way. That is the sort of proposition that has been put before us. The member for Heysen did not disappoint me. He came in with his press releases and a

letter from a constituent. I do not think that he has ever been able to make a speech without half of his speech being read from press releases and the other half from letters from his constituents. I do not think that he has ever had an original thought in his head. One of these days he will give us a speech off the top of his head and we will be absolutely flabbergasted.

I have to congratulate the member for Newland because she always comes in extremely well prepared. If it were not for the fact that she has such copious notes, I am not sure that contributions that she has given in this Chamber would have been heard. When members read in *Hansard* the member for Newland’s contributions to these debates, they are beautiful, absolutely beautiful. One would have thought that she had sat down and written an English composition. One of these days we might actually be able to hear what she has to say.

Mr Brindal: One day you might have to use your copious notes, so be careful.

Mr FERGUSON: Oh, the threats are coming. I am shaking in my boots. The threats are coming from the other side.

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Henley Beach that threats from the other side have no effect in this House. However, the Chair does.

Mr FERGUSON: I will certainly take notice of what you say, Sir, and you certainly have got me frightened.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr FERGUSON: No, Sir, I would not do that. I agree with the member for Napier who, in his previous contribution to this House, properly praised State Print. State Print is an organisation of which all members on both sides of the House ought to be proud. The service it has given to all members is something of which we ought to be absolutely proud. However, it has not satisfied the member for Bright. Certain people in his electorate have taken umbrage at what he had to say in his contribution to this debate. Because people outside do not have the privilege of Parliament I must make sure that this letter is included in *Hansard*. It is addressed to me and reads:

Once again State Print has been subjected to unfounded attacks by a Liberal (Mr Matthew) in State Parliament (*Hansard*, Wednesday 14 August 1991). The State Print Association on behalf of its members would like to put the facts to you, in our defence.

1. Why do we need a State Government Printer? This sort of statement still astounds us; why don’t the Liberals take heed of what happened in New South Wales under Greiner’s vicious axing of the Government Printing Office? Private enterprise did not cater for parliamentary work. It was a debacle and that Government is now trying to rectify it.

Contrary to popular belief around Parliament House, State Print has to compete with private enterprise to get printing, the 300 per cent mark-ups claimed by Mr Matthew would not help our competitiveness.

2. If Mr Matthew took the time to find out how the *Government Gazette* is processed he would cease to make snide remarks about how private enterprise could produce it on time. *Government Gazette* cannot be printed until the official copy has been sighted and checked by State Print personnel. Official copy usually arrives at 10.30 a.m. on Thursdays but on this particular occasion it did not arrive until 2.30 p.m. due to the amount of copy and the late signing by the Governor (five *Government Gazettes* in two days, containing 401 pages with 71 regulations).

If you get the opportunity could you please convey these facts to Mr Matthew and all members of Parliament. With this attitude that the State Liberals are showing towards Government departments, it’s no wonder they are in Opposition.

Mr Brindal: Who was it signed by?

Mr FERGUSON: It was signed by people from State Print. I was very interested listening to this debate to find that the Leader and the Deputy Leader have hitched their star to a goods and services tax. The only positive thing

that has come out of the debate so far has been their slavish support of a goods and services tax. I wonder why they have not asked the country members of the Liberal Party why they should support a goods and services tax, because there is no way farmers can be compensated whether by taxation or by extra social security payments so far as a goods and services—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that there is a Standing Order of this House relating to relevance, and I fail to see the relevance of a Federal tax.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member must realise that we are at a stage of the debate called the grievance debate, and if he wants relevance to apply to a grievance debate it should apply to both sides of this Parliament. I suggest that the honourable member let the debate flow.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have very little time left, and I would like to say that I cannot understand why members who represent country areas support a goods and services tax. One member is going to get up and speak, and I hope he can explain to us why he supports a goods and services tax, which will be to the detriment of our farming population in South Australia. There is no way that the Federal Government can compensate them.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have a couple of particularly important matters that I want to bring to the attention of the House this evening, but before I do I must say that the contribution of the member for Henley Beach has been quite amazing. It is very interesting to hear the honourable member continually repeating exactly the same comments he has made over the many years he has been in this place, but I hardly see the sense or relevance of the honourable member's comments with respect to the present needs of this State.

As I have only a few minutes, I would like to make some comments that are relevant to my particular patch of this State. Earlier this year, I received a letter from one of my local school councils requesting assistance to combat the ongoing problem of vandalism and graffiti attacks, which states:

... School council notes with satisfaction your efforts on law and order in the Tea Tree Gully area. We also appreciate the work you have already done for the safety of our students on road traffic crossings outside this school. Thus it is with confidence that we write to you on a matter of serious concern to schools around the State.

As you well know, graffiti, vandalism and arson have increased alarmingly on school premises in the past 12 to 18 months. Our school has certainly been no exception, with some form of damage being inflicted every weekend so far in 1991.

Council has discussed the problems and investigated possible solutions, and has run into legal brick walls before any progress is made. In fact, recent working bees construction work has even been undone on the same day, such is the apparent immunity of current offenders.

As we see it, one of the obvious problems with current security in schools is that only between midnight and 6 a.m. are trespassers liable to prosecution for being on school grounds without permission. However, it is a fact that much of our vandalism and graffiti takes place well before midnight and at least some school fires around the State are lit before midnight.

We believe the curfew times are inadequate and need to be increased to cover the time between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. The few times when people are legitimately still on the school grounds after 10 p.m. are insignificant and a legitimate right to be there, e.g. school council meeting or class sleepover, can readily be explained to an investigating police officer.

While no other action against such anti-social behaviour appears likely, surely the Parliament can be convinced that something must be done to curb the growing tide of crime against schools

after hours. One of the simplest, cheapest and most effective deterrents is to change the curfew hours and erect signs on school boundaries advising would-be offenders of the increased risk they face.

We appeal to you to please investigate this suggestion fully and take action to see it raised in Parliament as a necessary step towards saving some of the State's precious education dollars and reducing crime and wastage.

Mr Brindal: A sensible letter.

Mrs KOTZ: Absolutely! Most responsible. Regulation 14 of the Education Act 1972, under the heading 'Trespassing on departmental property', provides:

A person who is on school premises between the hours of 12 midnight and 7 a.m. is guilty of an offence unless that person—

Then it goes on to list three areas where permission and exemptions are clear. The penalty for guilt of that trespass is shown as \$200. I should like to commend this school council on its seriously considered and responsible suggestion. The concern in our community in respect of all aspects of law and order is continually being brought to the attention of members of Parliament and of this House.

Having received such a well thought out and responsible suggestion from one of my local school councils, I am most pleased to take this opportunity to present the proposal to this House, with a view to implementing this positive measure to assist as a deterrent to vandalism, graffiti and arson attacks on our schools after dark. Upon receipt of this school council's request, I contacted other schools within my electorate to determine the attitude to the suggested increase in school curfew hours. Comments on this issue by other schools include the following:

I would be in favour of increased curfew hours. The school is used by local groups after 10 p.m. at times but it is obvious in these instances that the groups are not unauthorised on the premises with intent to commit a crime. In these times of economic stringency, I consider measures to eventually secure all schools will be financially worthwhile in the long run.

All these school councils, on behalf of their local areas, are being most responsible in the actions they are looking at to extend outside of economic areas to protect and secure their own school grounds. One of the problems behind vandalism and arson within schools is related in certain letters I have received over the past 18 months—letters detailing instances in which schools have been vandalised.

It is also worthwhile at this time to document in *Hansard* one of the letters received from a school council. The letter sets out the actual incidents on one particular night out of many events and instances over the past 18 months and states:

Concern has been expressed at council meetings this year that the security of school premises and grounds is questionable, to date inexpensive security work has been undertaken at working bees and by the school groundsman. The situation intensified to an unacceptable state at a recent council meeting, where parents attending the meeting had car windows smashed and personal effects interfered with. On the same night, damage was also reported to cars owned by users of the school gymnasium.

Further incidents were reported the following night; this time a classroom had been broken into and the room severely vandalised. During the year, other incidents have been reported and it seems the situation now has reached epidemic proportions. Positive action is required. As parent involvement and participation is to continue at a high level, parents need to feel that their property will be secure while working and/or attending meetings at the primary and junior primary school.

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: It is quite typical of the member for Hartley not to appear in this House and then, when he does, not quite to pick up the strain of what is being said. The letter continues:

The situation is extremely urgent and the matter must be given your highest priority.

I have a series of letters from all the schools in my area who support the call for increased curfew hours. The schools in my area—and I am sure that the same can be said for the areas of all members—battle continually, supported by their school councils and by parents, to contain the effects of vandalism and graffiti on a regular basis. There is a cost to our school communities, not only because of the individual time and energy exerted by parents to clean up after these attacks but also in respect of the drain on the finances of school councils and the finances of the Education Department.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): During this debate tonight, a number of interesting contributions have been made. Listening to some of the speeches over the past couple of days, I was reminded very much of a fishing trip. When you go on a fishing trip—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: They must have thought that you were going to be speaking. That's the usual thing: they all disappear when you get up. You are a hard act to follow. When you go fishing, you need a rod, a line and bait or a lure. In fact, I must say that on the consumption tax members of the Opposition are the only fish I know that fell to the straight hook. They did not even look for a lure or for bait: they jumped straight onto the hook.

The reality is that, where the consumption tax debate is concerned, the member for Custance and other members opposite get a great deal of joy out of the situation that they now say they want to impose on the people of South Australia. In his address to this House yesterday, the Leader mentioned a pamphlet that I put out in my electorate, and an address that I made in this House last week.

In fact, what was said yesterday was very interesting. The Leader alleged that I said a number of untruths about the consumption tax. We now find that the goods and services tax that is proposed at the Federal level is well and truly supported by the frontbench opposite and the member for Custance. One can understand why the member for Custance supports the tax—because that was one of the election issues that he found so hard to live down in his electorate. He may be one of the members opposite who survives at the next election, because that campaign has already been run against him.

Why the Leader and the Deputy Leader endorse this policy of a tax-led recovery and why they jeopardise their election chances, at least at the Federal level, is surprising. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition came in here and said that if members on this side of the Chamber were not prepared to embrace the truth of the goods and services tax—the consumption tax—we would end up eating our words. It may well be that members opposite end up eating those words, because we were also told that it was erroneous to say that, if a 15 per cent tax were imposed on goods, grocery lines would be cheaper. What we are being told repeatedly in here is that we have the numbers wrong; that there are so many hidden taxes that a 15 per cent tax or whatever across the board on grocery lines would actually make groceries not much dearer.

In that case, Mr Speaker, why do members opposite support this tax? They support it as a way of reaping more tax. Members of the Liberal Party are talking about redistributing wealth. They are talking about giving money back to high income earners and those who pay capital gains tax. If that is to occur, the tax has to come from somewhere. In fact, it will come from the ordinary people out there who

will not have the ability to pay that 15 per cent tax, or whatever level it winds up being.

The reality is that the State Opposition has now jumped on this bandwagon. I find it amazing that it comes in here endorsing someone else's lead weights, but that is what it has done. It has come in here and said, 'In the interests of everyone, in the interests of the whole community, we will support one of the most unpopular tax measures that we have seen in recent political history.' We can only surmise that members opposite would like to see this tax in South Australia because they have an ulterior agenda. We are told that under the Liberal plan if you go to a supermarket and buy toothpaste you will pay a tax on that. If you buy soap, detergent, dog food and a number of other items you will pay tax on that. In fact, if the supermarket is big enough, you might even buy a camera and pay 30 per cent tax on that.

The reality is that most shoppers do not fill their shopping basket or the supermarket trolley with just toothpaste, detergent and dog food; they buy a whole range of other goods which do not attract wholesale taxes. I say 'wholesale' taxes because those taxes are levied at the last wholesale price; they are not levied at the point of sale, which is what is being proposed here. It is a redistributive tax: it takes from the poor and hands back, in the form of tax cuts and with the end of capital taxation, to the rich.

The reality is that members opposite are out there trying to sell this tax. In my electorate I sent out a pamphlet which made it quite clear that the anti-consumption tax debate was well and truly on the way. I welcome the speeches that have been made in here by members opposite who now support the consumption tax, because that act of foolishness was not lost on this side and it will be used for everything it is worth. Members opposite will not sell this tax in the suburbs and streets of South Australia. What is more, they will not sell it on the farms or in country towns, because the troops will not wear it. The reality is that it is an extremely unpopular measure. The community knows what it thinks of a consumption tax, and it is not happy with it at all.

What we are told is that in a couple of months at the Federal level we will find out more about it; we will be told the precise details. We were told here yesterday that it will not affect mortgages, financial payments or those sorts of arrangements, but we do not know that yet. We have not been told that. We have only the Leader of the Opposition's word in here that that will be the case. In this place we have also been told that a number of items will not be any dearer and that the overall basket of supermarket goods will not be any more expensive. Well, if it will not be more expensive why is this tax to be introduced? What is the purpose of it? Obviously, it is to raise revenue. No-one would go through that much pain if it were not to do that.

What will happen to electricity and gas bills and those sorts of things in this State? Will they be subject to the tax? Of course they will. We have had the Opposition in here going on and on about State charges. It goes on about electricity charges, and it spent a good part of last year doing so. It has gone on about other charges such as the water rate. Will those things be exempt from the consumption tax? We have not heard anything about that. What members opposite will do is add another 15 per cent to it. Or, will they come in here and tell us that a wholesale tax is already applied to electricity, gas and water? No, they will not say that; what they will say is that it is good for the whole community.

Well, it is good for that part of the community that some members opposite represent. There is no doubt that quite

a large number of members opposite would like to see this measure brought in. I have received a number of phone calls from constituents and, at this stage, they are running at about 15 to 1 against the consumption tax. I will deal with the people who have rung up and said that I have been unfair to the Liberal Party, and there have been a couple of those. The only thing is that they were not keen to give their name, but eventually they did; and they were not keen to give their address. Eventually they did, and both turned out to be false.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In speaking to this debate I would like to take up a couple of points that have been made by the member for Henley Beach and the member for Playford. The member for Henley Beach referred to the doom and gloom spread by the Opposition, and he may well have been including me in that wide net. I have not been spreading doom and gloom: I have been telling the House the facts in respect of what you, Sir, I and every citizen of this State have been confronted with—massive debts and charges.

I will mention several figures and use some other broad figures to draw an analogy that people might be able to understand. The State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission have non-performing loans of about \$5 billion. That is what has been reported in the press. If we divide that by the number of citizens in this State and multiply it by four (the average size family in this State), we have a debt of \$14 286 per family of four. The State Government also has borrowings of \$4.5 billion. Again, if we use the same mathematical equation based on a family of four the debt is \$13 864 per person.

A Federal budget deficit of \$4.7 billion is projected; that is \$1 106 per family of four. We have a foreign debt of \$136 billion, and that works out at another \$32 000 per family of four. A total of \$61 238 per family of four has been mortgaged on every family in this State. On top of that we could add the debts of local government and all the other extraneous matters. On top of that, we have all the increased charges, taxes, levies and a whole range of things, some of which have been introduced in the past 14 days, that makes the going that much harder for those who are in a position to earn an income or to eke out a living for themselves and, hopefully, for their employees. The situation is getting way out of hand.

The member for Playford stands in this Chamber and starts ridiculing alternative taxation proposals. If he can justify a black market out in the community and not try to redress that situation, one must ask, 'What is he trying to hide?' He is obviously trying to look after the SP bookmakers and what I call the black economy in which people do not pay taxes. Because that section of the community does not pay taxes, you and I and every other PAYE earner must pay extra tax.

Mr Speaker, conditional upon the acceptance of the goods and services tax is the abolition of the wholesale sales tax. According to latest figures released yesterday by the Federal Treasurer, the wholesale sales tax runs at \$9 237 million. Let us put that into context. The total revenue from PAYE employees is \$42 460 million, so we are talking about a very significant level of funding. That in itself runs at about half the total tax revenue. If we get the black economy into the equation, obviously the amount that PAYE employees and other taxpayers would have to pay would be so much further reduced.

Another matter which Government members have so conveniently overlooked is the fact that the goods and services tax is conditional upon the following: first, a restructuring of personal income tax; secondly, a total abolition of the wholesale sales tax; and thirdly, a total rebate on input production costs. On that basis, there has to be a vast improvement and restructuring of the taxation measures that will hopefully encourage the production sector. If the productive sector can become viable again, it will be the most likely sector to create job opportunities and further employment. Surely, everything we do in this House should be towards ensuring that job opportunities are created and become a benefit for the whole society. The more people in employment, the more jobs we can create and the better society will be.

I take umbrage at what the Federal Treasurer has said—that 10.75 per cent unemployment is likely at the end of this year. That is not addressing the problem: it is learning to live with it, and I do not believe that we as a Parliament should learn to live with it. It is much more serious than that.

I have other concerns. Given our present situation, where will the employers of tomorrow come from? Where will the farmers of tomorrow come from? The system now effectively gets rid of the employers and the traditional farmer who knows best how to handle and manage his land, but there is no move by anyone, anywhere, to try to retain those people or to encourage the creation of job opportunities and export earnings. As long as we allow the system to run down, this situation will only get worse. We have seen that massive figure relating to a family of four; it has escalated 10 times over in the past five or six years. That problem has not been addressed; it is not being taken seriously by the Parliament, and it is something that people must sit down and take a long hard look at.

As an aside, but indeed a very serious one, whether the restructuring of the rural sector be forced, voluntary or organised, I wonder where the Government thinks environmental management is going. We have banks that now put a line straight through any weed control measure in a budget. Financial restrictions are forcing farmers to cut back on weed and pest plant management controls; they are forced to do that because of economic conditions. The banks themselves are putting lines through those measures. The statutory authorities, such as Australian National, have effectively put a line through them but, when they are challenged or pushed, they will come back part way on the issue and try to do something, but only when they are pushed.

The Government should be making sure that the banks guarantee that those environmental issues are put into effect. We would normally be obliged to do that because of regulations, statutes, fees and penalties. When things get a bit tough, the Government backs away and does not push people to make sure that the weeds and vermin are controlled. People run away from these issues and they become very hard.

The farmers are the best managers of the land: there is no question about that. Corporate owners are not good managers of land, neither is the Government a good owner. Neither is it fair nor possible that neighbours can take over land and be able to manage it in such a way. Things are getting totally out of hand. There will be an environmental problem, let alone a financial and ecological problem.

Finally, the Minister of Agriculture earlier this year made statements in relation to the availability of interest rate subsidies where people meet certain criteria on an eligibility basis. I was pleased to hear the Minister express his concern and that of the Government at a recent UF&S conference

that the moneys had not been taken up as they should be. Obviously, the criteria means that those moneys cannot be taken up. The Minister indicated a revision of the criteria, and I hope that that is the case. If that money is there—and the Minister assured the UF&S conference that it was—it should be made available and the criteria should be amended accordingly. If the Government has the funds and it is backed up by Federal funding, why is the money not getting out to the farmers? The banking institutions should look at that situation, because in many cases the banks are not making recommendations in relation to interest rate subsidies, and that is what they must do under Government guidelines.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to stand in this place. It is one of the greatest forums of all times in which to stand and say what you believe without fear or favour. I well remember, between 1979 and 1982, criticising the then Government's introduction of on-the-spot fines. They were brought in by the Government in a very sneaky way.

Mr Ferguson: Which Government?

Mr HAMILTON: The Tonkin Government. It brought in on-the-spot fines and, just before Christmas 1981 or 1982, there was a massive increase in the number of offences. I do not reflect on those who went away, but I was one who decided to stop at home that Christmas and New year and do a bit of research. I was surprised at all the increases under the Tonkin Government. First, there were traffic infringement notices (TINS) and, secondly, there were classifications of different offences under the traffic infringement notices. The Liberal Party members are the ones who are squealing like stuck pigs—if I can use a farming term.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Custance knows that I do go out on to the land, but we will not talk about that. Members opposite are squealing now like hell, because the Government has increased the number of offences that can be expiated by way of on-the-spot fines. I find rather amazing, to say the least, the hypocrisy of members opposite. I believe that, if one does not want to pay a traffic infringement fine, one should not break the law. If one gets caught, one should cough up. I have been caught once—and I take no great pleasure in saying that. In fact, I was angry with myself for being caught. I paid up; I did not squeal about it.

It is offensive to the intelligence of the average person in the community that Opposition members and, indeed, some sections of the media, jump up and down and talk about the big bonanza from on-the-spot fines.

Mrs Hutchison: That is what it is all about.

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague says, that is what it is all about. There are those in the community who choose to ignore, or think they are immune from the laws of the land.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, that may well be the case. I do not want to go down that path. They do it for charity.

This is a serious contribution. There are those who want to break the law. If they break the law, let them pay the price. I find it amazing that members opposite are concerned about the number of on-the-spot fines. I think that they should be castigating those motorists who are jeopardising people's lives.

I remember many years ago being on the intersection of Port and Woodville Roads in my then new car, an XW

Falcon, which stalled at the intersection while I had a green light. That was lucky for me because, when I finally got my car going, just by switching on the ignition, in those few split seconds a semitrailer ran a red light and roared through.

That also reminds me of a woman who came into my office earlier this week and who was very much aggrieved by the fact that her husband had been hit while driving his motor vehicle and killed at an intersection. This woman was crying in my office. She asked, 'What am I going to do? I have lost my husband, and my two children have lost a father.' I make no apology for the fact that this Government has installed these cameras and issued more traffic infringement notices to those people who want to break the law. Those red light cameras are there as a deterrent. They are there to stop those people who think that they can flout the law. An article in the *Advertiser* of 15 August states:

In the first six months of the legislation, from July 1988, cameras at various locations had detected 1 812 cars being driven through red lights—an average of 302 a month. In the next 12 months (1989) 4 596 cars were detected—a monthly average of 383. The report found that intersections checked by cameras had significantly reduced casualty and right-angle accidents.

I have been critical of the RAA in the past, but it has supported what this Government is doing. I commend the Minister, because he is sitting here. That is one of the reasons why I raised this issue: it is very easy to be critical of the Minister and the Government. However, I believe in giving credit where credit is due. If we save only 1 per cent of lives of the 1 812 drivers of cars that were detected going through red lights, the Government should be applauded. There is no doubt in my mind that this Government is doing the right thing. Red light cameras are very important. They provide those people who protect us, that is the police, with the opportunity to do other duties.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as the Minister said, 25 fewer deaths. I have been a great advocate—and I know that some of my colleagues will not support what I am about to say—of sky patrols. Many years ago I was in Western Australia driving along a certain road; my wife said to me, 'There is a sky patrol. Be careful. You don't know who is looking over your shoulder.' I lifted my foot. That is the deterrent, and it is the deterrent of red light cameras. I applaud the Government and the police for installing more of those devices.

Years ago when I was invited to address a number of would-be inspectors in Echunga, I was asked to put my own perspective, not that of the Government. After that meeting one of the chief inspectors said to me, 'Kevin, thank you for coming up and putting your point of view. What we have to do as a police force is get smarter, not necessarily increase the numbers.' Anyone who has attended a Neighbourhood Watch meeting and seen the film that was shown—and I do not know whether it is shown now—would recall that it related an increase in the number of criminals to an increase in the number of police. There was a saturation of police and criminals.

The message is that we have to get smart. It is not a person's right to have a licence to drive on the road: it is a privilege. In Japan and Germany, for example, people who drink and get caught lose their licence. I believe that in my lifetime—maybe not whilst I am in this Parliament—that system will be introduced in this country. It is a very sobering thought, and I do not jest when I say that. We must address the issue of road accidents because of the enormous associated costs. One only has to go into any hospital and talk to any surgeon, or to any person who has anything to do with people who have been seriously injured or killed, to recognise that they are very sobering thoughts.

When people are seriously injured or when they lose a loved one because of a road accident, they realise what it is all about.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I want to cite three examples of blatant discrimination against rural people in my electorate. First, I must set the record straight about one of the questions that was asked this afternoon. The Minister of Agriculture has one fan on this side of the House—at least he had one fan—me. I have never doubted the Minister's credibility. I knew him before I came into this place. But today I thought he got away with absolute daylight robbery in replying to the question the member for Napier put to him about the South Australian Rural Development Association (SARDA). If ever someone was mucking around with figures, it happened then. I want to put the record straight. The Minister said (*Hansard*):

I know the member for Custance will listen with great interest to the answer to this question because he knows the figures included in SARDA's submission were incorrect.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I want that record put straight. I have the record in my hand and I shall be checking in the next few days to make sure that the Minister will know that what he told Parliament today was a fabrication and playing with figures.

The member for Albert Park—I think he has gone—said that he enjoyed the forum of this House because he felt he could speak and get things off his chest. I also enjoy that, but I often wonder about the futility of the matter. One can make the best speech in the world, but I wonder who is listening, apart from a couple of people in the gallery and the media up there. I often wonder whether it is worth putting the exercise together, particularly after listening to some of the renditions by the member for Henley Beach. Although I find them interesting and humorous, I wonder what they do for this House and this State. If we all made speeches like the member for Henley Beach, where would we be?

Gloom and doom may have been the subject in the last couple of weeks, but we need to be realistic. It is gloom and doom. The member for Henley Beach got up and, in typical fashion and good style, went into his usual rhetoric and slated us, but it was not very constructive. At least you, Sir, would find it entertaining because you have to spend a long time in the Chair. I would hope that you enjoyed it.

I come back to my subject—three areas of blatant discrimination against rural people. I will keep this short. I hope that members will find it enlightening, because I shall not be putting forward things that may have been heard from this side before.

Recently, a constituent highlighted to me an unequal penalty between city and country people. This goes on from what the member for Albert Park was saying. I am talking about the penalty for speeding. One must say that if you break the law you deserve the full punishment of the law. If a driver in the city is caught speeding by a speed camera, he is fined; he earns no demerit points for that offence. However, in the country speeding drivers are usually caught by radar traps. There are no speed cameras in the country, unless one or two pop up in the cities of Whyalla, Port Pirie or Port Augusta. I do not know why that is, but the country driver is not only fined for speeding; he earns three demerit points because he is caught by the radar.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Or she.

Mr VENNING: Or she. The honourable member reminds me that the fair sex also breaks the law. I am sorry for that omission. Whether the Government has knowingly or

unknowingly done that, we can see the discrimination. I have constituents in the country who have lost their licences after being caught for speeding, whereas relatives in Adelaide who have been caught more times have not earned any demerit points. I hope that Government members are listening to this, because the situation sounds like blatant discrimination. I thought that we were all equal before the law. If one breaks the law by speeding, why should not everybody be fined or earn three demerit points? Why should there be a differential?

I am not disputing the penalty for speeding drivers. All I am saying is that in the city drivers get away with a fine, whereas in the country drivers' licences are in jeopardy because of demerit points. Having lost their licence, rural people usually do not have a transport alternative as city dwellers have. I hear no interjections from the other side, so I gather that members agree with what I am saying. I hope that the Government will address the situation. A constituent has asked me this question and I would like to tell him something encouraging about this inequity.

My second example—and I hope that the member for Stuart is listening to this—concerns local television in Port Pirie. I refer to GTS channel 4. Apparently there was a proposal by the Federal Department of Transport and Communications to shift channel 4 to channel 11. 'So what?' members may say. The reasons are that the channel 4 frequency must be cleared because it has been allocated for FM radio services. This is Australia-wide. I am told that GTS 4 in Port Pirie vehemently opposes this move for all sorts of reasons, not the least of which being that viewers have identified with channel 4 since the 1960s. That in itself is not a valid reason.

As a local viewer—and I imagine the member for Stuart is also—I am pretty cranky about such a move. It is not so much that they want to clear channel 4 as that they want to use channel 11 instead, particularly around Port Pirie. We are only just able to receive the city channels there, and it is usually very fringe reception on channels 7, 9 and 10. It is also necessary to have a filter on televisions there to filter out channel 4 so has to receive channels 7, 9 and 10. If they were to move to channel 11, they would not be able to filter out these channels. Channel 4 would completely swamp the fringe channel of 7, 9 and 10 if it were to be allocated channel 11. That is a real concern to people in that area. I have not heard the member for Stuart mention this. She nods indicating that she does know about it, but the people there feel almost cheated because the big bureaucrats in Adelaide could not care less about having to move channel 4 to channel 11.

There are alternatives, and going to UHF is one. I hope before the move is made that something can be done. People there do watch channels 7, 9 and 10, because so much is offered on those channels which is not available on channels 2 and 4. I hope that the member for Stuart will support me, and I will support her, because predominantly these are her constituents, not mine. However, they have been telling me about it. Being slightly electronically minded myself, I do understand. I have watched channels 7, 9 and 10 without a filter and I could see channel 4 on the channel that I was watching. People get two for the price of one, but it is hardly satisfactory.

My third area of discrimination—a long interest of mine—relates to country rail services. In the city, people have a choice about their modes of transport. If they choose to use the bus or suburban rail services, they can do so, and usually at discounted and subsidised rates. Country people have no such choice. They either catch a non-subsidised bus or they drive. They do not have the option of rail travel. Bus

services run only once a day, if at all. Towns like Hamley Bridge have no transport whatsoever. We can imagine how the pensioners feel about that. Car travel means that one has to own a car to begin with, and one then runs the increased risk of having an accident, whether through one's own fault or somebody else's. If there were a decent passenger service to the northern areas of the State, particularly Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla, as well as places in between—I am talking about reinstating the Iron Triangle service—I am sure that many people would use it.

For example, I am sure that mothers with small children would use the service, because it is so much easier to manage children in a train than on a bus. They can be let reasonably loose and it is a more pleasant way for the whole family to travel. They arrive in Adelaide reasonably refreshed to go about their day's business. That was the way that these people chose to travel. However, they did not do so in its last few days because it was not user friendly. It was designed almost to scale itself down. It did not deliver passengers to the Adelaide Railway Station. I would support the Minister in reintroducing this service—a new service to the Iron Triangle—using modern rolling stock, ex-STA if need be, to give the Iron Triangle a reasonable rail service.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the few minutes available to me I should like to touch briefly on a matter which is causing great concern, or increasing concern, worldwide, and that is an increasing incidence of breast cancer in women. One of the problems is that more money needs to be devoted to research to find the reasons behind this increasing incidence. There has been a lot of comment, particularly in one article which I have recently been reading in *Time* magazine of 14 January 1991, about the relationship between the Western type of diet and the incidence of cancer and the fact that it is becoming increasingly obvious as one of the causes. I ask the State Minister of Health to urge his Federal colleague to provide funds for research into this very worrying increase in breast cancer in women.

I want to mention a few facts contained in this article. According to the National Cancer Institute the number of cases are continuing to soar. In the United States, between 1982 and 1987 there was an increase of 32 per cent. The only other comparable cause of death is lung cancer, but breast cancer leads in women aged 35 to 50. I am quoting American statistics, but overall a woman has a one in 10 chance of developing breast cancer during her lifetime, and apparently that risk is increasing.

As I mentioned, the big question is why. Most experts on this disease agree that part of the reason for that increase can be attributed to the earlier detection of tumours because of the increased use of mammography screening, something which I totally support and which I am looking forward to seeing in rural areas of South Australia later this year. I am sure that mammography screening will help to detect early breast cancer in women in those areas.

However, just detecting it is not the important thing; we have to discover why this very high incidence of cancer is occurring worldwide in women. The United States is pushing ahead to try to get a large amount of money for research through its Government. Canada has also been doing some preliminary research into this matter, but it is hoping to get further funds from its Government to increase the amount of research. Some 65 per cent of American women over the age of 40 have had mammograms, an increase from 20 per cent in 1979, and the widespread use of this tool, which is a low-dose X-ray, has meant that more women are discov-

ering tumours earlier thus cutting down the incidence of death from breast cancer.

In past decades prior to the increased use of mammography, such women might have died of other causes before their breast cancer was detected. Nonetheless, most investigators of this epidemic believe that early detection is only part of the story. They have been looking at the causes of breast cancer, one of which is called 'the fat factor'. Many researchers around the world are pointing to the Western type of life and a diet rich in fat as contributing causes to breast cancer. For more than 40 years researchers have actually known that in animals in a laboratory situation high fat diets promote growth of mammary tumours. They have also observed that the varying rate of breast cancer in different countries correlates very neatly with the amount of fat in each nation's diet.

I point out that the United States, Britain and the Netherlands, which have some of the world's richest diets, have among the highest breast cancer rates. We are probably all aware that countries such as Japan, Singapore and Romania have a very low fat diet. The incidence of breast cancer in those countries is one-sixth to one-half that of the United States. When women from countries such as Japan, Singapore and Romania move to, say, the United States—or Italians to Australia—they adopt the diet of the country to which they move and it has been found that their previously low breast cancer mortality rate rises to match the higher rate of the country to which they have moved. So, there is increasing support for the theory that a high fat diet contributes to breast cancer in women.

Maureen Henderson, an epidemiologist at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Centre in Seattle, flatly states that she is very sure that the connection between a diet rich in fat and breast cancer should be researched further. Researchers in Japan are going along the same lines and are also convinced by the same data used in Seattle. Breast cancer is one of the fastest growing diseases among Japanese women, increasing by 58 per cent in the 10-year span from 1975 to 1985. The largest factor behind that increase was the sharp rise in the Westernisation of eating habits in Japan. That factor has been a real cause for concern for researchers in that country. In fact, Japanese women are eating more animal fat and less fibre, a tendency which it is hoped will be counteracted.

I point out that, despite such evidence, not everyone shares the conviction that fat is the villain. Critics of this theory have pointed out that statistical correlation is not the same as proving cause and effect. However, many researchers argue that probably several lifestyle factors are involved rather than one single culprit. The high rate of breast cancer is not due to one bad habit but to our whole way of life, according to Mary-Claire King, a cancer geneticist at the University of California, Berkeley. However, it is also stated in this article that overall calories may play a larger role than fat. Critics of the fat theory have also pointed out that several studies seem to refute it. Unfortunately, researchers seeking conclusive evidence of the effects of a very low fat diet have had very little success in the past in obtaining funds. One concern is the total funding needed. Another concern is that women participating in such trials would have trouble adhering to the drastic regimen, which would mean very limited amounts of meat, dairy products and oils of any kind.

I believe that the United States and Canada are pressing ahead to try to get the necessary funding to continue with this research. They are asking for better regulation of mammography standards, for mandatory insurance coverage of mammograms and generally for more research into the still

mysterious roots of breast cancer. These countries will need to budget expressly for basic cancer research, and they are pressing for Federal funding for that purpose. That is why I suggest that our Minister of Health should press the Federal Minister of Health for sufficient funding at least to begin research because of the details that have already been given in a lot of overseas research, which shows that there must be some sort of correlation between the increasing rate of breast cancer in women and the types of diet that women are used to in various countries. I urge that as soon as possible this Government request the Federal Government to provide additional funding for research in this area.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Before I entered this august building as the member for Adelaide, we used to have grand round presentations on Wednesdays in the hospital and a case history would be presented to us. As medical students, this was a joyous occasion because there was free food—it was a feast. I intend tonight to present a case history that gives me no joy and, unfortunately, at the end of it there is famine rather than feast. The case I wish to describe is a case of paralysis associated with loss of vision, complicated by terminal narcolepsy.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And hardening of the arteries.

Dr ARMITAGE: And hardening of the arteries, indeed. Disease often affects people other than those primarily affected, and infectious diseases are a particular example of this. The case I wish to discuss tonight is just such a case. The patient suffering from paralysis, loss of vision and terminal narcolepsy is Government thinking and planning on health at both Federal and State levels.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: You had better define 'narcolepsy'.

Dr ARMITAGE: 'Narcolepsy' is sleeping sickness for those members other than the member for Coles who may not know that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: And the member for Stuart—I take that back. Unfortunately, the innocent victims of this disease are all South Australians, including the 52.1 per cent of the two-Party preferred voters who, at the last election, wanted a Liberal administration. Why do I assert that Government thinking in the health arena is afflicted by this disease? Let me give the history of the case in question.

The precipitating cause of this disease is the Federal budget, which was brought down yesterday and, in particular, the announcement that people being bulk billed will have to pay \$3.50 in the first instance, moving up to \$5 for a consultation. Clearly, this is a dismantling of Medicare. There is no way around it, it is a dismantling of something of which members opposite have been very proud.

I refer, first, to Medicare. The idea of Medicare, in essence, was to give a universal health cover but, in fact, what this jewel in Labor's medical thinking has provided is a universality, which I accept, but it is a universal access to waiting lists. On 19 February the Federal Minister told Parliament:

The Government has sought to manage an equitable approach to health insurance policy. It has been successful. It has been stable. It has resulted in the restraint of costs.

Now, about six months later, the Government has done an absolute somersault and, effectively, introduced a \$3.50 co-payment, soon to move to \$5 and, basically, dismantled bulk billing for medical services. This is the same Minister who recently described Medicare as 'one of the ALP's proudest social justice achievements'.

I have searched the literature—the journals, papers and newspapers—in the past week or so and listened to the radio for any comment on this from members opposite.

Unfortunately, I have heard nothing but echoing hypocrisy. Not one thing has been said by Ministers and members opposite, despite their proud vaunting of this universal health policy, which now has been effectively dismantled. Members opposite have sat back and said absolutely nothing.

Let us now talk about the disease's symptoms: first, the paralysis. I recently asked the Minister of Health in South Australia whether he had made any personal representations to the Federal Minister in regard to what could be quite clearly described as the most major change to the health system in the past 10 years. The true Sir Humphrey's man said, 'Well, I haven't actually done anything. My department has had some talks, but I haven't done anything.' This from a Minister who is in charge of the health care of South Australians.

Here we have a major dismantling of what the Federal Minister has described as one of the ALP's proudest social justice achievements, and the South Australian Minister has not even bothered to ring him to say, 'What's going on here? I understand that everyone is going to have to pay for their health care now. I thought for the past 10 years we have been saying that this is a wonderful free health system. What am I going to say now? How can I rationalise it? What will I tell all the people on my side of Parliament? How can I get around this? What effect will it have on public hospitals?'

What has our Minister done—nothing! What effect will this have on casualty and accident and emergency departments, which are already overrun and which already have many hours for patients to wait? What will happen is that, like a spring under Hooke's law, they will be further and further stretched. However, those of us who have studied it all know that, as you keep adding weights to the spring, Hooke's law states that eventually you exceed the coefficient of expansion and the spring does not come back.

I am very worried that this is exactly what is happening to our hospital systems: they are being overstretched, their coefficient of expansion is being exceeded, and they may never come back. The next symptom of this disease is loss of vision. Yesterday I asked the Premier whether he supported this move, and amongst other things he said:

The member for Adelaide, as Opposition spokesman on health and as a medical practitioner, would know about the problems of overservicing, of oversupply of doctors and the cost effects that will have.

He went on to suggest that a higher charge would help to stop this. That sounds great. However, it is a case of loss of vision and lack of ideas. There is a document called the Macklin Review, which is the Government's own National Health Strategy. Reading what that has to say about the capacity of such co-payments to control demand, it concludes that the importance of co-payments has been overstated in Australia and they are unlikely to play a significant role in solving any of the major problems facing the health sector.

Here we have the Premier casting around for ideas, devoid of the ability to take the hard decision and, unfortunately, the people of South Australia are suffering. What we have here is an example of a disease that has affected Government thinking both at Federal and at State levels. Its symptoms are clear. Unfortunately, members opposite fail to acknowledge those symptoms. They may well acknowledge them in the Caucus room, but unfortunately fail to acknowledge them to the people they represent. They have not once said, 'This will dismantle the jewel in Labor's health care crown.' They have not once said, 'People will pay more.' They have just accepted it. Unfortunately, South Australians are affected too greatly by this patient—the South

Australian Government—which is afflicted by this disease. I am afraid that the only solution I can see is for the Government to indulge in a liberal dose of voluntary euthanasia.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): During the course of this grievance debate, I wish to clarify a number of matters related to the sewage treatment works at Glenelg.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Clarification would be difficult: it is a bit murky.

Mr BRINDAL: It is indeed murky, as the member for Coles points out. This House has for some time been occupied one way or another with this matter, and I think it merits some clarification. When I raised the question on Thursday last, I believed that it was a matter of considerable public importance. It was not raised frivolously or in any way to be vexatious to the Minister for Environment and Planning. I have acknowledged in this House before that she is a hard working and dedicated Minister. Unfortunately, that does not mean that I or my colleagues always agree with every action taken. After all, those actions are not always taken by the Minister. The Minister is responsible, but the actions are often departmental actions for which she must exercise responsibility.

It was in that vein that I asked a question not about raw sewage, as the Minister seemed to think, but about the collection of what amounts to faecal material, soiled toilet paper, sanitary pads and other gross objects, in terms of size and, I suppose, in terms of nature, that are collected by primary screening at the treatment works around Adelaide.

It is not only the Glenelg works but all sewerage works. When the sewage flows into the works, there is a screen which, at the Glenelg works and I believe at other sewerage works, collects material the size of dentures. When people have occasion to be ill into the toilet, because of the effect that alcohol has upon the human body, they sometimes lose their dentures, and these dentures are collected in the screen at Glenelg.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is not an unhealthy interest. The only reason I explain that is to point out the size of material that the screen takes out. Anything that is larger than the size of dentures is taken out by an elevator and deposited in an open bin. That bin is then transported from Glenelg across the city to Wingfield. My information—and I believe it is good information—is that until the Minister took action there was some haphazardness about the process and the material was not covered. I do not think that that is a matter that should be taken lightly or not treated seriously. I draw members' attention to the fact that today there was a letter in the paper from a senior academic of the University of South Australia pointing out the problems that such matter can cause.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It was not a letter from the Opposition. I repeat, it was a letter from a senior academic of the University of South Australia, and that letter can be found in today's *Advertiser*. I draw the attention of the House to

the Asset Management Plan of the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works which is Library Reference 87/20 and which was produced by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in July 1987. It deals in some detail with the grit screenings process and the screenings disposal process. In 1987 this material, which was placed in the bins, was taken to other parts of the Glenelg works and buried in large trenches.

However, around that time they ran out of space and were no longer able to bury it on site. Apparently the Minister gave permission for this material to be transported across the city. It is about this that I take some objection. I cannot concede that it is a safe or healthy practice. The Minister has yet to convince me that it is in the best interest of this community that such a practice should continue. Indeed, the academic who wrote to the paper said that a safe method of disposal would be incineration and burial of the ash on site.

I would like to read into the record some of the comments that are made in the Asset Management Plan. Page 50 under the heading '5.2.7.1 Present Condition' states:

Disposal of most of the collected grit and screenings is by burial on-site in trenches dug in an area of the works buffer zone, although a portion of the pressed screenings (and grit) is burnt in a departmentally constructed incinerator.

The plan goes on and lists the type and nature of the material which comprises the screenings. Page 51 shows photographs of the corroded and deteriorated states of the A/B plant screens and the grit and screenings burial area. Under the heading '5.2.7.2 Upgrading Proposals'—and I presume that these were put to the Minister by her department—it states:

From preliminary investigation work that has already been carried out, it would appear that the preferred disposal option, especially from an environmental viewpoint, is total incineration of all the grit and screenings, with burial of the residual ash on site. The incinerator would be capable of meeting the requirements of the Clean Air Act, and ideally would be located adjacent to the existing screenings press to enable automatic mechanical feeding of the compressed screenings and dewatered grit into the incinerator.

The document points out that there would be an additional cost and also talks about a manpower saving. It states:

This manpower saving is expected to be in the order of 2 800 man hours per year, which equates to an annual recurrent cost saving of approximately \$23 000. Discounted at 7 per cent over 25 years, this saving would have a present value of \$268 000.

I think that this is an important matter. I accept that when I asked the question on Thursday the Minister may well have been confused and may not have understood what I was speaking about. However, I still believe that it is not good practice to carry material of this nature around our city. The Minister has at her disposal a report of the Engineering and Water Supply Department which clearly lists an available alternative.

The Glenelg sewage treatment works, I believe, is currently undergoing extensive upgrading for the benefit of the people of South Australia. This is another portion of upgrading that the Minister should look at, because no matter what else, it represents a more satisfactory way of dealing with the problem. I hope that the Minister, whose diligence I have not questioned before, is at least accepting of the fact that this is a problem and is prepared to look at it.

I do not think that the health of South Australians is something with which the Minister would deal lightly. This is a matter that concerns the health and well-being of us all, and I ask the Minister to consider this question carefully.

In answer to one member opposite, I would say that I do not have a fetish about this. If there is a distasteful subject about which I must speak in this House because I believe

it is to the betterment and good interests of South Australians, I will do so.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I would like to speak tonight about a real success story at the Carlton Primary School in Port Augusta in my electorate of Stuart. It is an R-7 school with 230 students, of which a very high percentage are Aborigines. The school community itself clearly identified a need to focus on developing skills in the areas of literacy and mathematics, and literacy across the curriculum is one of the major focuses of that school for this year. It has been developing many programs over the year in line with that focus.

One of the programs was funded by Priority Projects through the Federal Government, and that was for the development of a publishing centre at the school for students to publish their work. The publishing centre is a place where the students can encounter a wide range of publishing options and make positive choices about the presentation of the material that they want to put out in the school. The essence and aim was to increase childrens' self-esteem and confidence in themselves as readers and writers, and to give the many Aboriginal students a real purpose for their writing.

The actual writing includes the drafting and editing of anything they do, which is a very important part of the whole process. Small groups of students take their final drafts to the publishing centre where it is published in some way. The students' final drafts come from many subject areas, including the written language, mathematics, science and environmental education, and the publications so far have included a wide range and diverse subjects in posters, shape books, mobiles, big books and jigsaws. It is hoped that students will be encouraged to explore publishing options further by expanding into areas such as audio tapes, moving pop-up books, videos etc.

The publishing centre at that school received a very positive response from both students and staff, I am pleased to say. I was honoured to be part of the official opening ceremony, and I performed that in April this year together with Mr Ray Davey, who is an Aboriginal gentleman. It was very heartening to find that many of the parents of the children who attended the school were also present. Many people attended the official opening, including visitors from the metropolitan area and well-known authors. Max Fatchen and the Premier were amongst those who sent messages to the school. It was a rather unique experience for the school. The displays at the opening included writing drafts and proof sheets with editing comments, so the comments made by the editors to try to improve the skills of the students were shown.

As part of the evening's entertainment, a local songwriter, Mr Terrence Coulthard, presented some of his songs with the assistance of some of the Aboriginal students, and that was very well received by those in attendance. There was also a range of work by various authors and children. I pay tribute to the principal (Mr Bronte Stewart) and to Sue Gerschwitz and Gail Mather, two teachers who spent much time in establishing the publishing centre running it and having it ready for the official opening.

Much work went into that in conjunction with the children who were presenting their work, and I must say that all who saw the centre were very impressed with the work being done. I will refer briefly to some of the benefits of this publishing centre. The students have actually developed a greater degree of confidence and self-esteem. It has also increased their enthusiasm for reading and writing. A large number of the students are Aboriginal, and they were behind

the white children at the school in their reading, writing and mathematics skills. They have learnt skills with respect to publishing, they are making their own very positive decisions and choices about their own work, and there is a sense of ownership in terms of their work.

Their work is receiving recognition in the publishing centre, and that counts for a lot with those children. They share ideas in published work. They talk about that work and make decisions about whether it should be improved by further editing. That will help them with their further work. On speaking with the teachers, I found that the quality of work is increasing every week. They are very proud of the work being done. Children are taking risks and they are being far more creative than they were before the centre was opened because of their increased confidence and the recognition they are getting. They learn from the other children who present work, and more and more children are encouraged to participate in the activities of the centre.

They request a variety of resources of which they were not aware before, and they use those resources for innovative and novel ideas in presentation of their work. One important aspect that has become apparent is the very positive sense of self worth that these children feel as a result of their work. They are also being encouraged to take responsibility for their own behaviour and to use their initiative. That is also an extremely important part of the learning process for children at centres such as this. I understand from the teachers that the children are showing a much greater enthusiasm for reading, writing and speaking, and most of us would admit that one of the constant complaints we hear is that reading and writing skills are not as good as they were in the past: there is a need for greater emphasis on those skills in schools.

One very good thing about this publishing centre at the Carlton Primary School in Port Augusta is that it is actually achieving those improved skills. It is teaching the children, in the editing process, better spelling and grammatical skills, and how to string together sentences far better than they would have done before they attended the centre. It is a learning experience for those children and also for the teachers, who also are learning much more than they previously did with regard to these skills.

I know that they have been very excited about the progress made by the children. Also, it seems that the parents are taking much more interest in what their children are doing at this centre. They, too, are showing enthusiasm in terms of the reading, writing and mathematics skills of their children. They also feel a sense of achievement, together with their children, as to what is actually happening at the school.

The publishing centre helpers are also benefiting. They feel comfortable about working in the centre. They are encouraging the children to take risks and make decisions. It is not a one-way street. The children are not the only ones who benefit: the centre has also been of immense benefit to the teachers and the helpers. Fundraising activities have been held, such as the making of jewellery, so that the centre can continue to expand its activities.

We should all applaud this unique initiative. I feel very proud about it and would certainly urge other schools, if they have the opportunity, to set up such a centre, because it will be of immense benefit in those primary areas.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): As I said in concluding my remarks earlier today during the grievance debate on the Supply Bill, I had intended to continue my comments regarding the establishment of a multifunction polis, or whatever other name we care to give to the tech-

nical city in South Australia. In the second stage of my comments, I wanted to point out the similarities to and differences from what is currently being regarded as the model upon which South Australia should base its own technically oriented city, and I refer to Montpellier, where Professor Michel Le Cave, who visited South Australia some time ago to lecture on this subject, is a professor at the university, and where Madame Danielle Mouton is the charming and efficient manageress of the Corum Centre.

She is the lady who gave us considerable assistance, advice and literature, and that literature will be ultimately placed in the parliamentary Library for all members to peruse. I have copies with me, along with maps of the Montpellier centre and the several various parks of different kinds already established there. Montpellier is not similar to Adelaide in many respects. It is a 2 000 year old city at least, which was visited by that world famous Italian tourist of the time, the general Julius Caesar. He seems to have been very widely travelled, but he spent some time at Montpellier about the time of the birth of Christ.

Eighty per cent of the population of Montpellier is new to the area. In other words, 20 per cent of the existing population is from the old Roman city, the remaining 80 per cent having come to the town recently to take advantage of this wonderful French decentralisation program. There is probably the first variance with South Australia's intention. Montpellier, along with Sophia Antipolis at Nice, Toulouse and 20 or 30 other French cities, is an example not of centralisation upon Paris but of decentralisation to large, small or completely new French cities located well away from the capital. However, they are served by very good, first class, often multi-laned highways, and almost invariably served by fast or very fast trains.

The French trains can move at speeds of 500km/h plus; I believe they have established a world record from Paris to Bordeaux with a speed of 515km/h. It is also served with air services. I compare that with Australia where generally we have just dual-lane highways, with one track each way; where we have a rail system which, AN and the Federal Government has admitted, is very run down; and where our air fares are among the dearest in the world rather than the cheapest. Our communication system does not readily lend itself to that type of decentralisation.

Montpellier has the five new pods of commerce: technical enterprise, agriculture, the law, medicine, and commerce and industry; it also has a centre called Alpha, which is similar to our technical venture at the Levels. However, it is dissimilar also in that the French are very strict. If an industry after just a few months does not look like succeeding, that industry is encouraged to move away quickly to make way for someone else. There is no real level of tolerance there. As far as possible, people of similar interests are settled in each area adjacent to the new centres of industry, which are grafted straight onto the old city where the Corum, the administrative centre, lies in the main city square.

Land was readily available for the development of the Montpellier technopole—that is technopolis in Greek or technopole in French. The ancient city is really the soul of the new city which is settled around it. There is the Galeries Lafayette, a very large shopping conglomerate, commonly located around France, and immediately adjacent to that is a mixture of social low-class and high-class housing in wonderfully designed neoclassical architecture, multi-storey, immediately behind the gallery, and containing banking, medical, shopping and general service facilities which are

needed by the people who reside there. It is a mixture of very expensive high-class housing and what we would call typical Housing Trust accommodation, but of very good quality, in the centre of Montpellier.

Another feature where this city differs from the Adelaide proposal lies in the fact that much of the 80 per cent of imported population comes from North Africa. When the French colonies began to wind down in Algeria, French Morocco, many of the French people there, instead of remaining, gravitated back towards the mainland and, rather than move towards Paris, decided they would settle on the Mediterranean shores where Montpellier lies and where, immediately adjacent to Montpellier, just a little south, one or two absolutely first-class seaside holiday resorts have been constructed, such as La Grande Motte and Le Grau—wonderful architecture, most attractive, clean, tidy and the sort of development which naturally attracts people with intellectual capacity, with money to spend and to invest.

There again there is another point which I think is most important: the catalyst, the single most important thing that generated Montpellier's progress, was the decision by IBM, one of the world's large computer manufacturers, to establish a major industrial complex there that literally attracted others. In one booklet alone put out by the Montpellier innovative companies, some 100 companies are listed involving a wide variety of technological enterprises. I suppose the emphasis there is that this is a private enterprise initiative, not something superimposed by a Federal or State Government. The French Government has some financial and advisory input, the regional Governments also are vitally involved, and Montpellier has an extremely vigorous and influential mayor who has been very persuasive in bringing companies, funds and enterprise into his district. But there is only one council to deal with: there is not a conglomerate of councils to argue the point amongst one another. There is cooperation directly through the line between the tiers of government.

The 200 businesses, at least, which have already settled there have obviously made a great impression on the region. We found that, in almost every quadrant that we looked over from the centre of Montpellier, we could see much new construction continuing. Just as in Toulouse, a much older, settled area of France to the north of the Pyrenees, outside the foothills and on the plain, there is a tremendous amount of development, with as many as 14 or 15 construction cranes on the immediate horizon, just within the arc of a camera lens—about 36 degrees—that is, one-tenth of a full circle. It gives some idea of the extent of the development which is already taking place in these very progressive European multifunction cities. When I was there I could not help but compare the Australian scene, which is very much depressed at the moment, with the feeling of extreme buoyancy and liveliness in preparation for the totality of the European Common Market, which takes place within a very short space of time.

Incidentally, France is quite a large country, as anyone who has travelled there would know. It is not a small country, so we are not comparing small countries with Australia, which is a large one. France is large in its own right. Sophia Antipolis at Nice is a different concept from either Toulouse or Montpellier.

Motion carried.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 22 August at 11 a.m.