

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 September 1989

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 4),
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation,
Stamp Duties Act Amendment (No. 3).

PETITION: BICYCLE HELMETS

A petition signed by 546 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make the wearing of bicycle helmets compulsory was presented by Ms Gayler.

Petition received.

PETITION: MURRAY BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish another Neighbourhood Watch scheme in Murray Bridge was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: NORTHRIDGE KINDERGARTEN

A petition signed by 159 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow Northridge Kindergarten to provide a pre-entry program for children was presented by Mr McRae.

Petition received.

PETITION: RECYCLING PLANT

A petition signed by 1 344 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish a materials recycling plant and prevent the dumping of ozone depleting substances was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

PETITION: BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

A petition signed by 46 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish a rail service to Bridgewater was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: STOP SIGNS

A petition signed by 658 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make representation for the removal of 'stop' signs at the Wellington

Road, Mount Barker railway crossing was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: HUNTING AND FISHING

A petition signed by 906 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to further restrict hunting and fishing was presented by the Hon. J. C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: HARTLEY LANDFILL

A petition signed by 256 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop the proposed landfill at Hartley was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER GAOL

A petition signed by 10 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to relocate the Mount Gambier gaol to the Mil Lel Mingbool area was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: ADOPTION

A petition signed by 292 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the veto requirements for restricting information released about adopted persons and relinquishing parents was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARINELAND

A petition signed by 515 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the closure of Marineland was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: EASTERN BY-PASS OF GAWLER

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to urgently implement the eastern by-pass of Gawler was presented by the Hon. B. C. Eastick.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4, 5, 7, 17, 28, 35, 37, 43, 47, 49, 52, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 73, 77, 84, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 104, 105, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 128, 129, 133, 136 and 140;

and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ROAD GRANTS

In reply to Mr **BLACKER** (Flinders) 24 August.

The Hon. **FRANK BLEVINS**: In 1989-90, a total of \$22.7 million has been allocated to South Australia for local roads under the provisions of the Federal Government's Australian Centennial Roads Development (ACRD) legislation. The manner in which this money is distributed is subject to the approval of the Federal Minister and the arrangements already approved for 1989-90 are as follows:

Commonwealth grants to South Australia, which are made for construction and maintenance of local roads, shall be distributed in accordance with the following principles:

33 per cent retained by the Executive Director, Department of Road Transport for construction and maintenance of roads under his care, control and management (in unincorporated and incorporated areas).

67 per cent to be distributed to councils for expenditure on roads under their control.

Funds allocated for special local road projects are to be 22 per cent of the total allocation to councils and will be deducted from the total grants to councils prior to application of the formula. Financial assistance which is made available for the construction and maintenance of local roads shall be allocated so as to provide Aboriginal communities equitable treatment in regard to their access and internal local road needs. The share of funds available for council controlled roads will be distributed between councils on the following basis:

- The distribution of funds between metropolitan and rural regions will be on the basis of equal weighting of road length and population.
- The distribution of funds between councils in the metropolitan regions will be on the same basis.
- The distribution of funds between councils in rural regions will be on the basis of equal weighting of road length, population, area and road effort (excluding road grants).
- Road effort for the allocation will be based on the average effort over the past three years.
- No council will receive an amount less than 90 per cent of its previous year's allocation.

The consequence of these arrangements is summarised below:

Department of Road Transport share (33 per cent of total)	\$m 7.5
Comprising:	
• for roads maintained by the Executive Director	7.0
• for roads in Pitjantjatjara lands	0.5
Council share (67 per cent of total)	15.2
Comprising:	
• urban grants (33 per cent of council share)	5.0
• rural grants (45 per cent of council share)	6.9
• special local roads (22 per cent of council share)	3.3

Of the council share of \$15.2 million, \$11.9 million comprising the urban and rural grants is distributed by formula to individual councils. The balance (\$3.3 million) for special local roads is allocated to specific projects following receipt of advice from the Local Roads Advisory Committee, which is chaired by the President of the Local Government Association, Mr Malcolm Germein.

It follows that the distribution arrangements are already along the lines suggested in that 22 per cent of council's share of the local road fund is effectively distributed at ministerial discretion, albeit on the advice of the Local Roads Advisory Committee. This year's allocation is an increase of over 35 per cent on last year's figure. Nonetheless, the need for monitoring the effectiveness of the local roads program is recognised and the Local Roads Advisory Committee is active in this area. It will in due course be

providing advice concerning arrangements for next financial year.

URBAN LAND TRUST

In reply to the Hon. **TED CHAPMAN** (Alexandra) 24 August.

The Hon. **S.M. LENEHAN**: In carrying out its land bank function the South Australian Urban Land Trust identified approximately 420 hectares (1 050 acres) at Aldinga for acquisition during 1989-90. To date, agreement has been reached in respect of 250 hectares (approximately 60 per cent of the Aldinga program). Further land offers have been received from owners in the designated potential long term urban area. These offers are currently being considered.

Consultation with council on proposed acquisition has not occurred due to the sensitive nature of the relationship between the trust as the acquiring authority and individual property owners. There will, of course, be substantial consultation with council in the investigation and preparation of any structure plan and supplementary development plan to rezone land prior to eventual release and development.

SOIL CONTAMINATION

In reply to Mr **D.S. BAKER** (Victoria) 23 August.

The Hon. **S.M. LENEHAN**: All water samples collected from dams and streams outside the gun club property have had very low lead concentrations (maximum 0.004 mg/L compared with the recognised drinking water standard of 0.05 mg/L). Similarly test results on sheep taken from adjacent farm properties indicate that the lead levels are well below the maximum limits for human consumption. (levels are one-eighth of that expected to cause illness in sheep, and one-fifth of the maximum residue limit for human consumption of liver and kidney).

As well as the above tests, sixty soil samples have been taken in the Cromer area as part of an extensive soil sampling program of all shooting ranges in the State. These results should be available shortly. However, in the interim a ban has been placed on the use of lead shot at Cromer until further notice.

Mr ESMOND MOOSEEK

In reply to the Hon. **JENNIFER CASHMORE** (Coles) 24 August.

The Hon. **J.H.C. KLUNDER**: Esmond Mooseek's alleged drug ring operated out of Victoria and not South Australia. The authorities involved in investigation of allegations against Mooseek are the Victoria National Crime Authority and the Victoria Police. When Octapodellis (Mr X) was interviewed by the South Australia Police Anti-Corruption Branch, no additional information was gained relative to Mooseek other than that contained in the 'Advertiser tapes'. All information in those tapes has been passed to the Victoria Police and the South Australian Police do not intend to interview Esmond Mooseek in the Philippines.

MARINELAND

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table a letter from the Auditor-General relating to Marineland.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—River (Murray) Fishery.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafte)—
Administration and Probate Act 1919—Regulations—
Property Improvement.
Property Approval.
Supreme Court Act 1935—Supreme Court Rules—Hearings and Interest.
- By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works—
62nd General Report.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
State Transport Authority Act 1974—Regulations—
Expiation Fee.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Public Parks Act 1943—Disposal of Parklands, Mount Gambier.
- By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Murray-Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1987-88.
- By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Advances to Settlers—Auditor-General's Report on, 1988-89.
South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1988-89.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund—Actuarial Report, 1987-88.
Industrial Court and Commission of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.
Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1988-89.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the statement of the Registrar of Members' Interests for 1989.

Ordered that the statement be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Port Augusta-Port Wakefield Road Realignment—
5.3 km Merriton Section—Interim Report.
 - Salisbury Downs West Primary School—Final Report.
- Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

MARINELAND

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I address my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. As I am this afternoon making public an agreement which the Minister forced parties to the failed Marineland project to sign in February this year, will the Minister now release those parties from their obligations to keep confidential information they have which will reveal the real reasons why this project collapsed at a current cost to taxpayers of in excess of \$6 million? I have in my possession

a five-page document called 'Heads of agreement'. It is an agreement between the Minister of State Development and Technology, companies responsible for designing the proposed Marineland redevelopment and the principal of those companies, Mr Ellen.

Under the agreement, Mr Ellen and his companies were paid a sum of \$412 031, conditional upon their agreement to keep confidential all information contained in the agreement and all other facts relating to the collapse of the project. The agreement also requires them to indemnify the Minister against any loss or damage caused by the subsequent disclosure of the agreement. Identical agreements were signed by another company and members of the Abel family involving total payouts of more than \$700 000 in return for the silence of the parties.

The agreements were signed after some of those involved were called into the Department of State Development and Technology at very short notice on a Saturday afternoon in February and put under enormous pressure to do as the Government demanded. The parties disagreed with certain matters stated in the agreement but felt bound to sign it to protect their own investments of time and money in the project. The Opposition has received legal advice that the terms of these agreements are unprecedented in that they preclude the parties from revealing any information about the reasons for the failure of the Marineland project. However, some of the parties to these agreements have recently asked the Minister to release them from their obligations so the full story can be told, and overcome the \$700 000 hush money being paid by South Australian taxpayers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition knows he is not allowed to introduce comment of that nature. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Leader has asked variations on this question previously, as have other members of the Opposition. I indicated on those occasions that we would inquire about whether the amounts that have been paid could, with the agreement of all parties, be made public. That agreement was sought and obtained and those figures were made public. As to other aspects of the heads of agreement, the point is that this is standard commercial practice that has been followed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The advice I have from the Department of State Development and Technology and from other sources is that that is the case and that the wording of the confidentiality clause in the heads of agreement is a standard set of wording. Indeed, the honourable member has drawn a very long bow in his suggestion regarding the areas canvassed in the confidentiality agreement. I might say that the terms he has chosen to allegedly quote are not words that appear within the heads of agreement document.

The other point is that all parties to the agreement were willing parties: there was no compulsion on any party to sign these agreements. They were willing parties to signing the agreement. Indeed, they had lawyers present who assisted them in determining whether or not these agreements should be signed. There was not any compulsion on them to sign those documents, nor was there any attempt to keep them free of legal counsel in the signing of those agreements. The reason why I am not prepared to go further than the extent to which we have gone already is the serious precedent factor involved for any arrangement whereby a commercial agreement is entered into by any party with the Government

or any agency of the Government and the impact that may have on the validity of those commercial agreements and what willingness there might be for parties to sign any agreement with the Government, knowing that we might, just at capricious whim, simply make those documents available for full public scrutiny.

I have already indicated that I am happy to have a full briefing given to the Leader of the Opposition. He has not accepted that. That is fine; it is his decision not to accept that. But the offer still stands. I have also indicated that any documentation on this matter is, of course, available and has been made available to the Auditor-General for his complete satisfaction, or whatever other questions he may have on this matter. The other point which is also overlooked and which has been overlooked by the Leader of the Opposition but which has been said by me on a number of occasions is that there are other parties involved in this issue as well. Some of the funds involved are those of creditors—and the Leader of the Opposition would pay no value to those particular interests and he would simply say that they are of no concern in his harassment of this project, as he seeks to see this project not proceed.

WALLAROO JETTY

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Marine tell the House whether the Government plans to close the Wallaroo jetty to the public? Recent media reports have suggested that the Government is considering a proposal to close the jetty, and that that decision will flow on to other jetties in this State. My constituents who often holiday at Wallaroo have raised this matter with me.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: This matter was raised by the member for Goyder when he spread false information in the local press misrepresenting what had actually taken place. This again demonstrated his lack of concern for the welfare of the people of South Australia. At this moment the Government has no plans to close public access to the Wallaroo jetty. However, when people are working on the Wallaroo jetty some precautions need to be taken for the safety of those who work there and visit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Mitcham is making noises like a crow. I draw his attention to the danger that people visiting ports can be placed in when people are working. The Chairman of the Port Adelaide Safety Committee has approached the department to see whether access by the public and visitors can be banned on the Port Adelaide waterfront when ships are being worked. If members opposite had seen these people working, they would understand the dangers that can be involved.

Visitors are banned from the Port Giles jetty when ships are being worked; that is a normal precaution taken at that jetty. I remind the member for Goyder that, when fishing was allowed from the Ardrossan jetty, which was owned by BHP, people could fish only when ships were not being worked. The people in the town knew that; when a ship was being worked, people could not fish from that jetty. When I went back to Ardrossan I found out that people could not fish from the jetty because the public had misused that facility. At Port Giles, employees of the Department of Marine and Harbours have been abused and threatened with physical violence when they have asked people who were fishing to move so that they could drive their vehicles up and down the jetty. At Wallaroo, an employee—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Again, the honourable member illustrates his lack of concern by interjecting when he

should not. Departmental employees at Wallaroo have been placed in jeopardy because of the refusal of people using the jetty to move their equipment. The department will employ a consultant to review public access to all Port waterfront properties when they are being worked. Earlier I said that the member for Goyder does not concern himself too much with public safety, and in this House some years ago he admitted that he had approached the previous Minister of Labour (Hon. Jack Wright) and asked him to relax provisions in the occupational safety, health and welfare legislation so that a certain workplace in the electorate of Goyder could survive. In other words, he wanted workers in that workplace to be subject to a lower standard of safety than occurs anywhere else, and that on the basis of cost. We now have the member for Goyder wanting to place in jeopardy the lives of those who work on and visit jetties because people are denied access when ships are working.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! No matter how strongly the member for Goyder feels about some aspects of the matter being canvassed, it does not absolve him from the requirement of conducting himself appropriately in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology give an absolute and unequivocal guarantee that he will take no action against signatories to the secrecy agreement on the failed Marineland project? Clause 5 of the agreement released this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition gives the Minister the right to sue parties to the agreement if they disclose or distribute any of its contents. I am informed that the person who provided this copy of the agreement to the Opposition is, in fact, a person in the employ of the Government who can no longer accept the Minister's persistent refusal to make this agreement public therefore denying parties to it the opportunity to answer misleading claims by the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is clearly—

Mr BECKER: —about the failure of the Marineland project.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson will apologise for defying the Chair as he was being called to order.

Mr BECKER: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, because—

The SPEAKER: Without any excuses.

Mr BECKER: All right, I apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hanson has asked me to give an absolute assurance that no action will be taken upon anything to do with a clause in that agreement. I think that is asking whether I will give a blank cheque to any statements that might be made by any of the parties, signatory to this agreement, regardless of what those statements may happen to be, regardless of the veracity of those statements and regardless of anything to do about those statements. I think it would be grossly irresponsible if I as Minister were to give such a guarantee. I am not in a position to give such a guarantee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the Chair calls the House to order that includes the Leader of the Opposition and the members for Semaphore and Gilles. The honourable member for Briggs.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HOLDINGS

Mr RANN (Briggs): Is the Premier able to confirm a claim that the New South Wales Treasury Corporation (the equivalent of SAFA) was involved in the purchase of promissory notes issued by the Western Australian Government owned company known as Western Australian Government Holdings?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RANN: I can understand the Leader of the Opposition's embarrassment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: When the Chair is satisfied that the House has come to order I may be able to listen to the point of order from the member for Eyre. Will the member for Briggs resume his seat. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: The matters being canvassed by the member for Briggs are not the responsibility of this Government or the Premier and therefore the question is out of order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the impression that the question put by the member for Briggs related to a matter that was canvassed with the Premier in the Estimates Committee by way of a question from the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. By way of explanation I point out that during the last few weeks the Opposition has sought to connect South Australia with the dispute between the Bond Corporation and the Western Australian Government. Following a question that I put to the Premier during the Estimates Committees, the Leader of the Opposition circulated a press release that claimed that the Opposition had established a link between South Australia and Western Australia Incorporated. In a detailed answer, the Premier informed the Committee that the transaction was a normal action of SAFA and that other States had also purchased these promissory notes. Indeed, the Premier warned the Leader of the Opposition that he might not like all the facts. I understand that the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is beginning to make a speech on the matter. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am well aware of this press release that has been referred to by the member for Briggs. It is quite right that he should raise this question, and in fact he also raised the matter during the Estimates Committees. It was properly dealt with then, in relation to the action of the South Australian Government Financing Authority in purchasing promissory notes through a third party, or an intermediary, which were initially issued by Western Australian Government Holdings and guaranteed by the Western Australian Government. It was a perfectly normal transaction, on which the Leader of the Opposition then sought to place all sorts of sinister innuendo. His press release, I think, is a very good example of that. He uses terms like 'admissions', 'revealed' and 'strong links between the Bannon Government'.

He talked about loans. That was one thing that was well canvassed. Loans were not involved. It was not lending money at all. If that indicates an understanding of the financial markets, I just cannot understand what the Leader of the Opposition has been doing for the last seven years. It is quite extraordinary that he would purport to have the financial management of this State in his hands. I understand, actually, that he plans not to exercise the role of Treasurer—if he ever gains office. I can see why. So, there was nothing sinister about this transaction. Indeed, the fact is that the matter was raised in consequence of a question asked by a Government member during the Estimates Committees. The Leader of the Opposition could not leave that alone, and we had this extraordinary performance of his again attempting to create this sinister connection between the South Australian and Western Australian Governments to prop up some transaction—I think the term used was 'looking after their mates'—and he carried on regardless.

The question that really has to be asked is, first: how can we be the mates of the Western Australian Government doing a sinister deal in this case and, on the other hand, the New South Wales Liberal Government, which also took some of those promissory notes through its Treasury Corporation, not be part of this makeshift network and sinister transaction? When the question was put to him by an interviewer on the *7.30 Report*, the Leader of the Opposition was visibly shaken by this evidence and, very interestingly, cautioned that that be checked accurately. He said, 'It should be checked accurately. Don't take advice from one particular spokesman. I suggest you go direct and ask the New South Wales Government about that.' The New South Wales Government and the New South Wales Treasury Corporation obviously confirmed that it was part of the normal transactions that took place.

That, I would have thought, exploded the whole matter—blew it out of the water—and one would have thought that we would hear no more of it. The innuendo will continue, and the attempt to make this connection will go on. It is just typical of the half-truths and the way the Opposition jumps into things. It will not listen to advice and facts that have been put before the House. In this case, the whole transaction was clearly laid out. It was clear what was involved, and the Opposition got badly caught and wrong-footed by simply not understanding either the nature of the transaction or its connection.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He's pretending not to listen.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is very strenuously pretending not to listen, as well he might, because it was a pretty sorry performance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Public Works and the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only thing I suggest is that in future the facts be checked properly and, most importantly, this constant attempt to try to undermine the financial activities of the Government should cease. New South Wales, South Australia and anybody else investing in those promissory notes through their corporations were doing nothing more than acting in the normal course of events. I particularly like the ringing assertion from the Leader of the Opposition that 'under a Liberal Government, this transaction certainly would not have taken place'! He would not have known about it. It is not the sort of transaction that the Treasurer of the State has referred to him.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These transactions are made on a short-term basis under the authority guidelines properly given to SAFA in order to allow it to operate effectively. Every month I see what transactions have taken place, but that is a record of those matters that are out. I remind the House also that those purchases took place over a series of weeks through February and March, and the promissory notes were on-sold in May. So, they were short-term securities, as is the nature of such things. To say that 'under a Liberal Government this would not happen' suggests that the Leader of the Opposition, if we have the misfortune to see him in government (or whoever he deposes to try to run its financial affairs), would be sitting over there in front of the Reuters screen in the SAFA office looking at all the transactions and beating them up so that he could say, 'No, you can do this; yes, you can do that'. How plainly ridiculous!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government make immediate inquiries to determine whether the appointment of a receiver and manager today for a company in which Crestwin Corporation Limited holds major interests will affect its ability to undertake the marina project at Marino Rocks announced last week by the Premier? The Opposition has previously raised reports about the financial position of Crestwin, and in the Estimates Committees, the Premier said that to the best of the Government's knowledge these issues had now been resolved. However, this afternoon Westpac has announced it has appointed a receiver and manager for the cooling and heating equipment manufacturer, Braemar. This followed a request made last Friday by Braemar and a related company, APR Limited, to have trading in their shares suspended on the Australian Stock Exchange.

Crestwin Corporation owns more than 30 per cent of Braemar and about 17 per cent of APR. Braemar and Crestwin also have the same Chief Executive. I am advised that, if Crestwin relies on the trading of Braemar to provide a cash flow, its ability to pursue other projects will be in doubt following today's developments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader and the Minister of Transport to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is typical of the negative questioning of anything that happens that we get from the Opposition. To the best of my knowledge, it will not affect the viability of the Marino Rocks marina proposal. This is being carried out by a company called Mintern Pty Ltd, which is a South Australian registered company and subsidiary of Crestwin and, in that sense, is no different from other subsidiary companies of Crestwin. The overall viability of Crestwin, as I outlined to the House previously, was based on a private company, W. and B. Turner Pty Ltd, and Pettit and Sevitt Industries Ltd, a well-known home building company which operated for many years mainly in the New South Wales and Queensland markets and which has substance. Inquiries were made of the activities of Crestwin Corporation in the light of certain newspaper articles. A writ was taken out in the Victorian Supreme Court to wind up Crestwin due to default on a loan agreement, and that action was settled in Crestwin's favour, as I outlined to the House about two weeks ago. We have no

reason to doubt the financial viability and ability of Mintern Pty Ltd to carry out this development.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): I understand that at the recent Australian Industry and Technology Council meeting in Sydney there was significant agreement between State and Federal Ministers concerning a number of important issues that will have an effect on industrial development in Australia. Can the Minister of State Development and Technology provide the House with details of the agreement that was reached?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There was considerable agreement on a number of points between the Industry and Technology Ministers at State level and the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce (Senator Button). However, there was one area where concurrence was not reached and there was an understanding by the States that the Commonwealth was proposing to do something, although three States exhibited caution about the timing of the moves. One area where there was concurrence—indeed, South Australia argued strongly in favour of the decision that was made and could argue the great success of a certain program in South Australia—was the national industry extension service program which, by the concurrence of the State and Federal Ministers, is to be continued for another five years until 1996.

This program, previously introduced by the Commonwealth Government, has been of enormous value to small and medium sized manufacturing industry in South Australia. Indeed, South Australia has been the most successful State in implementing that program. We were very happy to concur with the extension of the program and argued for it very strongly. There were other areas where there was concurrence, but one area where concern was expressed by myself as the Minister from South Australia, and by the Ministers from Victoria and New South Wales, involved the Commonwealth's proposed changes from 1 November regarding the preference margin for Australian and New Zealand suppliers for Federal Government contracts.

The Federal Government has argued that the preference scheme which gives a 20 per cent margin to Australian or New Zealand suppliers ahead of overseas suppliers is too bureaucratic, far too complicated to work out the Australian or New Zealand content, and has not effectively provided a boost for Australian industry. If that were tangibly the case, all the States of Australia would have accepted the Commonwealth's changes. However, we in South Australia, after consulting with industry (the Engineering Employers Association, for example) in Victoria and in New South Wales, do not feel confident that industry is convinced that this is the way to go for the best support for Australian or New Zealand industry.

We have asked the Commonwealth to phase in the changes that they have announced they will bring in from 1 November, if not totally defer them until there has been a proper chance to consider the implications. Also, I have indicated that South Australia will not be changing in the foreseeable future our scheme here with respect to that subject until there has been a proper evaluation of the Commonwealth scheme to see whether or not it provides more benefits to Australian and New Zealand industry. It would be tragic if anything were to happen which would see Australian and New Zealand industry disadvantaged in Commonwealth tenders.

I say that against the background that all the argument in favour of the changes is very cogent. The arguments that

we want a system which is not bureaucratic, which addresses real needs in industry here, which does so with the minimum cost penalty and which tries to encourage competitive industry are all very sound arguments. However, until we know that it will actually work, that the preferencing patterns of Federal departmental officers will favour Australian industry, this State for one is not prepared to give its wholehearted endorsement to that scheme, and we have been joined, as I say, by two other States in our concerns about those matters.

MR X

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Are the police investigating a report that the late Mr X possessed information which would provide important clues in identifying members of the so-called Family? I refer to an article in Saturday's *Weekend Australian* which claimed that the late Mr X possessed 'statements and possibly a video tape incriminating South Australian identities with the Family.' The article claimed that a friend of Mr X now had possession of this material. In the transcript of an interview which Mr X gave last year, he stated that he knew one of the alleged victims of the so-called Family.

He also stated, in referring to the murder of this person that, 'I've heard of cults there, witchcraft, black sabbath cults. I know they make porno movies in Adelaide.' Mr X also stated that the source of his information was a man he named who is currently before the courts on drug related charges and who, according to Mr X, was 'very involved' in these activities.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member has asked a question regarding operational detail of police investigations. I quite deliberately do not involve myself in that operational detail. I have merely indicated to the police that they should get on with the job to the best of their ability as rapidly as possible. I do not believe that the police would pass up any clue or any information at all that might lead them to the apprehension of these people, and I do not believe that it is my job as Minister of Emergency Services to broadcast in this place or anywhere else the operational nature of their inquiries.

SOUTHERN BLUE FIN TUNA

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): Will the Minister of Fisheries inform the House of the Government's position on proposals for a moratorium on the taking of southern blue fin tuna, and does the Minister support suggestions that Australia goes it alone with a ban on the taking of tuna because of declining stocks? This morning's newspaper has indicated that the Australian Government has failed to win support for a complete ban on the taking of tuna by Japan, New Zealand and Australia. I understand that South Australia was represented at the talks held in Tokyo and that there was considerable debate about the need for the action proposed by the Australian Government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I certainly indicate that South Australia does not support a unilateral decision to impose a moratorium on the Australian southern blue fin tuna industry for the simple reason that it would be tying the industry's hands behind its back while other countries continue to exploit a resource that is under some pressure. The point that we have supported, as a State, in our discussions with the Commonwealth and other States, is that

we need to ensure that any decisions made are validated by the best possible scientific research data on what is happening with the stocks of southern blue fin tuna.

There was a suggestion at the recent Minister of Fisheries conference in Perth that State Ministers support any action taken by the Commonwealth Minister for Fisheries in this regard. At officer level, before the meeting of Ministers started, that suggestion was opposed by South Australia which said that at the very least it should be 'any appropriate action'. When the meeting of Ministers took place I opposed the motion and moved that the motion be amended to include 'any appropriate decision validated by scientific research on southern blue fin tuna stocks and after consultation with the industry', because it is clear to me that the data available on southern blue fin tuna leads to a number of realistic interpretations.

As to what is happening on the part of some people who are supporting a total moratorium on southern blue fin tuna fishing, they are taking the most pessimistic interpretation of the data available, whereas a very reasonable interpretation can be made for the harvesting of southern blue fin tuna if not necessarily at last year's quota levels, then certainly to have some harvesting of that tuna. The actual figure would need to be determined finally after close analysis of the data. That is the point about which we have gone in arguing, and I sought the permission of the Federal Minister to ensure that Rob Lewis, Director of Fisheries in South Australia, could participate in the trilateral agreement talks in Tokyo.

Indeed, he took part in the Australian delegation and has been at those Tokyo meetings. I am still awaiting a report from him on the outcome of those talks, but I can assure members that this State Government does not support unilateral action, nor action which would cause serious problems for the southern blue fin tuna industry in this State, unless there were to be very acceptable and detailed scientific data indicating that that is the course of action that should be followed in order to protect the industry's future. In other words, we do not want to have the industry fished out. No one wants that. The southern blue fin tuna fishing industry does not want that. We have to come to decisions which offer the best prospects in the circumstances. It is our view that a total moratorium is not needed to achieve that.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Following the disastrous August balance of payments figures has the Premier had discussions with the State Bank about their impact on home loan interest rates and can he say what that impact is likely to be?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I have not yet had discussions with the State Bank, but I will be doing so in the near future. I point out that the State Bank is in no different a position from any of the other banks in relation to the impact of balance of payments figures on interest rates generally. It is certainly a fact that the State Bank has remained very competitive and has been largely responsible for South Australians being able to enjoy slightly lower home loan interest rates than those in other States. There has been much talk recently about deregulation of the 13.5 per cent ceiling, but that is not something that I would support. One does not solve the problem or attempt to ameliorate the problems of one group of people by increasing greatly the problems of another group.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Nationally, there are about 800 000 on regulated loans and about 100 000 on deregulated loans. I have also had discussions with the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer about the interest rate outlook in the light of the balance of payments. I have put to them very strongly that for steps to be taken that do not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—try to contain interest rates at their present level would be quite disastrous, in my view, for the Australian economy, not only for individuals; also it would be a major setback to the sort of long-term economic investment that is taking place in this country. There are limits, as we all have to concede. I notice a member of another place taking notes in the gallery, Mr Speaker. There are limits—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: How sensitive he is!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members on both sides that references to the gallery are out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My remarks will be recorded in *Hansard* and will be made freely available to the public. In terms of our balance of payments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! My tolerance, such as it is, for the Deputy Leader is wearing very thin. I ask him to cease interjecting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: One must look at the structure of the balance of payments, and the fact is that many of the imports—a major impact on that adverse balance of payments—were equipment, machinery and aeroplanes which, in themselves, will earn us a great deal of foreign currency in years to come. The restructuring that has taken place in our industrial manufacturing sector has been quite remarkable, but it still has a way to go. Until the past two or three years we had seen about 15 years of virtually nil investment in this country; we had stagnation in relation to our capacity to meet export markets to further process goods. If interest rates go much higher, it will jeopardise those capital purchases and will prevent them from yielding the long-term benefits we are looking for.

Having said that, I point out that we are subject to international forces. No Australian Government can ignore that and must use whatever instruments of policy it has. I was very encouraged by the reaction of the market to the latest balance of payments figures. The Opposition greeted these figures with great alarm and a high degree of glee and excitement, hoping to capitalise on them, whereas the international marketplace understood the basic soundness of the Australian economy and the fact that we are getting a lot of things right and have enormous productive capacity, and, therefore the debt—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Premier resume his seat. If the Leader and the Deputy Leader have particular points they wish to make, a variety of forums of this House are open to them. I ask them not to barrage the House with interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: International markets recognise that the debt is repayable, and that is a fact as far as Australia is concerned. The international marketplace clearly recognises that, and as a result we do not have the pressure on our monetary policy and on our interest rates that those

figures would normally have suggested. Therefore, every effort should be made to ensure that interest rates do not go higher in the current climate and, if they do, I suggest that that will jeopardise the economic recovery that has been taking place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland.

GULLY YOUTH CENTRE

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I address my question to the Minister of Health. Will the State Government renew its financial commitment to the youth of Tea Tree Gully by again providing funds for the Gully Youth Centre? The Gully Youth Centre was established in 1984 and, for five years, has been able to operate under funding that has been provided substantially by the South Australian Health Commission. The agreement under which that body has operated expires next month and young people and their families in my electorate are anxious to see the youth centre maintained and again supported by the State Government.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I can confirm that this very important facility at Tea Tree Gully will continue to receive support. I have information from Dr Blaikie which indicates that \$45 500 will be made available, of which \$31 900 will be for the Gully Youth Centre and \$13 600 for the Banksia Park youth worker. I believe that some negotiations are still to take place between the Health Commission and the City of Tea Tree Gully. Certain matters about management are to be resolved. I should also make clear that what we have in mind here is that this guarantee should run for a three year period and not simply be limited to the current financial year, and that it will be inflated for costs, provided that the other funding bodies involved will agree to similarly provide for an inflation element in the funding that they make available. My understanding is that the remaining matters, which involve purely matters of detail, will be resolved in the very near future between the commission and the City of Tea Tree Gully, and that the future of the centre is therefore assured.

MARINELAND

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Does the Premier endorse statements made to this House previously by the Minister of State Development and Technology that the Government put no pressure on Zhen Yun to pull out of the Marineland redevelopment because of union and Greenpeace bans?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Speaker, I endorse those statements.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION VANDALISM

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Transport say whether the recently erected security fencing at the Adelaide Railway Station has resulted in any reduction in vandalism? There has been a series of spray painting attacks on suburban trains in recent years and the people responsible have proved to be elusive. Considerable damage has been caused to the train carriages. They have become unsightly and large costs have been incurred in effecting repairs and repainting. Nonetheless, some spray painted carriages are still in view to passengers arriving at the Adelaide Railway Station. This has raised the question of the

effectiveness of the newly erected security fences designed to reduce the incidence of such attacks.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Adelaide for his question. I note that when asking this question the member for Adelaide was subject to a deal of interjection from the Opposition spokesman on transport. I would have thought that he would be the last person to interject during the asking of a question on transport by a member on this side. I have been the Minister of Transport now for six months—and the shadow Minister of Transport has not asked one question. When someone on this side asks a question on transport, one would think that the member for Bragg would do the decent thing and keep quiet. This is a very serious question, because the incidence of vandalism on STA property—and indeed in the community in general—is very worrying. There is no single, simple solution.

Mr Lewis: Not a problem in the country.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, the member for Murray-Mallee also wants to enter into the debate; he also has had six months to ask me a question on this portfolio, but has chosen not to do that. So, I think that he, like the member for Bragg, also ought to have the decency to keep quiet.

It is a very worrying phenomenon that we are having to deal with. It is a great pity that taxpayers' funds have to be expended on operating security around STA property. It is not Government funds; it is not STA funds; it is taxpayers' funds. It is a shame that we cannot use those funds in a more productive way. Nevertheless, that has to be done. Not only have we put a considerable amount of fencing around the property mentioned by the member for Adelaide but also electronic surveillance equipment has to be installed. Since the fence has been erected and surveillance has increased, only one incidence of vandalism has occurred. I am pleased to say that our very efficient security squad apprehended the person who was committing the crime on STA property—and it is a crime. People ought to realise that they are damaging their own property: they are costing themselves money, and they should not do that. However, if they do that on STA property, the chances are that they will be caught. If they are caught, they will be dealt with, and dealt with very severely indeed, because the security that is now available to the STA is very efficient. It is a very sad sign of the times that we have to go to that extent to protect taxpayers' property.

ISLAND SEAWAY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Can the Minister of Marine give any indication as to when the *Island Seaway* will resume its service to Port Lincoln? Today the Minister put out an enthusiastic press statement on the success of the second stage of the *Island Seaway's* million dollar modifications. However, conspicuous by its absence is any reference to when the ship will be able to resume the service for which it was actually commissioned—to service Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island. In fact, it appeared from the Minister's statement that the servicing of Port Lincoln was not on the agenda.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

An honourable member: One fine day!

The SPEAKER: Order! Enough of the Madam Butterfly interjections.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The *Island Seaway* was tested on Saturday and Sunday and it resumed normal services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: Only when it's calm.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would appreciate a calm House.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —to Kingscote on Monday.

Mr Olsen: Following the *Falie*!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It did the trip very well. It will take about a week to make a comparison of the information from the testing of the propulsion unit and the relevant information from the testing when the vessel was first put into the water. When that has been completed, the operators will have discussions with the crew as to when it will resume services to Port Lincoln. There is a lot of joviality by members opposite about the performance of this vessel. They have made a lot of comments about it, but let us go through the facts. The Leader of the Opposition made a comment a long time ago ignoring the fact that the vessel was an engineering project on which work needed to be done. Members opposite have constantly made comparisons with the *Troubridge*, but they do not like this comparison. In 20 months, it carried 80 tonnes less—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: If the honourable member wants to ask a supplementary question, he should ask the Speaker. He might help him out. The *Island Seaway* achieved that in about 50 less trips. It operates at about \$2.25 million per year less than the *Troubridge*. That is something that members opposite have ignored. They ignore those costs, but I know what the member for Victoria, the well-known businessman, would be doing if he were operating that vessel. He would have the *Troubridge* cut up by now and be operating the *Island Seaway*.

He would not have any bother with it because it would be making money for him. Now he talks about the *Falie*. I read an article in a newspaper about the *Falie*, stating that the *Falie* had never stopped; it kept going in all weathers. That is a lot of baloney. The members for Victoria and Custance should know that. When those ketches were sailing, whether they arrived today, tomorrow or next week did not matter; they pulled into bays to shelter in rough weather. What members opposite cannot accept is that we have a ship that operates a lot more cheaply than the *Troubridge* and carries gear to Kangaroo Island more efficiently and cheaply.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: We frequently have interjections from members opposite asking about Port Lincoln. I will repeat what I said. They must be deaf and hard of hearing. I said that, when the comparative tests had been made between the equipment that was placed on board the *Island Seaway* during the trials on Saturday, Sunday and during this week and the equipment that underwent sea trials when the vessel was first commissioned, the operators would talk to the crew about going to Port Lincoln. I said that before and I have said it again, but members opposite seem to be deaf and lack understanding. They refuse to accept that we have a vessel that is operating today and carrying gear. The member for Mitcham is again acting like a crow on a fence and making a noise with no sense. We have a very good vessel that serves the people on the island very well and it will continue to serve them long after members opposite are not here to complain.

WESTCLIFF MARINA

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether local people in the suburbs of Karrara, Hallett Cove Estate and Marino be given an opportunity to have an input into the planning of roads and open space associated with the proposed Westcliff marina?

Since the announcement last week of the marina proposal at Westcliff, I have received a number of calls on the subject in my office from local people. Most of those calls have sought further information on the project and some have expressed a desire to see plans and, if necessary, to suggest minor amendments in relation to matters such as public access, open space and the deployment of traffic generated by the proposal.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As the honourable member knows, I have asked for the establishment of a community consultative committee made up of local residents; indeed, I have asked the member for Bright to convene that committee. The residents will have direct input into such things as helping to plan the open space areas that have been designated by the proponents on the proposal. They will also have direct access not only to the proponents of the development but to representatives from Marion council and from my department. It seems appropriate that local residents should not only be consulted but be part of the fuller consultative program planned for this exciting development.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I refer the Premier to the statement he made to the House on 9 August in introducing Supply Bill (No. 2), when he said that the Bill 'is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November'. Does this remain the position, or is the Public Service able to carry out its normal functions for a longer period before assent is received to the Appropriation Bill?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is a fishing for an election date question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —or the Opposition has run out of questions. The Supply Bill is based on what was provided in the previous year. It is expected to provide for the period that was indicated in the second reading speech. It may provide for a longer period. It depends on the rate at which expenditure takes place. These things are always estimates. That is roughly the sort of parameter involved.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Emergency Services inform the House of the situation in respect of the transportation of TDI (toluene di-isocyanate) through residential Port Adelaide and Lefevre Peninsula? What precautions are taken to avoid accidental spillage and, if spillage does occur, what procedures are in place to neutralise the effects of this dangerous chemical? I have been told that TDI is regularly transported through residential areas in Port Adelaide and Lefevre Peninsula. This is the same chemical which spilled from a derailed truck near the South Australian/Western Australian border earlier this year and caused the hospitalisation of six railway workers. The chemical is used to make foam products and can cause severe breathing problems and burning of the skin, eyes and lungs.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of his question so that I could check the details. Toluene di-isocyanate (TDI) is transported from Outer Harbor on a selected route, namely, Victoria Road, Semaphore Road, Causeway Road, Bower Road and Grand Junction Road, to avoid the main business section of Port Adelaide. To minimise the chance of accidental spillage the transportation of TDI is covered by the Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road and Rail, which is administered by the South Australian Department of Labour. The Metropolitan Fire Service has emergency procedures for the handling of a TDI spillage, as with any other dangerous substance. A liquid spill of TDI, if contained, can be treated.

The liquid is not highly volatile and vaporisation can be minimised by covering the spillage with a foam blanket and the TDI neutralised by using a 25 per cent aqueous ammonia solution (in my day that was called ammonium hydroxide) giving a final non-toxic product of urea.

CONSULTANCIES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): What procedures are followed by the Department for Community Welfare to award consultancies to the private sector; is this done by open tender in all cases; if not, why not; and how much has been spent on consultancies awarded to FEM Enterprises? Several public servants have contacted the Opposition concerned about methods used by the Department for Community Welfare to award consultancies and about whether the qualifications of those awarded this work are appropriate to meet the Government's requirements. Of particular concern is FEM Enterprises, the directors of which are Deborah McCulloch and Yve Repin. I understand that at least two Government departments are involved in consultancy work with FEM.

We are informed that the Department for Community Welfare is about to award, or has just awarded, a lucrative contract to FEM and in response to concerns within the Public Service that the awarding of such contracts is not just jobs for the girls. We seek assurances that this is based on sound qualifications and open tendering procedures.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We will give the member for Mitcham—

An honourable member: The wrong Minister!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister of Community Welfare has the call, and no-one else.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We will give the member for Mitcham the benefit of the doubt. The present Minister for Environment and Planning was such a trail blazer in her time in the portfolio and made such an impact that the misjudgment by the honourable member is that much more credible. It is usual for these matters to be put out to tender, although it is not invariably the case. However, in all cases, the procedures laid down generally in the Public Service for the handling of these matters are strictly followed. As to the particular matter that the honourable member has raised, I will obtain the information for the House and bring it back.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MISREPRESENTATION

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: Following the publication of an article in yesterday's *News* and following the proceedings of the Estimates Committees of 19 September, I find myself needing to correct what was said at that time by the Minister about me, and it was not possible for me to do so then. The *News* article states:

South of Adelaide lies an area which has developed into one of South Australia's hotspots for crime and domestic unrest...

Chief Superintendent Neil McKenzie puts forward some compelling reasons for the district's troubles. 'The Christies Beach area has a high proportion of single parent families and unemployed people aged between 18 and 19,' he said. 'Probably about half the people who live in the area are on some sort of social support program... and this, in turn, puts the area in the upper category of serious assaults, rapes, murders and attempted murders. 'There is a correlation between these two statistics,' Superintendent McKenzie said.

I asked a question of the Minister of Housing and Construction during the course of the Estimates Committees about ways in which the Government could address that problem, and he misrepresented what I said at that time. I wish to tell the House what it was that he said during that Committee, and put the record straight. The Minister said:

The member for Murray-Mallee, like many country members, periodically makes accusations that the trust sends people out of the metropolitan area to nice little country locations and that, in sending them there, we export the misery, and so on, that they seem to think exists in trust housing.

I never at any time said that, and I know of no other member who did so, either. Further, the Minister said:

I would like to think that members of Parliament would foster aid and assistance for those people—

I have, Mr Speaker, I would and I do—

not dismiss them, like the member for Murray-Mallee. I shall cut out that little piece of the *Hansard* and keep it on my desk. The next time the member for Murray-Mallee writes me a whingeing, carping, critical letter about me transporting single mums and other 'wasted' (in his words) groups—

and I never said that at any time—

—the dregs of society—to Lameroo or Tailem Bend, I can give it to him with both barrels.

I do not know what the Minister was going to give me, but what I said bore no resemblance to what the Minister said. I stated:

I sincerely believe that the cost of providing dwellings in country towns, whether converted from STA stock or, as is more likely, constructed on existing blocks as infill, is very much less than in the metropolitan area. Indeed, this is for several reasons...

I gave those reasons as the cost of land, and so on, and continued:

An even greater benefit to the State Government—and therefore to the population of South Australia at large—relates not only to the fact that the dollar will go further in providing housing for those in need but that it locates families, who might be in unfortunate circumstances, in a community atmosphere in which their children can grow up without being anonymous and indifferent and subject to the unfortunate influences of ghetto suburbs, such as occur in some places in the north and south, where cheek by jowl there are hundreds upon hundreds of trust homes and people with similar problems living in the same locality, causing social mores to develop and a certain subcultural attitude that is less than constructive by comparison to what might have otherwise occurred had these people had the good fortune to live in a caring rural community, like Meningie or Lameroo, for example.

What I said was not in any way accurately reported by the Minister in the remarks that he made. There has not been an opportunity for me to correct that record, and I now thank the House for its leave for me to do so.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for the completion of the following Bills: Superannuation Act Amendment (No. 2), Appropriation, be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule on whether we are now being asked to note the Estimates Committees' reports when, in fact, those reports are not yet on our record? I and other members have not had the opportunity of analysing what has been said.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 September. Page 751.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition generally supports the Bill, albeit with one or two reservations which will be expressed during the debate. The amendments to this Act are designed to remove the State Government superannuation scheme from the new taxation arrangements on superannuation funds which were introduced by the Hawke Government. Two areas of taxation have been placed on superannuation funds, namely, the 15 per cent tax on employer contributions and the 15 per cent tax on the earnings of the funds. Under the proposed amendments, the Superannuation Fund will hold assets of the Crown and the investment trust will be the instrument of the Crown. This will effectively remove the fund from being taxed, because State Governments are not subject to Commonwealth taxation.

Employees will pay their contributions direct to the Treasurer, who will then transmit these to the trust for investment. Benefits will be made by the Treasurer rather than by the fund or the trust, thus keeping it wholly as a State Government concern. The net effect of this change is that the fund will not be taxed in the same fashion as are the private schemes, but Public Service employees will be required to pay taxation on their moneys at the time of receipt. A minor amendment allows the board to include other persons under the State Government superannuation scheme, and mention has been made of the Leader of the Opposition's office in that second reading contribution.

I wish briefly to review the reason for this move. The Hawke Government has seen fit to tax superannuation at the front end, a move that assists the revenue process for the Commonwealth Government but does not assist the long-term structural adjustment away from social welfare onto annuities and superannuation schemes that I believe everyone in this House desires. The long-term future of Australia, as has often been mentioned, really depends on our capacity to pay for what we provide.

One way in which we can improve our performance and improve our ability to rely on ourselves rather than on Government is to ensure that people have the capacity, when retiring, to have sufficient income to look after themselves rather than having to rely on Government. We have seen the Federal Government, in conjunction with the ACTU, being quite successful in moving towards a system of compulsory industrial superannuation as a trade-off against wages.

In this case it is the employer who is providing for the employees but, if the end result were to generate sufficient funds for people to support themselves in retirement, we would say that what to us is a short-term cost would be a long-term benefit to the country. However, as soon as the scheme is introduced, the Government decides it is going to tax it—and tax it at the front end rather than the back end, when people normally pay for their taxation forgone during the period of contribution. To me, it is quite cynical of any Government which says that we will provide for our future employees in their retirement to then use that as another revenue raising measure.

To me, it is important that people have sufficient in that lump sum base at the point of retirement so that they can comfortably revert to an annuity type of arrangement and perhaps top up with pension if it gets below a certain limit. People should be able to revert to that annuity with certain taxation breaks in the system so that the social welfare system does not keep getting battered.

Each time I think the Federal Government is heading in the right direction, we take a step backwards, and the long-term perception I have of Australia keeps getting shattered by the Government making short-term decisions to rip off some more money to assist the revenue budget. The taxation measure that was brought into place for the short-term benefit of the Federal Government has caused problems to State Governments throughout Australia. In private schemes it is quite clear: adjustments are being made in consultation with contributors to those schemes, that there will be a draw-back of the total benefits. That has been provided for in this legislation. If someone had been promised on the basis of a two for one employer contribution a certain benefit, the fund trustees are quite entitled to say that the benefit is going to be 10 per cent, 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 30 per cent or 35 per cent less than would have been expected, depending on when that person came into the scheme.

That is already provided for. As to the State Government, it would have to go through the same procedures, which would cause considerable trauma to the State Government, because it would be saying to its employees that four, five, six or seven times the salary arrangement at the various age that people were taken into the scheme can no longer apply because the cash at the end of the day will be less if we have the earnings of the fund taxed at the front end. That is what will happen under the Commonwealth scheme: the earnings of the fund will be taxed at the front end by 15 per cent. The employer contribution will not be taxed because the State Government is not subject to taxation. It is a matter of judgment whether it would cost the State Government more or the same—the judgment being would the State Government then feel bound or be under pressure to increase its contribution to make up the loss that would occur at the time of retirement?

If we just take the bland legislation, it is obvious that it is taking us nowhere, except that it is getting over a political dilemma of how to tell employees that the ultimate cash benefit is going to be lower. The way out of that is to restructure or change the nature of the scheme and bring it under the auspices of the State Government so that the ultimate end benefit is preserved. Some people have done calculations and they have suggested to me that this scheme could mean that the employee is worse off than if the scheme had been taxed at the front end. There is much confusion about that. The explanation provided to me is that there are ways in which one can have earnings on a superannuation fund which by definition would be non-taxable but which become available to the scheme at the

time of payout. They are in a capital gains type area and do not come under the current taxation ambit. So, it is possible to restructure the investment portfolio of the superannuation fund to take a large element outside that area which would be subject to 15 per cent taxation.

By so doing, the employee—if the 15 per cent taxable earnings were taken into account—would be better taxed at the front end than at the back, when being paid. It is a difficult situation. It is an incredibly complex situation, but I have been assured by different people who regard themselves as experts that that is the case. While public servants might have some security as to their ultimate benefits in dollar terms which may still well be preserved, in terms of what their net return may be, they could be worse off. I want that point clearly understood. What we are doing here is preserving their entitlement, which is shown under the Act. This means that we do not have to go through the long and arduous task of renegotiating all the formula that we spent so much time going through in 1988.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We did it well.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, we did it well. It means that we do not have to get into political problems in terms of people who believe that their benefits should be greater. It does not necessarily answer the long-term question, and I felt that I should make that point. I suppose that there are a number of other Governments around Australia doing exactly the same thing as we are doing, because they do not want to go through the same process. We are not alone, and I would presume that if the Liberal Opposition were in Government today, we would be looking at a similar scheme.

The alternative would mean months and months of complex actuarial work and negotiation. The one big downside of this legislation is that the superannuation fund now will be under the legislative control and responsibility of the Treasurer. Whilst already there are some reasons why the legislation has to change—and there are some safeguards in the Bill—there is the simple fact that a fund which has been independent is now under the control of the Treasurer. Whether we like it or not, that is a fundamental distinction between the Superannuation Investment Trust, which was provided with legislative backing and independence, making its investment decision subject to certain checks and balances and the Treasurer being the controlling authority of that trust.

No-one really wants to go down the track and surmise what can happen in those circumstances, but it is important for everyone to understand that we are taking a step today which could have some serious ramifications in the future. It is the Treasurer, because he is the designated person—the person of the Government, the person who is there to avoid the taxation—who now controls the moneys. We know that the moneys have to go through the Treasurer to go into the fund, and they must go out through the Treasurer to be paid. We have certain undertakings.

I know that the Public Service Association, for example, has been consulted and is content with the undertakings given by the Treasurer. However, those undertakings last only as long as the present incumbent is in power. Those undertakings will not necessarily stand the test of time. Therefore, there are some serious questions about the ultimate control of this fund. I will go somewhat further: we know that there are certain investments that have been made through SASFIT which the Opposition has seriously questioned. I refer to the ASER development, about which we still do not know the bottom line. We do not know how much was ultimately placed in the ASER complex by SASFIT. We do not know what the earnings on that investment will be because, according to our calculations, SASFIT was

required to double its contribution to the ASER project. Therefore, we would suggest that it is in a negative earning situation today.

I note—and it is important to note—that the annual report of the South Australian Superannuation Board and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust for 30 June 1988 has still not been presented, and that makes me very suspicious. If SASFIT is operating effectively, why have we not seen its report? During Committee I will ask the Minister about the whereabouts of the 1988 report, which was supposed to be produced last year and is still not before the Parliament. The Auditor-General noted that he had not been able to audit the books because the accounts had not been finalised. If that is so, why are we transferring a fund, where there seems to be no accountability to the Parliament and no-one knows what is in its report?

Is the report so horrific and are so many problems associated with the management of the fund that it is being kept quiet until an appropriate time? What ramifications does that have in relation to transferring this fund to the control of the Treasurer? The Opposition believes that those questions are important and we would like them answered. The Opposition would also like to know the long-term liabilities of the Government's superannuation contributions. The last time I asked such a question its outstanding liability was in excess of \$2 billion. Since that time the liability has almost certainly increased, and in addition there is the 3 per cent contribution for all those people who were not part of the old scheme. I would like my questions answered during the Committee stage.

Another area I will canvass will be a change to widen the definition of those bodies or persons who can be included in Government superannuation. I note that clause 2 amends the 1988 Act, and the Opposition would like to know how far that provision will extend. The Opposition understands the dilemma that is faced by all Governments in this situation, and supports the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister Assisting the Treasurer): I thank the member for Mitcham for his support of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Superannuation arrangements.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In most Bills clause 2 provides that an Act will come into operation on a particular date or at the time of proclamation. Is that the usual way in which legislation is enacted?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was not considered necessary in this case because there will be absolutely no delay in bringing this Bill into effect.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That means the Bill will come into operation when it is proclaimed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: When it is assented to by the Governor.

Mr S.J. BAKER: When is that intended to take place?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Immediately the Bill has gone through the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause widens the definition under the 1988 Act to include 'or person'. The second reading explanation stated that a minor amendment was proposed to section 5 of the Act to enable the Superannuation Board to enter into an arrangement with the Leader of the Opposition to enable his staff to be eligible for superannuation and in relation to matters of funding for the accruing lia-

bility. If this is the only body or persons affected by the change, the Opposition is quite content. Members will understand that the Leader's office has permanent long-serving staff, as well as contract staff who perform various duties, and it is appropriate that permanent staff be brought under this Act. Is that the only body or person to be included in this definition?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am advised that the Government has no intention of going any further.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5—'The fund.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: The second reading explanation stated that a number of schemes could be in a similar situation as the South Australian Superannuation Fund. Will the Minister provide a list of those schemes to Parliament?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that a determination has to be made about whether State Government authority schemes will be brought directly under the State Government or whether they will pay their tax up front. With which instrumentalities has this matter been discussed? At what stage are such discussions, for example, with ETSA and the South Australian Fire Brigade?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Discussions are at various stages with various contributors to the various funds. I will undertake to let the member for Mitcham know, as each fund is considered, the views of the contributors to those funds and what action is taken in relation to them. I think that negotiations in relation to one fund have been concluded and that it has been decided not to bring that particular authority's superannuation fund under the umbrella of the State Superannuation Act. However, it would be better if I get the member for Mitcham the information to date and undertake to keep him informed of ongoing discussions.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Has the Minister or his staff undertaken calculations, based on today's taxation system (given that we will never be able to understand or predict where taxation is leading us), to determine whether Public Service employees are better off paying the 15 per cent on the earnings of the fund now or waiting until the end of their working lifetime and then paying the appropriate rate on their payments?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the member for Mitcham stated in his second reading contribution, the PSA is happy with the Bill presently before us. If the PSA is happy with it, one can only assume that the provision is in its interests.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Insertion of Divisions IIIA and IIIB in Part II.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In response to the second reading debate the Minister simply said, 'I thank the Opposition.' That was all very well, but I was looking for some indication as to what had happened to the report which has not been provided to Parliament and which has not been subject to audit by the Auditor-General. I think it is pretty important that we know exactly where we are in relation to this matter.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do apologise for that oversight. The report ought to be available in the very near future—and I am talking about weeks rather than months. The report has been delayed purely due to the complexity of the calculation of earning ratios, etc. There is nothing sinister involved, no scandal. As soon as the report is completed, some time over the next few weeks, it will be presented to Parliament.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would like to know a little more about the ASER development, although I do not know whether this is the time when I will actually get an answer.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant to this clause.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On the matter of contributors' accounts and payment of benefits, I refer to the long term viability of the superannuation fund. As the Minister would understand, in 1988-89 we set aside \$120 million for the State Government contribution, while we finished up paying out \$140 million. In 1989-90 the estimate of the State Government's contribution is \$121 million, while we will probably pay out \$140 million at the end of the day. On the basis of my calculation, the Government liability for the old schemes (and I will now refer to both those schemes as the 'old' schemes) is in excess of \$2 billion. Will the Minister confirm that? Secondly, will the Minister provide some indication to the Committee of what the mounting liability for the 3 per cent contribution is?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: At the moment I cannot confirm the calculations made by the member for Mitcham, but I will have this matter investigated and respond to the honourable member direct. As regards the second question, again, I will have that matter examined. I am sure that this can be calculated and I will relay the results of the calculation to the member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am disappointed with that. We are talking about a change in arrangements. There has been some discussion that Governments will eventually have to pull the plug, that they will not be able to pay their bills and that they will not be capable of meeting some of the benefits that have been promised. I think it is important for the Committee to understand what the liabilities of the funds are, because we are at a point of transfer. Effectively, we are transferring the independent control from the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust to the control of the Treasurer. Whilst there are some checks and balances, in those circumstances I believe it is important for the Minister to tell the Committee clearly what the liabilities are and what the Government will have to pay out over the forthcoming year for its share of the contributions—although to my mind this should have been paid in from the very beginning, in which case we would not have this great problem that we have today, that is, the problem of escalating inbuilt liabilities. When will the Minister have the information we desire? I hope that it is available before debate commences in the other place.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will do my best to get that calculation for the member for Mitcham. If it means giving it in the other House, that is fine—there is nothing unusual in that. If I understand the member for Mitcham correctly, he is saying that the control of the management of the fund is moving from the trustees to the Crown. That is not the case. Clause 5 (3) stipulates quite clearly:

The fund is subject to the management and control of the trust. Management and control of the fund remains with the trust. It does not pass to the Treasurer.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Percentage of pension, etc., to be charged against contribution account.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: By way of rejoinder to the Minister's last comment, the trust is an instrumentality of the Crown and, indeed, the Treasurer will have the legislative control of that fund.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr HAMILTON: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE (Playford): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B, and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

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

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am not the lead speaker. I will refer to some of the matters dealt with in the Committees on which I served, but first I wish to draw the attention of members particularly to the operation of the State Clothing Corporation. The Auditor-General's Report deals with the operations of the State Clothing Corporation in some detail. He states:

The corporation is established under the State Clothing Corporation Act. The functions of the corporation are to manufacture, repair, supply and deliver clothing, linen and other textile goods which are required by any department, agency or instrumentality of the State or any other person approved by the Minister. The factory is situated at Whyalla with an administrative and sales office located in Adelaide.

Significant features:

- The operating loss after abnormal items was \$591 000 . . .

That is more than for last year. Further:

- Cost of goods sold . . . was only marginally less than sales revenue;
- State Government grants increased by \$191 000 to \$460 000;
- Reduction in administrative expenses . . . due mainly to management services provided by the Central Linen Service not being fully recharged to the corporation.

The Auditor-General further states:

Since 1984, the Government has contributed \$1 million by way of grants to the operations of the corporation.

Further, under 'Sales', he states:

Goods to the value of \$1.3 million were sold during the year.

Then follows a list of the major clients. He adds:

In addition, the corporation manufactured products for a private company on a cut, make and trim basis. For 1988-89, sales under this arrangement represented 35 per cent of sales.

Over one-third of its sales were made to this private, unnamed company. He states further:

As at 16 August 1989, outstanding orders for the manufacture of these products represented production to December 1989.

That means all production from 16 August to the end of this year was for this private company. So, I was more than surprised when I walked to the bargain counter of a store in Rundle Mall this week (as is my wont: I like to see what is on offer) and found the cheapest of cheap garments I have seen in the past 10 years on display made by the State Clothing Corporation, and I am wearing them right now! I

know I am not allowed to display goods in Parliament, and I cannot drop my strides! I am just stating fact: the shirt and the strides which I am currently wearing were—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, they are not. There is no hook; that was missing. I bought the pair of trousers for the princely sum of \$8.99 (less than \$9) and the shirt for \$8, so my outfit cost me the princely sum of \$16.99—and here is the docket if no one believes me. I have bought the old King Gees and Can't Tearems on special, but I have never had a bargain such as this. It is no wonder that the State Clothing Corporation is losing money. It had sales of \$1.3 million and lost over \$500 000 last year.

An honourable member: That is not your size.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is. When I put them on, I found a few things missing, including the clip that holds up the pants. But what do you expect for 9 bucks? That is probably what knocked off the cent! I would be right if I had that clip. There are a few important points to be made from all this. The State Clothing Corporation was set up, as I understand it, to supply Government departments at cheap cost. Well, it has never been able to do that successfully. Now, over one-third of its production goes to supplying a private unnamed purchaser, as the Auditor-General tells us, and all its sales for the five months from 16 August 1989 to the end of December were to that purchaser.

Mr Hamilton: Are you sure you're not wearing rejects?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I don't know whether they are rejects, but I defy anyone to suggest that the strides and shirt I am currently wearing can be manufactured for less than \$17.

Mr Hamilton: They might be rejects.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I don't know whether they are rejects, but the corporation is supplying this private company with its total production. All I can say is that I have never bought King Gees and Can't Tearems for anything like that on special. It seems ludicrous to me that the State Clothing Corporation is trying to get into this business. It is trying to supply the retail market, but the items were thrown out on a table at this retail store. When I was rummaging through them, I was quite excited. I have always had an eye for a bargain.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Talking about sizes, I was looking around for the appropriate size (and with a clip they would not be too bad), but a gentleman said to me, 'Don't take any notice of the size; they are all over the shop.' In other words, he was telling me that, if the article carried a 102 cm tag, it could be 115 cm. I asked casually in conversation with another customer, 'I wonder why this is so cheap?' to which he retorted, 'I think they are going out of business.' Be that as it may, I simply draw attention to the fact that the clothes I am wearing are subsidised handsomely by the public, and it seems a fairly ludicrous situation that the public is subsidising heavily, to the extent of \$500 000 on sales of \$1.3 million. If that amount is worked out as a percentage loss, that is a pretty heavy subsidisation of the operations of the State Clothing Corporation. It is ludicrous that, here am I, on my nonetheless fairly modest salary, having my clothing subsidised by the taxpayers of South Australia. I simply highlight the fact that that is another facet of the operations of the State Clothing Corporation which rather fascinated me.

With reference to the other Estimates Committees of which I was a member, let me say at the outset that I was rather astonished to enter the Chamber on Thursday eve-

ning last to hear the Acting Chairman of the Committee (the pro tem) ruling that any questioning on the commercial operations of Satco was out of order. There is one of two explanations for this phenomenon. It was suggested that the schedule on which we voted had no reference to Satco, and, therefore, any questions on those lines were out of order. That was either a ruse dreamt up earlier to preclude any questions about Satco (where a lot of taxpayers' funds have gone down the gurgler) or an attempt to block questioning. I do not know what the correct explanation is, but it is absolutely ludicrous when, in the Estimates Committees, members are precluded from asking questions about any matter involving Government expenditure or income.

The whole budget is about income and expenditure. If, through some oversight, some technicality, or some ruse of the Government, questioning is precluded, something is very much at fault. Any item which involves Government expenditure or income should and must be open to legitimate questioning during the budget debates and particularly in the Estimates Committees. If the Chairman's ruling was correct, we must have much closer scrutiny of the Standing Orders in relation to the votes which lead to the Estimates Committees. It is absurd, but of course it plays into the hands of the Government if it has anything to hide; and that was a particularly sensitive Committee. If that is the case, the resolutions which allow for examination by the Estimates Committees must be very closely scrutinised.

We finished by having a fuss. If the questioning had not been allowed to proceed, we would have been back on Friday morning at 9.30 discussing the matter. However, questioning was allowed to proceed as a result of an agreement. The decision makers decided that they would rather let the questioning go ahead than come back the next morning to discuss the disagreement with the Chairman's ruling. That ludicrous situation arose because of a technicality or a deliberate ruse by the Government—possibly the former—to suppress questioning on Satco. Commonsense prevailed, but only under threat of our coming back at 9.30 on the Friday morning to discuss the matter fully.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am raising the matter now. We were told to use the appropriate forum to discuss it. I must press on. Is it 30 or 20 minutes?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: 20 minutes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was told by the Deputy Premier that it was half an hour. He did not understand. To put it in the vernacular, I was given a bum steer by the Deputy Premier. When I suggested that the program was pretty light this week, and we had done our sums on 20 minutes per speech, he said, 'Don't you know, you get half an hour for the debate.' The advice that I got from the former Speaker was correct, and the advice that I got from the Deputy Premier was wrong. I do not usually use such words, but I got a bum steer. I have a lot to cover in my remaining seven minutes. I will have a go at some other time in relation to these Estimates Committees because I have a lot of ground to cover.

The Hon. Ms Wiese was less than forthcoming or convincing in relation to the operations of State Services. I served on that Committee. We pointed out that the Auditor-General had some hard things to say about the State Computing Centre, StatePrint and StateLink, and whatever else the Minister is responsible for under that line. The Auditor-General suggested that financial accountability left a lot to be desired. In his special comments, the Auditor-General said that Audit's concern for review was driven by changes in technology and that the absence of a policy framework makes it difficult to ensure that the most appropriate invest-

ment decisions are being made. This is in relation to the State Computing Business Unit, which wished to spend \$9 million to upgrade computing equipment, not knowing where it was going. Time precludes me from elaborating on that.

I pointed out that StatePrint had made a handsome loss last year. I also pointed out that as regards StateLink—this new unit which is to get rid of Telecom and allow us to have our own internal communications system within the South Australian Government—the Auditor-General said it did not have any good controls in place and he was still awaiting two reports in relation to management and financial reporting. The Hon. Ms Wiese—and I thought this was good stuff—said:

As to the issue of the interim solution adopted by State Computing, State Computing was requested by the Government Management Board to take this approach to the situation before it because the Government Management Board is developing policies for large computing facilities. Until the policy is finalised in this area, it was concerned that State Computing should not take a decision which later may be considered to be in conflict with that broad direction. State Computing was in close consultation with the policy-making body on this issue, it acted on its advice, and some of the criticisms made by the Auditor-General in this matter are therefore not considered to be appropriate in the circumstances.

The Minister is saying that the Auditor-General does not know what he is talking about. She is saying that the Auditor-General's comments are not appropriate. Here is the Minister in charge of State Computing, which, under her direct control, wants to spend \$9 million, about which the Auditor-General says, 'Hang on a minute—you do not know where the money is going' saying that his comments are not appropriate. I find that a bit hard to swallow. There is more that I could say about that, but I must give Mines and Energy a passing mention.

The Minister of Mines and Energy had the good sense to ask ETSA personnel to attend this year. I asked about the fancy financial arrangements, and it took the ETSA spokesman 35 minutes to give his initial answer. I thought that he had been vaccinated with a gramophone needle. Obviously he was determined to try to silence any other questioning about ETSA's finances. I managed to glean from that 35-minute response that ETSA had raised over \$900 million for alleged capital works. In fact, it did not need it all, so it immediately paid back a great lump of it. It showed a profit on these fancy deals. About \$500 000 had been sold to Japanese interests. I am not sure how one can make money out of a deal where assets are sold to a company, either Australian or Japanese (just under half went to the Japanese) pay the money back immediately and show a profit. Someone is doing a fiddle somewhere. It may be something to do with the tax laws in Japan. If people can buy a thing and sell it, and if everybody shows a profit, I want to get in on the deal as soon as I can.

Another thing which interested me, when I said that the IAC had found that we had the dearest electricity in Australia, was the fancy reply to that, too. If we quizzed the other electricity authorities around Australia, we would hear the same answer. We sold \$434 million worth of our assets to the Japanese in one of these fancy deals—'a bit like lease-back but not quite' was the answer. It was some variation. The fact that we had a leasing arrangement for about \$11 million worth of material when we were in government justified all these deals, although it was acknowledged that they were a bit different. In the short time left to me, I wish to deal with the uranium question.

The Minister refused point-blank to answer any questions, and would not allow his officers to answer any, which was quite an interesting innovation. We had a Minister who said he was not interested in the questions; he was not

interested in world markets; he had never heard of the uranium institute in London which advises world producers of uranium as to the markets. He was not interested and would not let any officers answer. At least his predecessor was more forthcoming; he did not travel much but he used to read a lot and was always well informed about what was happening overseas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He used to read a lot. I know he was in a tough spot in 1982 when the Indenture was before the House. He had to say that he did not want it when, really, he did. I know all that, but he was more forthcoming. The present Minister was much more coy, to the point where he refused point-blank to answer the questions.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Although I still have a little faith in the system of the Estimates Committees, one problem is that most of us belong to political Parties. These Committees become a method of attempting to score points or a way to stop someone scoring points, in many instances. On the recreation and sport line, the Minister slowed the whole process down, yet when it came to the next part of his portfolio, he did not do that. He took a more responsible and reasoned approach and, as far as I and other members were concerned, it was appreciated. Why would a Minister deliberately slow one issue and take a long time to answer questions in order to use up time, which was very limited, when he did not do so with other subjects? Was he not well informed on recreation and sport or was he unsure of his ground, or was it that some things were not as sweet and rosy as he would like them to be?

Parliament will never know the answer to that because the Minister will not tell us. Some of his colleagues may know because it may have been prearranged, and we will not know that either, unless we hear it from a friend of a friend. The truth is that that sort of tactic destroys the effect of the Committees, and if we are to have what the Bannon Government claimed it would have—open government—although that has proved to be a fallacy, as we all know, openness is important. If there is a problem within a department or with a head of a department or a person in that department has made a mistake, there is no need to name a person deliberately unless the offence is very serious (and once everything is proven that action should be taken and the person or persons named), but a Minister could at least admit to there being a concern in that area.

He could say that things were not going as well as he would like them to go in any given part of his portfolio, and people would learn to respect Parliament and Governments much more. People know that each and every one of us makes mistakes at times in this place, in our ordinary lives or in a Government department. If we get to the point of accepting that as a principle, the Estimates Committees could work properly. When we consider the thousands of hours involved, it would be interesting to know the cost of producing all the documents. Usually, departmental officers are a little fearful of watching every corner and taking longer than they should because of the political consequences or the benefit, as they see it, to the Opposition, but it would be interesting to know that figure. It would be a huge figure when we consider that in this place alone the burden for those reporting proceedings is greater than at any other time.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Fisher says it is my format. He knows that I have never been happy with what people see as accountability.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That brings up the very point: because I happen to have a doubt about it and because I happen to belong to the political Party that brought in the Estimates Committee procedure, the majority of members of which Party still believed in it, it is suggested by the interjections that it is improper for me to express a point of view that differs—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I ask the honourable member to look back through the debates, and he will find the answer to that.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member has proved the very point I am making. I make it because there was another instance of a Minister not wanting to be in the position of saying, 'Yes, we made the final decision and we realised it was getting too expensive and have had to slow it down.' That was in the justice information area, when the Hon. Chris Sumner read right through a press release issued by the previous Attorney-General in, I think, 1982, which was available to everyone. We all knew about it: the public knew about it, but he deliberately—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: All the public will never know about it. If all the public knew all about all of us, many of us would not be here.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That is correct, and there is no doubt about it. Members opposite can snigger all they like. It was obvious that the Minister was trying to 'snow it over'. Instead of saying, 'It has cost something around \$29 million up until now but if it goes for the full term as intended it will be \$75 million,' there was a deliberate move to avoid accepting some of the blame.

I will deal with a couple of specific areas. When we raised the question of the provision of fax machines and computers in schools, we were told that as long as schools had 100 students or more they would be provided with them, and they would all receive notices. I know of one school which did not and to my knowledge still has not, and I have written to the Minister about it since. That school is able to have a fax machine, but was not allocated a computer although it has 130 children enrolled. That school qualifies as a metropolitan school because it is the Eden Hills school. Half the students come from my area and half from the District of Fisher. The school is situated on the border of the two districts. I now turn to a small school like Clarendon with about 60 students which also lacks facilities. Its environment is semi-rural and the children come from the area represented by the member for Heysen but mainly from my side of the Onkaparinga River, because Kangarilla also has a school. I am not sure whether or not Kangarilla has those facilities, but I am sure that my colleague will be checking on that.

Clarendon school would like to have more computer equipment, but it is not included in the allocation. One could argue that it is just as important, if not more so, for children in such a school to have equipment available than in some of the bigger schools because people in these areas are isolated from many other aspects of life, yet children have to move into what we see as a modern society with much technology.

Certainly, I am aware of the change facing students leaving a small school to go to a big school. I left a school of

13 children to enter a classroom of 52 students at high school. I know what a fearful experience that can be for a student over a long period. I believe that Clarendon and any other similar small school should have the opportunity to have that equipment. In my electorate and other electorates to the south, students need assistance in the form of special education for many reasons, sometimes through disability resulting from illness or accident or, through unfortunate aspects of birth, are denied capacities that others have, or students encounter difficulties of language having been born in a different country or culture, and we should not be placing schools in the position where fewer teachers are available. However, that is what is happening.

People who would never have dreamt of coming to see me to lodge a complaint against an ALP Government are coming out of the woodwork and saying, 'They have let us down. They have forgotten us.' Only the Government can explain why that is so. The Opposition does not know the reason, but that situation has developed and is hurting people in a way that they should not be hurting. It hurts their potential to teach and it reduces the potential of people to become, if not the equal of others, then nearer to being equal in development to others and their children and grandchildren who have normal capacity.

I do not wish to discuss all the areas covered, except to say that in respect of sport and recreation the Minister admitted that there will be a matter that we will all have to look at in the future. Certainly, I raise with the Minister the difficulty we face in developing high quality stadiums and facilities for various sporting communities so that they can play sport and provide for spectator attendance to help finance special events such as national, international and State championships or major competitions.

The difficulty to which I allude is this: the Minister said, although not in as many words, that there is a problem, for example, people playing hockey in ordinary C or D grade tell me that membership fees need to be about \$130 to \$140, although some are as low as \$110, in order to meet per capita fees levied by the State Hockey Association. That level of fees is becoming too high for many people who still buy their own equipment such as footwear, clothing, and so on. That level of fee precludes many young people—people aged 18 years and over who have left the juniors—who are trying to participate in that sport.

The level of fees diminishes the number of people available to make the sport more popular by means of the greater player and spectator support that it needs, and the maintenance needs of ovals, main stadiums and State bodies is getting too high. Certainly, I do not claim that I know the solution to this problem. The same thing is happening and is part of the problem with netball, where we have two groups. It is difficult to bring them together because the per capita fees might escalate even more if that resulted.

In the areas represented by the member for Heysen and me we have a number of tennis teams and at least once in the past two years at the AGM it was discussed seriously whether or not they should affiliate with the State body. The question was not discussed because they have no time for the State body or believe that they do not need the State body—it is because the per capita fees are starting to affect the number of rank and file members.

For clubs playing out in the country on the surface that they have to try to maintain and develop themselves, because councils are moving to a user pays system, the cost is such that they are saying, 'Hold on, we have to raise all our own money to finance ourselves and look after our juniors, and cart them all over the place.' They are starting to walk away from the idea of meeting the per capita cost.

Both the Government and the Opposition need to be conscious that the concept of sport is to encourage as many people as possible to participate, to make it as economically possible for them to play while at the same time developing elitism for people who have the capacity. However, we must not pay money from State revenue to support elitism, once people in this category start getting paid in any professional way through advertising or any other revenue. Certainly, I take note of the report and I look forward to hearing what other members have to say.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Some of the points raised by the member for Davenport make sense in his criticism of the budget Estimates Committees. I pushed hard for many years in the Party room and when we were in government for the Estimates Committee system. At that time even the Public Accounts Committee was willing to help members wade through the budget documents and provide backup research, but the Government of the day refused that offer of assistance, which was a shame because members do need research facilities and this could have been provided by the Public Accounts Committee in a bipartisan and independent role.

The Estimates Committees have to be made to work and, if they do not work, other systems have to be looked at. We could look at the Californian State Legislature, where various departments and statutory authorities come before a committee of the Parliament, which is similar to the Estimates Committees. Those responsible for the department or authority have a few minutes to briefly explain to the committee why they need a certain budget allocation and, if the committee is satisfied that that is fair and reasonable, that amount is carried; but, if the committee is not satisfied the department or authority may be told that its budget is to be cut by a certain amount.

During the time I spent at one of those sittings something like \$400 million was lopped off certain areas and some heads of departments were staggered by the expenditure cuts made by the committee. The five minute speech and 10 minute consideration by the committee I thought to be quick to consider the huge budget lines, but later I found out that much lobbying occurred behind the scenes and that research officers advised politicians long before they had to make a decision.

More importantly, in the American system the budget is considered some four or five months before the commencement of the next financial year. It is wrong that it is towards the end of September before this House completes the debate and passes the budget; and then it still has to go through the Legislative Council. This means that departments do not officially know their budgets for the year until some time in November, and that it is the end of November and into December before a budget can be put in train and money spent or orders placed. Our system must be the most inefficient system I am aware of.

I do not know any company that goes through this budget process a quarter of the way through the financial year. It is a hangover from the old pioneering horse-and-cart days, and it is about time we moved into the twentieth century and brought down the State budget in February or March. By doing this, come 1 July—the commencement of the new financial year—the Public Service would know its budget allocation. As the member for Davenport said, we cannot allow the present system to continue; it is not good enough. As I interjected when the honourable member was speaking, this exercise costs in excess of \$1 million and involves a lot of work and time, and I wonder whether many members get much out of it and whether they understand it. Certainly,

very little is explained in the media, and the public are not fully informed—and that defeats the whole purpose.

Members have to rely on the Auditor-General to provide the necessary backup information, so true accountability still comes from his report, which I must say is excellent. I do not always see eye to eye with the Auditor-General—in fact, I never have and probably never will—because his report always omits the shortage and theft of Government property. I think it is important that Parliament know about security, what is being done to stop pilfering and embezzlement and whether greater care is being taken to look after Government property.

However, it is much bigger than that—it concerns tens of billions of dollars worth of Government assets, whether it involves buildings, schools, broadacres, open fields or Housing Trust properties, etc. The Opposition wants to know whether that is being properly looked after and maintained. For example, driving around the metropolitan area, one sees that many intersections are unsafe in that they are bumpy and have ridges in the bitumen because heavy transport vehicles apply their brakes at the last minute. Nothing is being done to maintain metropolitan roads.

The same can be said about Government buildings and schools. One school in my electorate has partly around its rooms asbestos sheeting which has never been painted because someone said it does not have to be painted. No-one has ascertained whether what flakes off and blows around in the air and is breathed in by the children and the staff is injurious to their health. That is incompetence. Another school in my electorate has for the whole of the year had six windows with small marble shanghai holes in them. I asked whether something could be done about this but was told that nothing could be done until that school's turn was reached in the cycle. That, again, is incompetence. The headmaster of that school should be able to ring a contractor and ask for the glass to be replaced. I do this in my home, as does everyone else. Why are schools left like that? I do not believe that the Government is so incompetent as not to allow the unblocking of gutters so that water does not run down walls and further damage property. And, so it goes on.

The Opposition had difficulties finding out the Housing Trust's budget this financial year. Parliament should not vote a statutory authority tens of millions of dollars without knowing its budget. The Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement has not been signed. This is the first time I can remember being asked to accept a budget when Parliament did not know the full contents of that agreement, and that is wrong. The Opposition, for that reason, should have moved that the budget be delayed so that we could find out exactly where this State stood.

Housing is one of the most important welfare issues the State will face in the next 12 to 18 months—how will we house all these homeless people? Do so many people desperately need welfare housing or affordable long-term secure accommodation? What is the State doing to ease the situation of the 40 000-odd people on the trust's waiting list—absolutely nothing. From what I can ascertain, the Federal Government is screwing the State—and that is a tragedy. I would not take the treatment that the Commonwealth Government is giving this State. I believe there is a conspiracy.

All the other States have lagged behind South Australia for decades in providing affordable, secure housing and, because the South Australian Housing Trust and successive Governments, whether Liberal or Labor, have followed the original charter of the trust, this State is being made to pay the penalty. The bureaucrats in Canberra and the other States want South Australia to come down to their stand-

ards. Instead of this State Government biting the bullet and the Commonwealth Government telling the other States to lift their standards and do, in an efficient and competent way, what South Australia does, we find that the screws have been put on South Australia. I hope that that does not have any impact on what the trust is doing.

One of the biggest problems the trust faces involves the large number of people who rely on rental concessions (last financial year those concessions were in the vicinity of \$89 million and in the current financial year, \$90 million, but it could be as high as \$100 million). That money has to be found in the Housing Trust's budget. I have always believed that trust tenants are entitled to the same rental assistance as are those tenants in the commercial market. The Commonwealth Government has now taken away concessional loans to the State and no concessional grants come to the Housing Trust. Therefore, I believe the Commonwealth should pick up that tab.

I will join the Minister in taking on the Commonwealth Government any time he wants. I think that this State should fight the Commonwealth in relation to the rights of trust tenants because, if we can get rental assistance, trust rents will be even more attractive. That would give the trust the injection of funds that it desperately needs to maintain its program, and \$90 million to \$100 million a year would represent a tremendous amount of social justice if we treated the issue more vigorously than we presently do.

This is an issue that I hope my Party will take up in the future. The HomeStart program has been launched in what were quite controversial circumstances. Mr 'Good News' gave us all the good news, of course, but did not tell us about the bad news or about the hidden traps. Very little was made of the fact that it will replace the State Bank concessional loan system. About 3 000 people—or as few as 2 500 people—have been receiving concessional loans through the State Bank, for many years. It was a wonderful scheme. Those loans started at about 5 per cent and increased by 1 per cent per annum. It gave the people that we wanted to help the best start they could get. Tragically, there was a waiting list of some 12 to 14 months and it would then take another six months before the loans could be processed. I felt that it was a fairly clumsy system.

I hope that the HomeStart program can process housing loan applications within four weeks. Goodness me, I could do it: when I was in the bank I used to put them through in a couple of days and, if necessary, an application could be put through in 24 hours. There is no reason why any financial institution could not do the same. It is a matter of organisation, and these days with computers it would be dead easy. I think that no-one was really trying; there was a market out there, a strong market, and it was a case of take it as it comes. However, that was not good enough. I am concerned about the management of this new HomeStart program. It has been given to an organisation that I have never heard of. According to *Hansard*:

National Mortgage Marketing Corporation Limited has been appointed manager of the HomeStart Loans Program. The HomeStart program is a South Australian Government initiative designed to provide 16 000 'affordable' loans over the next four years...

Bringing it back to reality, that is about 4 000 a year. The program is based on the low start principle, but the whole trick to it, of course, concerns the current interest rates. What a tragedy it is that people starting out have to borrow money to build or buy a house at 15 per cent. It ought to be more like 5 per cent. If the Government was dinkum and really wanted to do something to help people obtain homes, rather than begin this HomeStart program, it would subsidise interest rates. This is what we should be consid-

ering. We should also be playing our role in reducing the amount of capital expenditure. We should be telling the Commonwealth Government to get its act together. There was nothing in the budget to indicate that. There was nothing in the budget that gave any meaning to the Commonwealth Government's strategy of trying to cut down on the capital borrowings of the States.

That is the crux of the issue, with the huge balance of payments budget blow-outs that we have seen. We have a foreign debt of \$120 billion, which has to be financed by borrowings, and the interest on that is now becoming a huge burden. The interest bill alone could cover the welfare payments of the entire country. The interest on that \$120 billion could provide free education and the housing we need. It could do so much, and yet we are letting private enterprise, and Governments, the State Governments in particular, borrow huge sums of money overseas. It looks cheap, but in the long term it becomes very expensive for future generations. I objected to this back in 1981-82 when my own Government did it. I object to borrowing money to pay day-to-day costs and I object to mortgaging our children's future. I said then, and I will say it again and again, that what we have done is wrong.

When the Department of State Development and Technology lines were before the Estimates Committees we had the opportunity for the first time to question the Minister about the Marineland redevelopment and the actions and activities of this department. There is no doubt in my mind that the Department of State Development and Technology has a very strong case to answer. In researching the various documents that I have seen, and particularly the Auditor-General's Report, it is my opinion that there was a conspiracy in relation to the whole sad saga of the redevelopment of Marineland. There is no doubt that a promise was made by the West Beach Trust for the redevelopment of Marineland. The Labor Party knew that its policy would be changed. Obviously, it did not gamble on the unions using their muscle to stop that development, which they did.

In the meantime, the developers of Marineland, Tribond, brought in Zhen Yun. They found these people in Hong Kong, brought them to South Australia and introduced them to the Department of State Development and Technology. That department then induced them to scrap the Marineland redevelopment and to build an international standard hotel. I, together with Opposition colleagues, was on the Estimates Committee dealing with the tourism portfolio, and Tourism South Australia made it very clear that it was opposed to that project. It is obvious that Tourism South Australia would not support the project because it believed it was not viable. Yet, we have the crazy situation where the Department of State Development and Technology, before it paid out the creditors of Tribond, made all the creditors sign a deed of secrecy. In that deed of secrecy it made them agree to the following clause:

It has become apparent that such a development is no longer economically viable.

That clause—in what I refer to as the deed of secrecy—refers to the Marineland redevelopment. The way that the signatures were obtained by the department was an absolute disgrace on the part of this Government and it will remain so forever and a day. People were blackmailed and told, 'You will sign this document'—what could be called the heads of agreement, although to me it was a deed of secrecy. The people who had given services, invested money and given commitments to the redevelopment of Marineland were suddenly told that they would agree to this clause, that it had become apparent that such a development was no longer viable. That was absolute garbage. The redevelopment

ment of Marineland was viable. It always has been viable and would still be viable today.

At page viii of his report, the Auditor-General made the position very clear when dealing with the various issues in relation to the Department of State Development and Technology, Marineland and Tribond. He said that the company was placed in receivership on 13 February 1989. He also pointed out that a payment of \$300 000 under the guarantee (and some of these payments were never authorised under the guarantee) was made to Tribond Developments with respect to surrender of the lease.

Tribond was paid \$300 000, as I understand, for the purchase of shares in the company, and the three consultants were paid \$290 000 for the loss of the chance to act as consultants. These consultants were previously directors of Tribond. They all had contracts with Zhen Yun, so they should have been, and were, entitled to greater compensation than that. These payments were approved by Cabinet on 13 February 1989, so on that date the Government paid out \$590 000 to Tribond and the directors, and on the same day the company was placed in receivership with a liquidator who was sought by the Government to do that job.

In this Marineland saga, no tribute has yet been paid to the staff, who have done a marvellous job under the most trying and difficult circumstances.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I propose to deal at some length this afternoon with this Government's involvement in the failed Marineland project. This issue was exposed to considerable scrutiny during the Estimates Committee. There was an orchestrated attempt by the Government before three committees to conceal information. But what has emerged is further evidence of all that is wrong with this Government. It mismanages millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. It then tries to be secretive, denying this Parliament information, in order to cover up its failures. It also tries to blame others—in the particular case of Marineland, a small family business.

All this happened with the Marineland redevelopment because this Government is also frightened to take hard decisions about major developments in South Australia. Instead, it allows itself to be pushed around by its union mates and other special interests, while the public interest goes by the board. No wonder investors are reluctant to put their funds in the future of South Australia. Until our State has a Government which is prepared to operate openly, honestly and responsibly, our State will continue to fall behind. While the Marineland project in itself is important—it was the second best attended tourist attraction in our State—there are principles of public administration and probity involved which make this issue equally relevant to an assessment of this Government's overall performance.

The plan to redevelop Marineland was first announced late in 1986. The Chairman of the West Beach Trust, Mr Virgo, hailed it as offering South Australia a facility 'virtually unequalled elsewhere in Australia'. On 14 January 1987, the trust entered into a 40-year agreement with the Melbourne based International Oceanaria Development Company to operate, update and redevelop Marineland. This company was principally owned by the Abel family which had a great deal of experience in managing marine parks in Australia and other countries including Malaysia, Taiwan and New Zealand. It formed a wholly owned South Australian subsidiary, Tribond Developments, to undertake the Marineland redevelopment, with Mr Rodney Abel as Chairman, his son, Grant, as Managing Director, and Grant's wife, Margarete, as Marketing and Productions Manager. At the time of this arrangement being finalised, the Depart-

ment of State Development and Technology recognised the management capability and experience of this company as 'the equal of any in the Southern Hemisphere and possibly world-wide'.

The company planned a redevelopment at Marineland to bring it up to world standard. It would have included a new main aquatic pool, a wave cove for seal lions, an education centre and a new aquarium. A key to the arrangement was that the existing attractions at Marineland should continue to function to provide a cash flow for the business. However, the new operations almost immediately experienced unforeseen difficulties. There were protracted negotiations with the West Beach Trust over the details of the lease. This delayed its signing until September 1987 and, consequently, the finalisation of financial arrangements.

In a letter dated 14 January, the day Tribond took over the operation of Marineland, the West Beach Trust gave the following assurance to the company:

At the date hereof, the lessor is not aware of any matters which would prevent the continuation of the business of Marineland—which is presently conducted on the leased property.

This did not truly represent the state of the Marineland facilities. Indeed, the evidence is that, in the few years before the Tribond takeover, they had been allowed to seriously deteriorate due to neglect and mismanagement. For this, the Government must accept the direct responsibility because the West Beach Trust is subject to the control and direction of the Government. It is outrageous that one of South Australia's most popular tourist attractions should have been run down like this by a Government pretending to give the highest priority to developing our tourist industry.

Let me reveal the conditions at Marineland as they existed in early 1987, because this is something that this Government has been keen to cover up. The indoor dolphin and sea lion pools had serious rust damage. The filtration system was inadequate. The public, as well, was at risk, with inadequate fire exit facilities. There were major problems with the aquarium pool, with rust damage and inadequate filtration. Fish had to be destroyed because of disease. The outdoor dolphin pool was found to be structurally unsound with sections of the walls buckling to the point of giving way. The outdoor sea lion pool had serious rust problems. The penguin pool lacked a proper cleaning and drainage system. The House has already received evidence of maltreatment of the dolphins and other mammals at Marineland. The deterioration of Marineland was a scandal in itself which this Government is still trying to run away from.

During her Estimates Committee, the Minister of Lands ducked questions about this issue, even though she had been made aware of the appalling conditions at Marineland before the Abel family became involved. The Department of State Development and Technology has acknowledged that Tribond took 'swift action' to deal with these problems 'at some considerable additional unexpected cost', that is, to the individuals, the small family business. The company restored proper standards of animal health and husbandry to Marineland as it confronted other problems with the rapid deterioration of the buildings. In May 1988, Tribond received a report which identified a massive problem with asbestos in the Marineland buildings. The advice the company received was that its directors were exposed to 'very considerable legal risks.' It is obvious that this asbestos was originally installed illegally. The Opposition wanted to ask the Minister of Local Government, in line with her responsibilities for the West Beach Trust, about this matter during the Estimates Committees, but we were prevented from doing so.

The serious problem with asbestos left Tribond with no option but to close down Marineland, which occurred on 30 May 1988. This forced action denied them their budgeted cash flow. The statements constantly made by the Government, and particularly the Minister of State Development and Technology alleging that Tribond was unable to fulfil its obligations in this redevelopment make no allowance for the facilities they inherited—facilities run down to a state of complete and dangerous disrepair for which this Government is directly responsible.

At first, the Minister of State Development and Technology, through his department, attempted to assist Tribond to get over these serious obstacles to the future of the project. In June and July last year, the company was given approval to redirect just over \$300 000 of its Government guaranteed capital budget to pay operating costs. However, further pressures on the project then imposed themselves, on 29 July 1988. The Building Trades Federation imposed union bans on the project. They were a front for growing agitation within the Labor party to stop dolphins being taken from South Australian waters. The Abel family had made clear to the West Beach Trust in negotiating its involvement in this project originally, that it would be viable only if additional dolphins could be brought into Marineland. However, since 1985 this issue had been an emerging one within the Labor Party. In that year, the Victorian Government decided to ban the keeping of dolphins in captivity. This was followed by a Senate select committee recommendation to phase out oceanariums in Australia and to ban the taking of dolphins for holding in such facilities.

In 1986, the issue was debated for the first time at the South Australian Convention of the Labor Party. The 1986 convention supported the following motion:

Convention supports the conclusion and recommendations of the Report of the Senate Select Committee on Animal Welfare, Dolphins and Whales in Captivity. Convention calls upon the State Government to implement these recommendations and, as a first step, to move to ban the import or capture of Cetacea in South Australia as soon as possible.

The following year, this policy was hardened to direct the Government 'to revoke all permits issued for the capture and importation of dolphins into South Australia, and to initiate an urgent enquiry into the financial backers of the proposed Marineland developments and their appropriateness as managers of dolphins in captivity.' This was a slur upon the good name and reputation of the Abel family. A *Sunday Mail* report of this convention debate of 30 August 1987 quoted the ALP State secretary, Mr Cameron, as saying dolphins at Marineland had been 'brutalised and starved' as part of their training. We all know of Mr Cameron's qualifications to distinguish between proper and improper practices.

Here, however, was the beginning of a deliberate campaign within the ALP to scuttle the Abel family and the Marineland project. It was a campaign which quite deliberately overlooked the educational and research benefits of properly equipped oceanariums such as the one the Abel family intended to develop at Marineland under encouragement from the government originally. What marine parks do is no different from what zoos do with animals. Is the Adelaide Zoo to be the next target of this stupid and senseless campaign? What this campaign means, as well, is that there will no longer be a facility at Marineland to rehabilitate dolphins and sea lions stranded or injured at sea.

None of this stopped the ALP Convention in 1988 from passing another motion effectively telling the Government to scrap the Marineland development in favour of another proposal for Victor Harbor. The union bans had been

imposed in late July in the run-up to this convention. As well, there had been public speculation that the Bannon Government faced embarrassment over the issue. An article in the *Australian* on 1 August last year stated:

The Bannon Government is facing a serious backlash from its own State ALP Branch over its backing of a \$9 million sea park redevelopment that, it is claimed, breaches Party policy on dolphins.

The paper also reported:

Four new motions on the issue, some directly condemning the Bannon Government's involvement in the development, are on the agenda for the 1988 State Convention later this month.

Finally, the paper reported:

Previously, the non-factional issue has generated heated and emotional debates at convention. Some sources believe the possibility of an attack on the Government may lead to a compromise motion in a bid to defuse the situation.

The motion that was subsequently passed was indeed a compromise motion. It omitted specific criticism of the Government, because the deals had been done; the Government had already decided to cave in to the union bans. It only remained to ensure the Abel family was seen as the scapegoat. On 1 August, the same day the *Australian* story appeared, there was a meeting between representatives of the Department of State Development and Technology and Tribond. At the meeting, the department informed the company of its view that the project was no longer viable. As I have already revealed, only the previous month the department had approved the use of capital funds for operational spending to keep the project going. So why the sudden change in a month? It could only have been ordered by the Government—a Government frightened to tell its union and Party mates to back off.

The Minister of State Development and Technology was asked, during the Estimates Committee, whether he had taken any action to have the union bans lifted to ensure that the project was not jeopardised. He replied, 'I am not aware of formal bans being placed on this project.' He also said, 'We [the department] have not been aware of formal bans being in place.' That was a well rehearsed response. Coincidentally, the Chairman of the West Beach Trust, Mr Virgo, said the same thing during the local government Estimates Committee before further questions were gagged.

The Minister's claim both that he was unaware of any formal union bans and that the department had not been told about them is patently false, unless the Minister would also claim that he does not read the newspapers, watch television, listen to the radio or see important correspondence that comes into his department.

Mr S.J. Baker: Or answer questions in the Parliament.

Mr OLSEN: Or answer questions in the Parliament. Over a long period, these bans were the subject of considerable press and media coverage. I refer in particular to an article which appeared in the *News* on 19 August last year, in which the Managing Director of Tribond, Mr Grant Abel, was quoted as revealing that work on the project had stopped because of the union bans. The report also stated that, as a result, the project was in jeopardy. What the House should also know is that on 16 August, three days before this newspaper report appeared, Tribond had written to the Department of State Development and Technology specifically requesting assistance to have the bans lifted. The relevant part of the letter reads:

The third issue of significance relates to the current union bans which apply to all development at Marineland. Those bans were imposed prior to the ALP State Convention and again this is a matter which could well sway the decision of potential investors. We therefore seek your urgent assistance in the commencement of negotiations with the relevant union bodies (preferably at a ministerial level) with a view to having these bans lifted.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The Minister claimed not to know anything about that.

Mr OLSEN: Exactly. I stress that the request was for ministerial involvement. Yet the Minister has the audacity to tell the Parliament and the Estimates Committee that there was no such thing as a ban applied to Marineland. He had not heard of it. But what happened? At his Estimates Committee hearing, the Minister conveniently said he had not seen the letter to which I have just referred. Either he is not telling the truth or his officers were negligent in their duty. Here we have the proponent of a Government-guaranteed \$9 million project telling a Government department that union bans are placing it in jeopardy and the responsible Minister, we are asked to believe, is not told—it is not believable.

At the time, the project and the union bans were the subject of wide and controversial public debate. I just cannot believe the Minister's statement that he was not made aware of these union bans and their potential impact on the project—it is just not believable. The truth is that not one finger was lifted by this Government to save the project and to protect the interests of taxpayers guaranteeing the funds. I can well imagine what the Minister would have done had the submarine project or the Grand Prix been threatened by union bans. He, or another Government Minister, would have been onto the unions in a flash, but not in the case of Marineland: no, the project was killed by pressure from within the Labor Party. That is the key. This project was scuttled by pressure from within the Labor Party and by Government timidity in the face of that pressure.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They used the unions the same way they used Norm Foster on Roxby; they manipulated.

Mr OLSEN: Exactly, and who are the poor scapegoats—the Abel family. Not once did the Government speak out against opponents of the project and put the case for it and the need to take in additional dolphins to ensure its viability. As Tribond also stated in its letter to the Department of State Development and Technology on 16 August 1988:

We are disturbed that your department's assessment of the viability of the revised project appears to have been carried out in a hasty and cavalier manner, without due regard to all information provided, including Tribond's legal rights and obligations in respect of the project.

An honourable member: Hasty and cavalier.

Mr OLSEN: Hasty and cavalier. The facts are plain. The unspoken word had gone out from Cabinet in the middle of last year in the face of mounting opposition to the project from unions and within the ALP: it had to be stopped. In December last year, Tribond entered a share sale agreement with Zhen Yun in the hope that the project might still proceed. Under that agreement, Zhen Yun would have assumed responsibility for the Marineland redevelopment and employed the Abel family to assist in implementing it. The agreement was made subject to 'a firm consent from the department', but the Minister rejected this condition in statements to the Estimates Committee. He said:

My advice is that we were never asked to approve a share sale agreement.

Either this is another case of the Minister's not telling the truth or Zhen Yun has been deceitful and, in the process, has defrauded the Abels. I have in my possession a letter dated 6 February 1989 from legal representatives for Zhen Yun. The letter, which was sent to legal representatives for the Abel family, states:

We have been instructed by our client to indicate that the firm consent of the Department of State Development and Technology to our client's original proposals in relation to Tribond has not been forthcoming as required.

Our client appreciates the time and effort put into the negotiations by your client but feels that, as matters stand, worthwhile negotiations cannot be progressed for the time being.

This letter conflicts completely with the Minister's statement to the Estimates Committee. It records the view of Zhen Yun that the department was required to approve the share sale agreement before the Marineland redevelopment could proceed, but further from the letter also there can be no doubt that, while Zhen Yun was prepared to proceed with the project, it was the department's decision that it should not proceed.

These waters become even murkier because of discussions involving the Department of State Development and Technology, the West Beach Trust, Zhen Yun and Tribond in late January and early February this year. Arising out of those discussions, Tribond was given every reason to believe on 1 February that the project would be proceeding with the full support of the Department of State Development and Technology.

However, two days later, on 3 February, Mr Lawrence Lee, a principal of Zhen Yun, told Tribond that the department now did not want the project to proceed because of continuing opposition from Greenpeace and the existence of union bans (and this is the Department of State Development and Technology making the statement). At the time these discussions were taking place, the unions were making prominent public statements about their bans. On 24 January this year, the *Advertiser* quoted the Vice-President of the Building Trades Federation, Mr Ben Carslake, as warning that all work on the Marineland site would stop if attempts were made to break work bans.

That same report quoted the Minister of State Development and Technology as saying that union objections to the proposal were premature. This is the Minister who, incidentally, told the Estimates Committee that he did not know any bans were in place; the same Minister who now asks Parliament to believe that at relevant times he was unaware of union bans. The fact is that, in very early February this year, the Government finally caved in to those bans, scrapped the project, and scuttled the Abel family, hoping the public would see them as being to blame.

At his Estimates Committee, the Minister maintained that in early February it was Zhen Yun and not the Government which cancelled the Marineland redevelopment because it was not viable. He also claimed that he put no pressure on Zhen Yun to take this action and that it had nothing to do with the union bans. From statements the Minister made to the Estimates Committee, it would appear the decision was reached in telephone discussions between him and Mr Lee of Zhen Yun.

In answer to Opposition questions, the Minister admitted to the Estimates Committee that, before these discussions, Zhen Yun had given no written advice to the department that, in its view, the project was not viable. He said:

I do not have any letter on file from Zhen Yun that specifically states 'We will not proceed with the Marineland.'

But he also admitted, for the first time, that in one of his discussions with Zhen Yun he had raised the public opposition to the project. The Minister has made his admissions reluctantly.

Here is the crux of the matter: the final exposure of the truth. There is absolutely no doubt that the Government pressured Zhen Yun not to proceed with the Marineland redevelopment. The union bans were still in place and the Government would not confront them. Instead, it forced Tribond into receivership despite all the company's attempts to keep South Australia's second most popular tourist attraction afloat. The Minister will deny this. Zhen Yun may

deny this now. But the Opposition has no doubt that this is what really happened.

The Minister's position is very vulnerable. The Opposition asked the Minister on 12 April this year:

Will the Minister of State Development and Technology advise whether an officer of his department effectively blackmailed the investor in the West Beach redevelopment, Zhen Yun, by telling the investor that the Government would not support the construction of a hotel on the Marineland site unless the plans to include a Marineland complex in the redevelopment were scrapped?

The Minister, in his reply, said:

The Government did not blackmail Zhen Yun nor did the Government put pressure on Zhen Yun to change its plan to delete an oceanarium from its proposal.

The Minister has repeated this claim on a number of subsequent occasions. In due course I am confident that it will be proved that the Minister has persistently misled the Parliament about this matter. He will be found out for misleading Parliament.

I do not entirely blame the Minister: He has been the Government's 'fall guy'. Cabinet made the decision: he has been the one up front coping Cabinet's decision. He has been Cabinet's errand boy, forced to find excuses for stopping this project because of union bans and ALP Convention resolutions, and costing taxpayers at least \$6 million into the bargain, not to mention destroying the reputation of a small family company called Abels.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And of the State as a whole.

Mr OLSEN: And of the State as a whole. The reason I am so confident that this Government still refuses to tell the full truth about this scandal is the extraordinary measures it has taken to cover up the truth. This brings me to the so-called Deed of Agreement drawn up in February and finally stamped on 22 March this year by parties to the project. This is a 'hush' agreement—a \$700 000 'hush' agreement.

The parties who signed this agreement received payouts of more than \$700 000 for their silence. The Opposition revealed the contents of one of those agreements today after the Minister's continuing attempts to conceal it. He told the Estimates Committee last week that the agreement contained 'a standard commercial-type clause' relating to confidentiality. The Opposition has taken legal advice about this, and it entirely refutes what the Minister has said. Our advice is that the confidentiality clauses are unprecedented. They prevent Parliament's being fully informed about the spending of what now amounts to at least \$6 million of taxpayers' money.

Clause 4 of the agreement I have requires the parties to it not to disclose any information. For the record, it requires the parties—in this particular case, Elspan International Limited, Peter Ellen and Associates Limited, and Peter E. Ellen—to:

Agree that all information contained in or in relation or connection to this Heads of Agreement (hereinafter called 'the confidential information') shall be kept as confidential and shall not be disclosed by them or any of them to any person, firm, corporation or other body whatsoever.

This is all embracing on our advice, effectively covering everything associated with the project since early 1987. But there is more. Clause 5 forces the parties to indemnify the Minister against any loss or damage of any kind which he or the Government may have caused as a result of the disclosure of the agreement. This is pressure of the most blatant kind being put on individuals to cover up what is a Government scandal.

The Minister is a signatory to these agreements. He obtained the signature of some of the other parties after they were marched into the Department of State Development and Technology on a Saturday afternoon last February

and told that they must sign the agreement or risk losing everything—time and money—they had put into the project. The parties disagreed, in particular, with the suggestion in the agreement that the project was no longer economically viable. But they were given no chance to challenge this.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: No. It was not until they protested on the Saturday afternoon that they eventually got some advice. However, they were refused legal advice. Nor were they given a reasonable time to consider the consequences of what they were being pressured to sign. This is the greatest attempt to cover up Government mismanagement and impropriety that this Parliament has seen in its recent history. If this is the standard type of clause this Government puts in agreements—to use the Minister's words—then the sooner this Government is run out of office the better. If these agreements are typical of how this Government has been dealing with developers, no wonder there is a crisis of investor confidence in South Australia. These agreements typify the attitude of a Government which has become arrogant, power drunk and determined at all costs to cover up its failures, and a Government that is totally dishonest. The way this Government treats people investing in our State must be exposed so that it can never happen again.

I have now brought into the open some of the events and actions this Government has attempted to cover up. I now call upon the Minister to give a guarantee that he will release all parties to this agreement from their obligation to keep silent about the agreement and the events leading up to it; and that he will not take any action against them because this agreement is now public. The obvious threat in the obnoxious clause 5 is that, if the parties do speak up, they will be sued. They may be required to repay all moneys paid to them by the Government and then be left to carry all the losses and costs of the failure of the venture because of the Government's own incompetence and gross mismanagement. What a travesty of justice.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Where is the Premier in all of this?

Mr OLSEN: Where is the good news Premier? Nowhere in sight. I make it clear that this copy of the agreement has not been given to me by any parties to it, so they are not in breach of it. My copy came from within the Government—as many documents keep floating from the Government at the moment—from another person who is completely frustrated, disenchanted and disillusioned by the methods of this Government. The Minister has used this unprecedented hush agreement to go on making public claims that the Abel family was unable to fulfil its obligations to the project, while they and the other parties to the agreement have been constantly denied the opportunity to put their side of the story. That is not democracy: it is a denial of free speech and it is blackmail. It is the rule of a Government that constantly abuses power and individual rights.

The events I have revealed this afternoon have occurred because this Government will not make hard decisions. If it has a problem, it closes the door and waits for the problem to go away. It is no use the Premier talking now about a super Ministry to deal with major developments. It was very interesting to read the Premier's speech to the REI yesterday. It was also very interesting to see the 7.30 Report interview of the Premier on his way out, and the comments of those who were asked whether they got their \$35 worth.

It is no use the Premier talking now about a super Ministry to deal with the major developments. What is needed first is the political will to guarantee that balanced, environmentally sustainable economic development can take place in this State, and this Government just does not have

the courage to do it. Ever since the Premier's scandalously weak performance over the Roxby Downs project, the Labor Party has lacked any consistent or coherent policy to deal with major projects.

The former Liberal Government established a climate of public opinion in which desirable developments could proceed in South Australia: developments like Roxby Downs, the Stoney Point liquids project, the Torrens linear park and the O-Bahn. Each raised major environmental issues, but each was dealt with in an open, straightforward and consistent way to achieve public support. There were no secret deals, no giving in to unreasonable demands of special interest. However, this Government has passed up the opportunity to maintain a climate conducive to development. It has just had a four-year term, the longest single term any South Australian Government has served for 50 years and now—at the end of its term—all the Premier can do is admit failure and suggest a super Ministry. This will not work while the leaders in Government run away at the slightest sign of a problem. The Government's actions are driven by opinion polls.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is \$99 000-plus of opinion polls!

Mr OLSEN: Exactly. The Premier revealed to the Estimates Committee that almost \$100 000—it was \$99 700—of taxpayers' money was spent last year on an opinion poll, which included specific questions dealing with the Mount Lofty cable car project and the Sellicks Beach marina. Obviously, the decisions about these projects were not based on whether or not they were necessarily environmentally acceptable. Also, the Premier revealed that the arrangement the Government has come to over the Mount Lofty project will involve taxpayers meeting at least \$1 million already spent by the proponent to assess the project, yet this sum need not have been spent in the first place if the Government had selected one of the three other proponents because this would not have breached any of the rules.

This is yet another attempt by the Government to stop public criticism of its totally inconsistent approach to economic development. If I were the Mount Lofty proponent—and let him take heed—I would not hold my breath waiting for this Government to honour its promises. Conveniently, it has kept the project dangling until after the election. The Jubilee Point proponents were told by the Premier that the Government would hold further discussions with them to determine whether a project in some form could be developed three or four months down the track.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: They will never get to the barrier. They have been put on hold until after the election, and nothing further has been achieved at Jubilee Point. So desperate has the Government been in excusing its own inaction that Ministers are now arguing among themselves about future economic directions. The Minister for Environment and Planning obviously does not want the Roxby Downs project to have a future. She told the Estimates Committee that there was a world glut of uranium which would last until the end of the century. That is an old legend of the left trotted out again to justify out of date and reactionary attitudes. The Minister for Environment and Planning should consult with the Minister of Mines and Energy, who has promised that South Australia is poised to sell an extra \$100 million of uranium from Roxby Downs. There is a slight inconsistency there.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, on land values. As we approach the election, the disintegration of the Government will become increasingly apparent, because it has no vision and no

answers for South Australia. The Government has had seven years in office, and opportunities have been missed as we have fallen further behind the rest of Australia. Last week's retail trade figures—a key indicator of consumer confidence and spending ability—showed that over the past 12 months retail spending in South Australia fell in real terms and lagged 3 per cent behind the national average.

Currently, South Australia's share of national retail trade is 7.9 per cent, and it has declined progressively since 1982. Labor's record interest rates, high taxes and charges are hitting South Australians harder than people are being hit in most of the other States, and this budget is another example of missed opportunity. For two years the Premier has been promising productivity savings in the public sector. Two years ago, for the 1987-88 budget, he assured Parliament and taxpayers that the 4 per cent second tier wage rise would have to be paid for by productivity gains or other savings in that year.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Where are they?

Mr OLSEN: Yes, where are they? However, during the Estimates Committee examination of the Office of the Government Management Board, it was revealed that these savings across all agencies were not identified until the end of last financial year. The cost to taxpayers of this failure is at least \$70 million. This Government is making no serious attempt to find productivity improvements in the public sector. It is not setting the example for the rest of the economy in the way it should be. Last financial year, the Premier promised spending of \$1 million on a productivity fund to encourage departments to identify opportunities to make savings and improve efficiency. However, during the Estimates Committee, it was established that only \$227 000—only about a fifth of the allocation—was spent on productivity gains within departments. It is the responsibility of Ministers to give the lead and to encourage departments to find ways of making savings so that the pressure is taken off taxpayers.

This Government's greatest failure in achieving more efficiency in the public sector can be seen in the STA. I commented in my budget speech on the further massive drop in patronage and on the fact that this year it will cost taxpayers \$125 million to cover the losses of the authority. In 1987, the Government received a consultant's report on ways to improve the efficiency of the STA. That report made a series of recommendations, which included the preparation of a business plan to identify means to reduce the deficit, increase revenue and productivity, cut overheads and improve standards of service.

The report set a timetable for implementation of the business plan. I quote the relevant recommendation:

Preparation of the business plan should commence immediately and a draft be completed in time to form the basis of preparation of the authority's 1988-89 budget.

We are now dealing with the 1989-90 budget and the public and the Parliament are yet to see the final business plan. But, in typical *Yes, Minister* tradition, the Minister of Transport revealed to his Estimates Committee that the Government is to spend a further \$100 000 on yet another consultancy to look at work practices in the STA. We all know of the 5ft high stack of reports prepared on the State Transport Authority and its lack of efficiency.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: You can put them on wheels and travel with them.

Mr OLSEN: Yes. I have no doubt that it is just another device of the Government to postpone publication of the business plan until after the election because it will contain some recommendations unpalatable to this Government's union mates. Here again is more lost opportunity—opportunity to act in the interests of taxpayers to ease the pressure

on their own earnings. After seven years, this Government does not deserve another chance to pass up further opportunity to manage this State responsibly. The vision in this budget, promised by the Premier, has taken only one month to vanish. Soon, this Government will go with it. I will hand over to a Liberal Administration which will govern in the interests of all South Australians—and will be prepared to account for its actions fully and honestly to this Parliament.

The simple fact is that, year after year, over the past seven years, the ALP, nationally and in this State, has brought down the living standards of the majority of South Australians. We have record high interest rates. We were promised by Bob Hawke, during the Western Australian State election campaign, that interest rates will not rise—and they did. We have been promised subsequently that interest rates will fall before Christmas—and they will not. In the meantime, the people out there bearing the brunt of Labor's economic policies are trying to keep a roof over their head. They want a change, they deserve a change and they will get a change.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The reason for introducing the Estimates Committee system in the first place was to provide Parliament with genuine information—information needed if this State is to be run in a proper fashion by this Parliament. One of the most important aspects of these committees is the supply of information from Ministers and senior departmental officers: it is an ideal opportunity for genuine information to be provided to all members. Under the previous system members asked each Minister a certain number of questions but, on numerous occasions, that information was not available and we had to wait a considerable length of time while senior departmental officers obtained it.

The Estimates Committee procedure whereby senior departmental officers are present enables, in the majority of cases, information to be provided forthwith. There is no disgrace in Ministers or departmental officers not being able to answer questions asked by members, because questions can be taken on notice and answers provided within a certain period.

I still have a lot of faith in the present system: I believe it is the most appropriate way to obtain information. However, the major problem with the present system is the Government's persistence in ensuring that freedom of information is not a fact. Time after time, whether in these Estimates Committees or under the previous system, we have seen fudging and the provision of any sort of information, no matter whether or not it is accurate. Information that might be damaging to a department, or particularly to a Minister, has been withheld, and that was the case particularly with the Estimates Committees just concluded, coming to an election as we are.

I was a member of the Estimates Committee that examined the lines of the Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Lands; the Minister of Education; and the Minister of Local Government and Minister for the Arts. Some information provided by those Ministers was relevant and detailed, but other information was very scanty indeed. Ever since the Estimates Committee system was established I have been concerned about the cost in terms of the number of officers who have attended. It is a pity that 20 or so officers are made available in case they are needed. It is appropriate that a Director-General, a Deputy Director-General and perhaps a couple of other senior officers attend. As I said, if a Minister and those officers are not able to answer the

questions, questions can be taken on notice. It is ridiculous and a great cost to South Australian taxpayers that 20 or so officers accompany a Minister, and just sit there in case they are required. They have to be fed during the day. In future, I believe that Ministers should take a chance and ask only three or four officers to attend.

The Minister of Local Government, who was involved in the Estimates Committees for the first time as a Minister, answered almost all the questions herself. I think on only one or two occasions did she find it necessary to have her officers provide answers. Perhaps she was trying to prove that she knew everything. Perhaps she wanted to indicate to the Committee that she had everything at her fingertips. However, in the majority of cases we had to wait while the Minister sought a detailed response from one of her officers so that she could then respond to the question. I think that is a great pity. Actually, I think the Committees would work a lot better if the Ministers were not there. Perhaps the Minister could be part of the Committee and just be available if called on specifically. This would give us the opportunity to question the appropriate officers.

I think the State would benefit a great deal from this exercise, certainly a lot more than is the case at present. This would eliminate the Ministers' looking at the political aspects all the time. If the Ministers recognised this opportunity to allow officers to answer the questions directly, I think we would get a lot more information. Having said all that, I still think that the Estimates Committees are the best way to deal with the various details in the budget. I think it is appropriate that they should continue. But the Standing Orders governing the Estimates Committees need to be updated: they need improvement in some areas. Generally, though, I believe that Estimates Committees should continue.

I now refer to some of the matters that were raised in the Estimates Committees with which I was involved, the first concerning the Minister for Environment and Planning and, in particular, the activities of the South Australian Urban Land Trust in the Aldinga area. It was not very long ago that the Minister for Environment and Planning was quoted in an article in the *Southern Times Messenger* as saying that a previous article (in the same newspaper and on the same subject) was nothing more than a beat-up. In fact, that is how the Minister put it in this House when she answered a question on the same subject that was put to her by the local member (the member for Alexandra). At that stage the Minister indicated that the whole thing was nothing more than a beat-up.

When raising this matter with the Minister I indicated very clearly the details of the representation that I had received regarding this matter, and I know that other members of the Opposition have also received representations on this matter. A spokesman for the Minister was quoted recently as saying that notices of intention to acquire land in the Aldinga area had not been received by landowners. That is not true. I was able to quote from such notices and to refer specifically to instances where people had received such notices.

I now refer to a letter that I received from one of these constituents in the Aldinga area. I did not have an opportunity to do so during the Estimates Committees. The letter is to the Minister for Environment and Planning and is as follows:

In reference to an article in the *Southern Times Messenger*, dated September 1989, you are quoted as saying in reference to a previous article concerning the purchase of land in the Aldinga area as a beat-up and that the trust was just going about its business. The role and function of the Urban Land Trust... is to purchase land in the fringe of the City of Adelaide to ensure

that the supply of land in South Australia is kept ahead of demand.

First, it is the manner that the Urban Land Trust is going about its business in Aldinga that is causing the frustration and anxieties to residents and neighbours in the area in which we live. The South Australian Urban Land Trust's annual report 1988 really defines the 'business' of this trust, that is it purchases land at rural rates ahead of its requirements, rezones the area when ready to proceed, takes a developer into partnership, sells at a huge profit. The South Australian Urban Land Trust is certainly purchasing huge areas of vacant land, or more precisely cereal growing land, from farmers who wish to sell.

However, in an area contained by [names of roads supplied] which one can describe as a rural living area because it contains 12 houses erected, one in the course of construction and one awaiting council approval. Each house is erected on land ranging in size from 10 to 16 acres. Contained in this area is eight areas without dwellings. The eight areas are used by their owners for various rural pursuits. The Urban Land Trust has purchased three of these which were for sale. One is being used as an olive orchard together with grape vines and bee hives, two are being used to grow oats for hay, and the other two are being used in conjunction with land on which dwellings are built to run stud ponies and horses.

I am personally affected in that I have a home situated on 16 acres of land together with another 10 acres on a separate title, and I use this land as a pony stud . . . and I breed Welsh mountain ponies, and grow hay to hand feed when required in the summer and winter. My 10 acres, together with the other four without dwellings, have had acquisition orders placed on them by the Urban Land Trust. The object of the Land Acquisition Act 1969-1972 is stated as:

An Act to provide for the acquisition of land for works and undertakings of a public nature, and for purposes incidental to, and consequential upon, such acquisition.

How can this Act apply in these circumstances? It is not being used 'for works and undertakings of a public nature' in these circumstances but is being used purely and simply as a profit making venture.

I am aware that the Urban Land Trust intends to purchase about 1 000 acres in the Aldinga area. There is much speculation about why such a large area is being purchased. A number of articles have been written about it, one appearing on the front page of the quarterly news from the District Council of Willunga headed, 'Japanese city—will it be here?' There is much speculation about the possibility of a multifunction polis being established on that land. I do not know what the situation is: only the Government would know. Questions have been asked about that and, as usual, it is difficult to obtain accurate information, or any information, from this Government, which presumes to be in support of freedom of information.

I have also received a copy of a letter from the Deputy Premier to the residents of his electorate. He goes into a bit of a spiel, then deals with growth and quality of life and then, referring to part of the Aldinga area, says:

Further growth in the area is inevitable and probably desirable. A large local population will provide a better revenue base through which much needed local facilities can be afforded.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, it is the same Deputy Premier—and the same Government—who supported the comments of the Premier back in 1985 when the Minister was singing the praises of urban consolidation. I also strongly support that practice. Under the heading, 'Halt drift to cities—Bannon', an article stated:

The drift to cities by people from country areas must stop if Australian cities are to remain manageable in size, according to the Premier, Mr Bannon.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That was a bit of rhetoric for the *Adelaide Review*, I think.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It probably was rhetoric. The fact is that it was stated by the Premier. He went on to say:

One of the major advantages of regional development is the ability to allow children living in country areas to remain in their own environment and be part of a thrust to exploit its potential.

The drift to the cities from the country has to be arrested in the future.

Mr Lewis: The Government is closing down area schools.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As the member for Murray-Mallee says, the Government is closing schools in country areas. It is not improving the lot of people in regional and country areas. We have a Deputy Premier who is part of a team which has supported the need for the city to be maintained at a reasonable size and for more promotion to be introduced to support country people and ensure that they stay in the country and in regional areas rather than come into the city. I am particularly concerned about what will happen in the Aldinga area in relation to the activities of the trust. I can only hope that the Minister for Environment and Planning will provide me with information as requested during the Estimates Committee.

Another matter that is of interest to me is that, recognising the actions of the Urban Land Trust and recognising that the Minister and her predecessor have on a number of occasions both inside and outside this place referred to the role of the Urban Land Trust in 'ensuring the availability of affordable land for residential purposes', the Minister, certainly in reply to questions during the Estimates Committee, has mentioned the role of the private land developers in this State. Because of the increasing activity of the Urban Land Trust, the private sector has gradually been squeezed further and further. There are now fewer people involved in the private land development industry. I shall be interested to learn from the Minister, when the answers are provided, how she sees the future role of private land developers in this State. Unless some dramatic changes are made quickly, in a very short time we shall virtually see the private land developers move away from this State altogether.

I do not have much time to refer to many of the other issues which were raised. I questioned the Minister about the proposed legislation that she intends to introduce regarding the EIS/PER system within the Planning Act. I was interested to learn that she intends to bring in that legislation before the end of the year, although I am told, with some authority, that, because of the controversial nature of the legislation, the Minister does not intend to have it debated before the election. I have asked a number of questions about that legislation and the organisations which were provided with the White Paper which spelt out some of the provisions of the legislation. Much of that detail will have to await detailed answers being provided by the Minister.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): On the surface, it would appear that this is the last action necessary in this House in relation to this year's budget, other than to take a message from another place at a later stage to say that it has been passed without amendment. However, whilst this is the last opportunity members of this place will have to address the various aspects of the budget, it will not be finalised until the Ministers comply with their promises during the Estimates Committees to supply answers to the many unanswered questions.

An honourable member: You'll get them.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am glad to receive the assurance from the former Minister that we will receive them, because those arrangements were made at the commencement of the Estimates Committee. I related the fact that answers are still to be provided to a number of questions asked during the 1988 Estimates Committees; in other words, a number of Ministers failed to make the information available. In the past, the information which has been provided by Ministers in answer to a whole range of questions in all

portfolio areas has been incorporated in a special edition of *Hansard*. I think I am correct in saying that last year that edition was almost five months late. It makes an absolute farce of the whole process and, if the Government were on the ball, it would not allow such delays to occur, because there could be the suggestion that this Government has something to hide and that it is making every effort to do so by not providing the material to Parliament. If my assertion in this regard is not correct, it is up to this Government to provide that further information this year, because a great deal of it is very vital to the Estimates Committees.

In a number of cases it was not reasonable to expect the Minister or his or her officers to provide the information immediately. It has been the case in the past, and I suggest it will in the future, that information sought will not be available in a matter of minutes, or in some cases probably within days. However, if those questions are not answered in totality, preliminary information should be provided that the material is still being collected, or some updated information should be provided. As other information is gleaned, members should be provided with that detail. Anything less than a complete answer to members of the House immediately it becomes available to officers of the House, and then subsequently in *Hansard*, is insufficient.

As a communication issue, it is important that the record be total and that it be there for posterity because, as my colleague the Leader of the Opposition indicated a little earlier this afternoon, it is only by tying together some of the answers provided in relation to Marineland over 15 to 18 months that the duplicity surrounding the whole Marineland fiasco has suddenly been highlighted. There has been a great deal of hedging and a number of answers do not relate to previous questions and answers. A number of documents are now being produced because the people who work for the Government are dissatisfied with the manner in which it or its Ministers provide detail to the public. Nothing frustrates conscientious public servants more than to know that their efforts are being hidden under the carpet or that they are being presented improperly.

This Government should learn very quickly that it is painting itself into a corner and that, as sure as night follows day, the more the Government seeks to sweep matters under the carpet the more revelations there will be. That has been evident in the past six weeks or so with direct Cabinet documentation 'coming off the back of a truck', to use the proverbial term, when in fact it was either sent by mail or left on a desk. It is authentic. It is conveyed in the first instance by telephone or by conversation in the street, and subsequently followed through.

It has happened in the past. It happened in 1979 and it was happening in late 1978 as a result of the frustration that so many members of the Public Service felt at the manner in which the then Dunstan and subsequent Corcoran Governments were misusing the detail that was the rightful possession of the public at large. And it is happening right now. The Leader of the Opposition in the closing stages of his statement talked about development and the fact that it is a change to find the Government actually making some announcements in recent times when it has led so many people up the garden path and caused so many people to lose so much money.

The Lord Mayor of Adelaide put it very well when addressing a recent central region local government meeting on the whole subject of development. He was followed by people representative of the Australian Conservation Council, the local government arena, the Department of Environment and Planning and developers. In speaking to that

meeting, Mr Condous said that he had recently been in Queensland and had asked a developer well known in that State (who had undertaken development elsewhere in Australia and, on one occasion, had I believe undertaken development work in South Australia) whether he would consider coming down, using his expertise and bringing his financial benefits to the State of South Australia.

The response from that person is very pertinent. He said, 'We don't mind coming down to climb a couple of fences; that is an expectation that any developer would have. But, we have not yet, and will not, put ourselves in the position where we have to learn to be pole vaulters.' That was the way that he and others saw the situation in South Australia, and it is the Government's fault that people outside see it that way.

People have been allowed to spend \$2 million on such projects as Jubilee Point on the information and encouragement of the Government, only to have the carpet pulled out from under them at the last minute. One also thinks of the situation that has evolved in relation to the Mount Lofty project, where the Government actually picked out the developer and where the information that the developer had given the Government before the consortium was chosen clearly indicated the manner in which the Government would approve that project (including the cable car and the five storey hotel complex in the hills face zone). This highlighted to everyone else the expectation that that was what the Government would accept.

As Mr Redman has indicated on a number of occasions (although he has gone fairly quiet because he is still working in the area), the tens of thousands of dollars which that company put forward for this project was all for nought. The company is hopeful that in the remainder of the project it may recoup some of that money. Those sorts of experience which are well and truly known within Australia and those sorts of situation which have appeared not only on local newspaper front pages but also on the front page of the *Weekend Australian*, clearly signal to developers everywhere the problems which exist and which led to the statement by the Queensland developer that he does not intend to become a pole vaulter.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I have previously referred to problems in South Australia directly associated with the development industry. I refer now to some aspects of the committees on which I sat. Others of my colleagues have drawn attention to the unfortunate aspects of the system which prevent questioning of the appropriate Minister relevant to the actions which he or she may be called upon to exercise during the course of a 12-month period, but for which there is no particular line. I fully appreciate that one cannot question a Minister who is not responsible for a particular area. On occasions, that matter was drawn to the attention of members from both sides of the House, and that is correct. However, in relation to the West Beach Trust and the Minister of Local Government, the continuation of a series of questions, which had been handled quite well by both the Minister and the Chairman of the West Beach Trust, was prevented as a result of a claim by a member of the Government that there was no line.

It is not unreasonable to presume that, if a particular piece of legislation is under the Minister's control, the Minister is responsible for laying on the annual report of that particular trust or committee and determining and appointing the Chairman—although, not necessarily in a single year—and bringing that fact to the Parliament. Also, if

required, the Minister or his representative in another place is responsible for the presentation to the House for its consideration of any statutes, by-laws or regulations in relation to that trust throughout the year. The work associated with the handling of those documents is with the Minister's department.

The Minister's lines include administrative costs for the Minister and her staff, yet a member is prevented from asking questions relative to those general activities of the trust or committee. I do not believe that that was ever intended in the creation of the Estimates system. It is a ruse that has been developed, in this case, by the Government. It may well have been developed by a previous Government of a different persuasion; I cannot recall the circumstances. However, when the heat is on, when members are refused the opportunity to ask questions, something is grossly wrong with the system. I hope that with goodwill on both sides the matter will be resolved before we go into any more Estimates Committees.

In relation to the Minister of Local Government, we found that a number of circumstances directly associated with a conflict of interest on the part of councillors had caused some difficulty since the Act was amended in 1984. In referring to a case in respect of Enfield council, Coober Pedy council and other councils that are on the record (including Gawler council), it became apparent that the handling of those cases of conflict of interest has not been dealt with in an even-handed manner.

There has been a different set of circumstances applied, depending on who was calling the shots within the department at any particular time. I am pleased that, although it took a long time to extract from the Minister and her adviser that the clerk of Coober Pedy council could not be held responsible for implementing an illegal decision of that council, subsequently all the councillors, somewhat out of character with the terms of the Bill, passed a motion saying that they will go back to scratch and start to consider various aspects of the release of the parcel of land in the middle of Coober Pedy in a different way.

One thing that is important, whether it be in local government, planning, transport or whatever, is that the same sort of circumstances should be treated evenhandedly. If a fault is identified in the handling of a case, that fault should not recur. There ought to be a clear understanding in the various departments of not allowing different interpretations of the same set of circumstances with differing effects or costs for the people against whom action is being taken.

I was heartened by the agreement of the Minister that there is to be a review committee to look at that aspect of the Local Government Act. I give it my support and trust that those who will be placed on the committee are widely enough involved in the whole of local government to be able to come forward with a response that will benefit local government generally. I was concerned that the Government sees no reason—or, as presently expressed by the Minister, does not accept responsibility—for requiring a conflict of interest clause relating to the activities of senior staff. There is evidence that a number of senior staff—not necessarily with intent, or trying to defraud or gaining anything from a set of circumstances—have been involved in practices within the council. If those practices were undertaken by a council member, it would have put that councillor before the court. It is extremely important that we look at the top management of local government as including not only elected members but also senior staff. I hope that the importance of conflict of interest is addressed in the forthcoming report. I hope an amendment will come forward in due course.

Earlier this afternoon the member for Heysen referred to the problems of planning and the White Paper circulated by the Minister. The Minister seemed to be laid back about the content of that White Paper, suggesting that, because it was being attacked from all sides, then like the Pastoral Act it was probably right as it was, because it suited no one. I point out to the Minister that the difference here is that the attack is coming from all sides but it is all in the one direction—against the action that the Minister seeks to take.

In respect of the Pastoral Bill people were taking different stances, all looking in, and there were different circumstances to those that apply in respect of the White Paper on planning, and the creation of a fast track, as adverted to yesterday by the Premier. If the Minister retains her portfolio until the election and were to proceed down the track that she has publicly taken to this stage, I can tell her that the conservation groups, the Local Government Association, the Law Society, the universities and everyone else will be hammering at her door to wake her up.

One cannot fly in the face of reality. One cannot create a new situation as the Minister's White Paper does, particularly when that paper does not even reflect the true direction of the Green Paper which existed before the creation of the White Paper. I refer specifically to the Bill which accompanied the White Paper and which is full of flaws. The Auditor-General, who appeared before one of the Committees, was ready to open his mouth, as he had been invited to do, when from the sidelines one of the members of the Government directed the Minister to withdraw his rights.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment briefly on matters related to the Estimates Committees and on matters which ought to be drawn to the attention of the House. We are considering a budget appropriating in excess of \$500 000 million. I raise again the great difficulties many people are faced with in the agricultural industry in this State and what could and should be done to boost that industry. When people have to pay up to 18 per cent interest to buy a home and in excess of 22 per cent to continue to be involved in their business, there is something drastically wrong with this country.

The current economic policies in place, which unfortunately this Government has supported, will dispossess a generation of Australians. Those policies will make the dream of owning a home impossible. They will make it nearly impossible for people to start off in small business, including the agricultural sector, unless they are fortunate enough to be in possession of large amounts of cash. They will help evict many people from small businesses and from the agricultural sector. What will be the long-term effect of those decisions on the community?

On Eyre Peninsula and in other parts of South Australia the Government will decimate small rural communities, and we are seeing the effects of that. Some of the problems were highlighted in the *News* today in an article clearly informing the public of South Australia about some of the difficulties that those people are experiencing. According to the rural council at Wudinna, some 25 people have been forced to leave the industry and walk off their farms. If we extend that across the rest of Eyre Peninsula, we will see what is taking place. The comment by a spokesman for the farmers that many of the decisions are made in Sydney is correct.

In my dealings with some of the banks on behalf of people I have found that the worst bank is the one that operates

out of Sydney. It appears to be quite insensitive to the needs of those people and to the long-term effects of their decisions. When one considers that this year it has been estimated that the gross value of agricultural commodities produced in South Australia will be some \$2 073 million—the largest single industry in South Australia—one should understand that it is essential that Governments take decisions that will help those people operate if conditions are reasonable.

This Government has to turn the economy around, create incentive, reduce interest rates and bring down the value of the dollar. It should be revalued so that export industries can allow us to trade out and improve our balance of trade. It is no good artificially keeping up the dollar, as is happening now. Only two industries can help this country out of its difficulties: agriculture and mining. No matter how one looks at it, those two industries have built this country and will sustain it. I have already quoted the figures for agriculture in South Australia. It has been estimated that the mining industry accounted for \$961 million. The amount of money generated by Roxby Downs is also referred to.

Yet, this week Federal Cabinet is brawling about whether or not to allow mining to take place in the Northern Territory. Economic reality has to dawn on the Governments of this country—either they want to create a reasonable standard of living and bring interest rates down or they do not, and the only way they will do that is by exporting. They have to have more Roxby Downs and mines like the one proposed for the Northern Territory, otherwise Australia will continue down the road of economic chaos.

Coupled with the need to improve our trading position and to reduce interest rates, we have to allow people to get on with their business by abolishing unnecessary red tape, controls and bureaucracy. It has been brought to my attention that departmental inspectors now measure the height of wool on trucks, and that drivers are told they are two inches over the limit. What nonsense that is. The size of wool bales has not changed for the past 100 years. I have been associated with the agricultural industry for over 30 years and, although that is not a long period, semi-trailers have always carted wool four bales high. We now have this enlightened departmental officer racing around with a tape measure. Anyone with an ounce of intelligence would know that it is not economic to cart wool three bales high. What sort of mentality is there in government to allow that nonsense to take place?

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: And the officers then tell you to deflate your tyres three inches, and you can go.

Mr GUNN: The member for Chaffey has also experienced this problem, but anyone who has driven a truck knows that it is an expensive exercise to drive with tyres that have the wrong pressure in them. A constituent of mine who is a most reliable and responsible carrier and who has been involved in the transport industry for two generations told me about this problem. I told him to check his facts. Those who allow departmental officers to operate in that fashion should be brought to heel. How can the wool industry—the greatest industry in this country which helped build this nation—operate efficiently when people try to impede its products getting to market? There is enough trouble in the live sheep market and in people not being able to meet their commitments because of the crazy economic situation in Australia, without them being harassed in this way.

Commonsense should prevail. One cannot cut a bale of wool in half. Farmers are taxed and paid per bale; they are limited as to how much they can put in a bale. I have some knowledge of this. What harm will being two inches over the limit do the travelling public? Why this has suddenly

become a danger is beyond my understanding. I may be a relatively simple soul, but I find this situation amazing. The Minister should do something about this. All members on the Government benches and those involved with the administration of the State should read the comments in today's *News*, and what Mr Carey and Mr Cronin had to say. The points they made are relevant. The case of this farmer's survival is well known. He is a constituent of mine and has worked very hard—the type of person who made this country and, if given a fair go, will continue to do so.

The time has come for the Minister and his colleagues, when dealing with the Federal Government, to stop talking pleasantries and to acquaint the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer and the Minister of Finance with the realities. Only one good thing can come from the present policy, namely, changes of Government in this country. The first will be in this State and the second will be federally. Despite whatever arguments might be put forward, no group of people can tolerate being taxed out of their homes or to a degree which makes their lives impossible. It is causing all sorts of social problems.

One could refer to many aspects of this matter, but for a start there are two key industries involved in improving the economic situation—mining and agriculture, and the industries associated with them. They must be given a fair go. We have to develop more mining in this country. We should be looking throughout the whole State at what other minerals we have. We should support the Northern Territory Government in its desire to exploit the minerals in the Northern Territory. This will help our export earnings.

The only way to improve our balance of trade deficit, at present in excess of \$2 000 million, is to get mining industries going. We can have all the academic arguments we like but at the end of the day the reality has to dawn on people that we must be able to produce, that if people cannot produce they go out of business and down the gurgler. The people that this Government claims it wants to help are those that are the first to hurt, people in the lower socio-economic group. They are the people who hurt first. The rest can survive for a while, but they, too, are starting to hurt now. They will respond accordingly at the ballot box—there is no doubt about that.

I refer briefly to debate that took place during the Estimates Committee examining the Minister of Local Government's lines concerning conflict of interest. Let me say at the outset that I appreciate the efforts of the member for Light in raising this matter and acquainting the Committee with the most unfortunate set of circumstances pertaining to it. Members on this side of the House clearly understand and appreciate the desires of the Coober Pedy Miners Association to get cheap fuel and cheap supplies for its members, because they are hurting and are experiencing the effects of increasing interest rates and costs getting out of control. Like farming and other small businesses, the costs involved in mining are forcing people out of business. The Coober Pedy Miners Association has undertaken a program to try to get its members fuel and explosives at the cheapest possible rates. I do not think any reasonable person would object to this. I certainly support its endeavours.

The whole conflict that has taken place at Coober Pedy has been most unfortunate. It should not have occurred. I sincerely hope that now that the matter has been raised in this place and given a proper airing commonsense and good judgment will prevail and that the matter will be solved to the mutual benefit of all the citizens up there. At the end of the day commonsense must apply. All citizens should be treated equally. I sincerely hope that the ill feeling and controversy which has raged up there will now be put aside

and that the people involved will work together in an endeavour to solve their difficulties.

Within my electorate there are many indications that the Education Department and the Public Libraries Branch fail to understand that in isolated communities it is essential that adequate facilities be provided so that people who look to those education facilities can get the best possible education. There has been an ongoing battle at Leigh Creek to improve the library situation there. This has been going on for a long time. I suggest that if a situation like this occurred in the electorate of Bright, or somewhere like that, it would be fixed up immediately; however, because it is at Leigh Creek it seems that it is a case of out of sight out of mind. I refer to a letter that was written to the Education Department in Adelaide on 15 April 1988, as follows:

I write to you as a follow up to our recent telephone conversation in which I highlighted the desperate situation which currently exists at Leigh Creek Area School re the number of hours of community library aide time provided. Leigh Creek Area School community library is entitled to 33 hours per week but is only allocated 20 hours per week at present. The staff in the library are under a considerable amount of pressure by attempting to provide support to the community that it serves. A tremendous amount of time is spent in extending this service to outlying surrounding areas.

The library not only services Leigh Creek but also provides a good service to a large area. The letter continues:

The community library aide is a most dedicated person who has done her best to accomplish the work necessary to ensure the efficient functioning of the community library. Every week she spends many hours in excess of the 20 hours allocated to maximise the service provided. On Monday of this week she rang in to say that she would 'be away for the week . . . I've had enough'. I believe that the future of the Leigh Creek Area School community library is in serious jeopardy and I urgently request the allocation of the entitled additional hours, thus providing the full 33 hours per week in accordance with the allocation formula.

The school received a letter dated 11 April from the department. It states:

I refer to your letter of 20 December 1988 concerning the provision of community library aide hours at Leigh Creek. Because of budget constraints the only option which is available at present is to continue the existing arrangement on a temporary basis until the end of term 2, 1989 . . .

Then, on 7 June 1989 the Community Librarian wrote to the Whyalla Regional Office concerning the community library. That letter states:

I am writing on behalf of the Leigh Creek Community Library Board of Management with regard to the allocation of community library assistant hours at Leigh Creek. The community library assistant is currently employed for 20 hours per week (permanent), when in fact she is entitled to be employed for 30 hours per week. For the past 18 months, an extra 10 hours per week has been negotiated on a term by term basis.

The letter continues:

As a board, we feel that [the person] has been unfairly treated by the western area. We request that she be relieved of the necessity to make special application for an increase in time each term and that the extra 10 temporary hours she has been granted be made permanent . . .

A response was received, and it states:

In response to your letter dated 7 June 1989 expressing concerns about the Leigh Creek community library hours. At this stage the arrangement of 20 hours permanent and 10 hours on review being assigned . . . will have to continue.

In reference to the letter from Dr Were dated 1 February 1988, it is clear that the distribution of community library hours is vulnerable to fluctuations. Unfortunately until a position occurs, hence enabling additional distribution of hours, the arrangements as *per se* will remain.

Members of the board were still far from satisfied so, on 31 August, they wrote again to the Director. The letter states:

Following an expression of concern from the community librarian, the school council recently reviewed the history of time allocated for the library assistant at Leigh Creek. This is summarised below and identifies a deficiency in the allocation of permanent hours.

1. When the library was first opened in 1981, the population of the area was 1 270. An allocation of 20 permanent hours library assistant time was given.

2. During 1983 and 1987 the population increased to 2 600 and the extra demand on the library was met by working many additional voluntary hours per week above the 20 hour allocation. However, the Education Department's staffing policy designates that we should have qualified for an additional 10 hours . . .

3. This time has also been allocated in 1989 but require written submission from our librarian and Principal . . .

4. The allocation for 1990 is to be reviewed at the end of the 1989 school year . . .

5. In addition, the following points are worthy of note.

1. The library assistant currently works four additional voluntary hours per week to ensure that all essential work is completed.

2. The library will be extended during late 1989 giving an increase in shelving space of 50 per cent. It would be reasonable to expect an increase in borrowings and therefore additional workload for the library assistant.

We therefore urge you to consider all of these factors when conducting your review of staffing for 1990. To grant an allocation of 30 permanent library assistant hours . . .

On 13 September the board wrote to me, saying:

It is with concern that I write regarding the allocation of community library assistant hours at Leigh Creek. This problem has been with us now for a number of years and we would appreciate final ratification. As has been stated, the Leigh Creek Area School community library is entitled to 33 hours per week.

I hope that those responsible will do something about this isolated community. It is entitled to something in excess of 30 hours per week. The matter has dragged on for too long and commonsense should prevail. Because people live in an isolated community they should not be denied regional education facilities.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I need to cover a number of matters in my remarks. First, I should put on record my opinion of the fashion in which the Estimates Committees are working and the way in which they have developed. Whilst I could wax eloquent on this point for several minutes, if not the entire time that I have at my disposal, I will not do that. However, it is most important that we should recognise that, by and large, Ministers of the Crown, who believe themselves, for whatever reasons, paranoid or otherwise, to be under seige and under attack will not provide the information being sought by members. This is particularly the case in my experience in recent years where Ministers respond to questions put to them by Opposition members rather than their own colleagues. Another thing which was foxed out and put plainly on the record early in the piece this year about the way in which Ministers conduct the affairs of Estimates Committees is the preparation of dorothea dix questions for which form answers have been provided.

Mr Hamilton: That is pure hypocrisy.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Albert Park will have an opportunity to make his contribution. The Government and members of the Government backbenches feel very embarrassed—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park can make his contribution later.

Mr LEWIS: Documentary evidence of what was being done, at least by some Ministers, was produced to support the Opposition's claim. Our observation over the last two or three years was that the practice has become more widespread. It was particularly the practice in those instances where the Ministers were less than enthusiastic about their work and even less competent to do it. Many of them end

up with portfolio responsibilities which they have neither the knowledge nor the wit to understand.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, it is. I have to acknowledge the assistance of the member for Mount Gambier in his accurate summation of what the member for Albert Park has just said. It is one of his best speeches by way of interjection for some time. I commend him for the way in which he spoke so frankly at that time—whether or not sincerely the record will show in due course.

Let us not kid ourselves. If we want the Estimates Committees to work in a society which depends upon this institution to provide it with representative democracy, it is necessary for members of Parliament, regardless of which side they are on, to be able to ask questions of Ministers and ministerial advisers and for them to be able to give the answers without fear or favour. If not, not only will the Estimates Committees fail and become a mockery but Parliament will even more become an object of ridicule and contempt in the eyes of the public.

As members know, I am genuinely concerned about the increasing extent to which that is occurring. It is not occurring in this institution as much as in the subjective minds of inane journalists who report the proceedings of the institution in a way which enhances the penetration of their articles in the media rather than report the activities and proceedings of this place. It is a pity that they have to depend upon increasing their popularity from ratings, column inches, and so on, by reporting controversial rather than constructive things. Notwithstanding those remarks, I believe that we should contemplate restricting to three minutes the time that Ministers or their advisers can take to respond to any question put to them.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It would be better if the Ministers weren't there, wouldn't it?

Mr LEWIS: Some people believe that to be the case, and that matter could be properly countenanced by the Standing Orders Committee. However, if the Minister were not present, it would be difficult for the ministerial advisers to determine who would respond to the enquiries put to them by members of the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We would get more factual information.

Mr LEWIS: That may be so. This year the Minister of Local Government attempted to participate in the Estimates Committee, but one could be forgiven for thinking that much more factual information would be forthcoming if she just sat there, shut up and let the advisers answer the questions. Notwithstanding that gratuitous advice, and having spent five minutes on the question of the function of the Committees, I will now move to some of the issues to which I was attracted during the course of the disclosures or the lack of them.

I turn to the Marineland dolphins and the stupid situation in which the Government finds itself. I refer to the waste of money on this matter in that it will now cost this State about \$5 million to \$6 million before that project can be completed. I note that the Minister at the bench is in no small measure responsible for this issue. He was certainly not responsible for the matter in its genesis, but he has now been placed in the position where he will have to mop up, as it were, and that is unfortunate.

The whole saga has its origins in the successful lobby within the ALP by those fanatics who are animal liberationists and even Marxists who are committed to encouraging more public support for the view that no animal should be kept in captivity. They term those who do not

subscribe to that view not as engaging in sexism but, rather, in specieism. They focus attention on keeping the dolphins in Marineland as a means of inserting the thin end of the wedge. If they win that issue, they can go on from there and have zoos closed. Having argued to the public about the wisdom or otherwise of keeping animals in captivity, they can close the intensive animal industries in this country. As the member for Eyre said a few minutes ago, rural production is the very sound base of this country's economy and no rural production anywhere in the cool temperate part of Australia would conduct its operations without including animals somewhere in the rotation or agricultural animal husbandry technology, whether it is rain-fed dryland farming or any other type.

Historically, we have depended on keeping domestic animals, as did our forebears, to provide not only meat, eggs and milk but also comfort, warmth, clothing and shelter. We depend on those products, but these people are committed to the destruction of the fundamental base of Australia's economy and they have chosen the dolphins at Marineland as the thin end of the wedge in the belief (and they did this successfully) that the public would be convinced in sufficient numbers to agree that we should release the dolphins and that it was cruel to keep them.

That is a lot of piffle. Why do we not turn loose all the sealpoint Siamese cats, budgerigars and dogs and let them go back to the wild whence they came so that they can fend for themselves? Let us do that and see how far we get. In fact, such action is not compassionate or reasonable. Some of the attitudes I have heard expressed in the course of this debate coming from animal liberationists really smack of romantic fantasies, the like of which I have never been able to contemplate in my wildest lateral thinking.

The Hon. H. Allison: Kentucky freed chicken!

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Kentucky freed chicken. It would not have to be cooked. It would be rather good tucker for all the liberated pet dogs, 98 per cent of which would die within three months of their release. They would soon die from not only starvation but also internal and external parasites, which would be horrendous.

These dolphins were chosen for that reason. I shudder to think of the fate of the sea lions and other animals such as the seals. It would not surprise me if the Government finally decides to kill the lot and does it one Saturday night when the media have gone to bed and nobody is listening or watching. It has about as much good sense in it as the Adelaide Zoo feeling apprehensive at feeding to the animals feral ducks which were taken off the Torrens Lake.

Mr Hamilton: You're sick!

Mr LEWIS: I am not sick at all.

Mr Hamilton: You're sick in the head!

Mr LEWIS: That is animal protein. What do you feed the big cats in the zoo, anyway? What have they fed on for the past 40 million years that they have been on earth, going back to sabre-toothed tigers? They live on animal protein. If you keep them in captivity, you feed them on animal protein. What does it matter where the animal protein comes from? It is the flesh of other animals. What did members Opposite eat for dinner tonight? Anyone would imagine that to eat animal flesh is uncivilised! It is ridiculous to suggest that we should not have animals in captivity and should not use their comfort and company in the form of pets, or their products as food and sustenance for ourselves.

Can the Minister for Environment and Planning justify the stand she is taking in spending \$6 million which will ultimately result in those animals at Marineland being killed, by saying that otherwise they should have been released to

the wild? If she can argue justifiably that they should go back to the wild, what the hell was she doing taking the koalas out of the trees at Cleland and bringing them down to the Royal Show so that people could fiddle, fondle and photograph them down there? You call that commonsense? You call that realism? Is there anything realistic or, for that matter, logical about that sort of approach? No—it is hypocritical and smacks of a double standard all the way down the line, and the losers will be the animals at Marineland who will lose their lives and the people of South Australia who have paid the taxes that are now being squandered on this ridiculous exercise in political opportunism.

That resource could well be used for the kinds of facilities and services that are being denied to people in the electorate of Murray-Mallee and elsewhere in rural South Australia by this Government that chooses to ignore its responsibilities once it gets outside the metropolitan area. Quite happily it goes on pork barrelling its ridiculous programs around the metropolitan area, the likes of which I could instance in great detail if time will allow me, but I cannot and will not.

What I will say to illustrate the kind of issues to which I refer is that the Minister of Education, for instance, has chosen without consultation with the Government simply to rip the guts out of two communities in my electorate and the schools they depend on for their education. Geranium Area School and Pinnaroo Area School will be non-existent as providers of secondary education next year. If members want to understand the ridiculousness of this situation to which I refer, let me put to them quite fairly and reasonably that, if they were to live in Seacombe Gardens, how would they like their children to be got out of bed each morning in time to catch a bus at 7.20, 7.30 or up to 8 o'clock as it travelled across the western suburbs to deliver the kids to school somewhere in Smithfield Plains or Elizabeth Field? That is not on sealed roads, either. That is on mud surfaced roads, roads upon which even I cannot drive at times.

During this winter there have been several times when I have not been able to get along those roads, yet that is what the Minister of Education has decided is an appropriate course of action. He tells me and he tells those communities that it is not about money: it is about the best interests of their children and, in particular, their children's education. It is not about money at all: it is about providing a sufficiently broad range of curriculum options, and he sends out Dr K.G. Boston—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I didn't catch that—you will have to increase the volume.

Mr Tyler: What is wrong with offering a broad curriculum?

Mr LEWIS: Nothing at all, except that it is useless if, when the kid gets to school, he is either frozen to death, sizzled to a cinder, or asleep. If one must get up at 6 o'clock in midwinter to catch the school bus at 7.20 a.m. and arrive home at about 4.45 p.m., one finds that that is fairly physically debilitating. By Friday morning, one is not in the best of shape to concentrate at school. A long time ago, we decided not to require kids to do what I had to do and what, no doubt, some other honourable members in this place had to do. That was nothing compared to what had to be done 100 years ago. In my own case, I had to walk to school. I had to go five miles and back, down across the River Torrens, and when it was in flood I had to go further, because I had to walk around (there was no fording), and up the other side to Paracombe. That sort of thing is no longer necessary. If it is, it is certainly not necessary for anyone living in metropolitan Adelaide, Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Whyalla. I do not see why it should be necessary

for the children of Murray-Mallee. They are inside the settled areas; it is not as if they have the other advantages of lower taxes and charges accepted by people in the pastoral industries.

These people have that advantage and recognise that, when they go to that sort of area, their children must be sent to boarding school. I am putting it to the House that it is not legitimate to move in and knock off the secondary school and expect the kids to travel the extra distance without having first given serious consideration to issues other than the curriculum options that the Government says it is expanding. If the children cannot learn it does not matter how many subjects they can choose from; if they are exhausted and asleep they will not learn any of them, no matter which subjects they choose.

In the first instance, the important thing would have been to say, 'Your children will be better off if we do this, but now we wish to talk to you about the way in which it is feasible.' Of course, it will be feasible if we can get them to school in reasonable time and back home again each day and if we get them there safely, in all weather. That would imply not only getting some school buses that would travel the extra distance in the same time it takes for children living elsewhere in Australia to get to school—that is, no more than 40 minutes a day—but also fixing the roads so that they had decent buses in which to travel and which kept their bodies at a reasonable temperature in both summer and winter and was safe for them to travel over to get to and from school. Even more important than that, their families could support the schools to which the children were sent. It is not safe to go out on those roads during the daytime when they are wet and muddy, let alone trying to drive on them at night when there is an even greater risk of running into a kangaroo, because one is not able to control one's vehicle.

I am distressed to find that the Government has made that decision and is inflexible in its attitude. It should have taken greater care to ensure that all the infrastructure elements in making the decision were put in place before they moved in heavy-handedly to lop off the secondary school component. It may well be, in a theoretical sense, to the curriculum advantage of the children to be able to have a greater number of subjects, according to their aptitude, from which to choose, but it is not fair to do it in this way. It is no benefit whatsoever to them if they must go that extra distance. I confess that I have pointed out, in most instances, what is happening at the most extreme ends of the margin, but it does not alter the basic principle of the point that I am making.

It also has serious implications for the continuing viability of the town and the community from which the secondary school is being removed. It will affect the local doctor and pharmacist. Country pharmacies are shot to bits now because of the actions of the Federal Government; our dear friend Mr Hawke, in Canberra, has ruined them. A future coalition Government will restore the incentives and profitability to country pharmacists to the point where they might be attracted back. If there is no school to which they can send their children when they get to secondary level, pharmacists will not go back to those communities. There will be no pharmacist nor doctor—because they do not want to live in a community like that—and you will not get people to work in the hospital. Bank workers, postal workers, Telecom workers and shop workers will not want to go there. Therefore, the whole darn town loses its reason for being. It will not be able to attract the professionals it needs to provide the infrastructure support for the broader community. You are turning it into a ghost town, and that is a tragedy.

I do not approve of what is being done. I wish I had more time to give more explicit instances. However, I will say one thing in favour of what the department is doing, and in this respect Mr Paul Hewton deserves a pat on the back as Area Director. I refer to the introduction of the remarkable Rendezvous Distance Education communications technology. I hope that the Government goes in and buys it quickly. It is available now, is very cheap, is made by NEC and is marketed by British Telecom, I understand. It is jolly fine stuff.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): It is always very difficult to follow the member for Murray-Mallee in debate because he puts the problems of country people so succinctly that there is nothing else to say. However, in this instance, when noting the Estimates Committees reports, there is unfortunately much to say. I was fortunate to sit on several committees, including that which dealt with the Woods and Forests Department on the last night.

The Hon. H. Allison: It was Thursday night for the Woods and Forests Department.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, quite right. The member for Mount Gambier knows that the department's lines were examined on the Thursday night because, of necessity, he was at Mount Gambier in his electorate for probably the sixth announcement and opening of the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Plant by the Premier. The member for Mount Gambier had to be present not only because he was the local member but also out of a sense of courtesy to the Premier of South Australia. He had to attend the opening and then drive at probably breakneck speed to return to Adelaide to give me the support that was needed to examine the Woods and Forests Department lines.

Of course, the member for Mount Gambier has an intimate knowledge of what is going on in the department because much of its activity is in his electorate, and most of the remainder of the department's activity is in my electorate. However, after the honourable member's breakneck dash back to Adelaide, the Opposition asked the first question only to encounter a point of order that was raised in an attempt to bell us out for the evening simply because the Government did not want to go on with the business of the evening.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Fisher has one more week, I am told, before the Government calls an election. This is your last night here and you want to interject. Do you want to have a go? You can have a go tomorrow. There is not much time left but, if you want to speak, it will be your swansong. I am happy to sit down so that you can have your 20 minutes; then I will get up and have my 20 minutes. It is up to you. If the Acting Speaker cannot keep you in order, I will sit down; you can then have your go and I will have mine.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker. We had this charade going on where the Opposition was allowed to ask one question. Then, a Government member raised a point of order, trying to stop our asking further questions. The same Standing Orders have applied for eight years, so I am told. True, I am new in this place, but the same Standing Orders have applied since I came here. Every year the Estimates Committee has considered the Woods and Forests Department line. I have been involved every time, and we have asked questions. Gov-

ernment members tried to pull a stunt and, thank goodness, the member for Mount Gambier stood on his dig and would not put up with it. Luckily, the Deputy Leader came in and said a few mild and passifying words. We told the Estimates Committee that, if its members did not want to come back and debate the line on the Friday, they had better get on with it and be sensible. We then had an adjournment. I am told that that is not within Standing Orders, but at least commonsense prevailed.

The Hon. H. Allison: It involved one hour and 10 minutes.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We saw one hour and 10 minutes of fruitless kindergarten nonsense from members opposite. That did not give us the opportunity to ask questions. We lost 1½ hours and the opportunity to put questions to Minister Klunder. However, to Minister Klunder's credit, he said that he would be willing to answer the questions that he could answer; at least he was willing to cooperate. At the end, commonsense prevailed. I would like to say to you, Mr Acting Speaker, and to the House that it is about time that members grew up a little and sorted these things out before we went to the Estimates Committees. Certainly, it was an embarrassment to have to sit there with all the officers who had waited for most of the afternoon and who were dragged into this place to answer questions, but who then had to listen to the childish nonsense that went on in arguing that event.

One of the most debilitating things in this place is the lack of objectivity of some of the people in it. The system has to work and commonsense has to prevail, otherwise democracy cannot work. If the Government does not have the guts to answer questions put up by the Opposition—I do not care which Party is in office—it does not deserve to be in power. At the end of the day, after an off-the-record adjournment, we managed to get down to what we were on about. One of the first questions we wanted to ask the Department of Woods and Forests related to what is going on in Lake Bonney. We had a well publicised visit to the South-East and to the electorates of Mount Gambier and Victoria—unannounced in Victoria, I must admit, although I guess that Ministers do not have to announce their visits.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will give the 'acting' member for Fisher time to get in his interjection. I would hope that everyone on this side tells members when they are visiting their electorates. It is an unwritten law, I am told—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Leader doesn't.

Mr Robertson: Absolutely arrogant!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister and the member for Bright to order and ask the member for Victoria to address the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: If you want a wager on the side, I will give you tens if you want to have a go. Do you want to do it through the Chair? I will give you tens that you are not here by the middle of December.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Bright to order.

Mr D.S. BAKER: If the member for Bright wants to have a go, *Hansard* is recording it. I will give you tens that you are not here by the middle of December. Do you want to have a go or not? He's gone silent. Get the fabricator to tell you the economics—he knows all about these sorts of things.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Victoria to return to the content of the debate and to address his remarks through the Chair, and I ask other members not to interject.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister for Environment and Planning came to the South-East. She did not announce that she was coming to my electorate, but that is fine, although I hope that I apply the courtesies of the Westminster system when I visit other electorates. I do not know whether she announced her visit to the electorate of the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: She didn't?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: The instruction went out that Lake Bonney was not allowed to be let out to the sea while she was visiting. Quite a few land-holders about that lake and, with one of the wettest winters we have had in the South-East, they are starting to feel the pinch. Fortunately for them the Minister's visit was brief. She made some motherhood statements about the environment, but none of her comments included wood-lotting, which we have announced as a cure for the problems of Lake Bonney. It would rehabilitate it within quite a short time as it would stop water from Bolivar going into the gulf waters around Adelaide. The Minister gave instructions to the E&WS that the lake would not be allowed to trickle into the sea. It got to a situation where the land-holders were being flooded out.

Once the Minister had left, the orders came to undo the floodgates, let it go and not to worry. That was aided and abetted by the Department of Woods and Forests which had been out there saying that there was 50 000 cubic metres of timber in the lake, that it wanted to drain the lake, with this suspect water putting at risk the whole fishing industry of the South-East—with an annual income of some \$30 million—in order to reclaim the alleged 50 000 cubic metres of timber.

During the Estimates the Opposition asked how much timber was left in the lake and the Minister replied that there was 70 000 cubic metres. I asked whether the Minister could substantiate that, because in the Estimates for the Woods and Forests Department it was 50 000 cubic metres. On questioning, we found that no adequate records were kept after Ash Wednesday when the timber was cut down and put into the lake.

In fact, we found that, in the first month after Ash Wednesday, the timber had been put into the lake in such a way as to protect the industry and the jobs of people in the South-East, and no documentation had been kept. However, we found that better documentation was kept when the timber was taken out of the lake, and we were told that that documentation could be provided.

Why would one want to drain the largest freshwater lake in South Australia and pour millions of megalitres of water into the sea to put at risk the crayfish and abalone export industries in order to recover an alleged \$1 million-worth of timber? Obviously, the Minister for Environment and Planning does not understand the ramifications of it, and the Minister of Forests does not know exactly how much timber is there. To that end, some photographs were taken of the lake, and we find that much of that timber has already been washed up onto the shores of that lake and can easily be got at. No-one during the Estimates Committee could give an accurate estimate of how much timber was left in the lake. The first 1½ hours was wasted, and we concluded, after the next half hour, that it was another blunder by Klunder.

The next item we brought up was the scriumber operation. On many occasions, the Minister has severely castigated the member for Mount Gambier and me for having the temerity to question the financial viability of that operation. Initially, the scriumber plant at Mount Gambier was to use forest

waste (in other words, thinnings taken from the forest for its future good); it was to come on stream in 1987 and was to cost \$12 million. The Minister admitted that it is not yet on stream, although one beam has been produced, and I note the memo to the Minister stated that one beam had been produced on, I think, 23 September or some date close to that; and it has now cost \$44.2 million. I believe, with the escalation in cost from some \$12 million to \$44 million, there is a question mark in relation to its competitiveness in the industry.

Although the forest industry has just had two of the best years for many years in the industry, there are pressures not only in Australia but also overseas in relation to prices obtained. So, something that has cost \$44 million is coming on stream at a time when there is intense competition. The Minister could not tell us much about it; he was not prepared to indicate its cost of production per cubic metre. We questioned him at length on the supposed royalties that would be received from selling scriumber licences around the world. He has castigated me in this House and said that people were queued up around the world to buy scriumber licences.

I asked how much had been received over the past 12 months from those licences and was told, 'Yes, we did have someone in America who paid \$50 000.' I asked what was the budgeted figure for income from licences next year, and the Minister's response was quite unbelievable. He said, 'Well, we can't be in the business of putting forward budgets when we really don't know what will happen. We really can't document anything like that.' His financial adviser gave the same opinion. What are budgets all about? They are about estimates of what will happen in the next year. That is what we are debating tonight and what we have debated over the past two weeks.

A budget supposedly involves estimates formed on a commonsense approach. It is an indictment on the Minister that he cannot tell us what he has budgeted for in relation to licence fees to be received for the scriumber operation. Only some three months ago, when espousing how great this project would be, he said that people were queued up waiting to sign licences.

On very sound financial grounds, I have been a critic of the scriumber operation. I support the Minister and the South Australian Timber Corporation in the proposition to sell licences for the right to produce scriumber overseas and to receive money for that. That is a very sound and proper way to go. In fact, if the operation is as good as the Minister says, there would be some future in it for this country and this State. However, I am very critical of an operation which at the beginning was estimated to cost the taxpayers of this State some \$12 million and to come onstream in 1987 and which in fact has ended up still not onstream in 1989 and costing \$44 million. That is typical of the South Australian Timber Corporation's financial management. In the past couple of years we have become used to the Government hiding from the Parliament and the taxpayers the absolutely abysmal financial arrangements of the South Australian Timber Corporation.

I now refer to the Marineland development—another matter on which this Government has blundered. Today the Leader very succinctly and in very precise terms outlined what has happened with the Marineland operation since it first started. I would recommend to all the people who might question the operation of Marineland to obtain a copy of the *Hansard* report and to go through it, as that will increase their knowledge greatly.

First, a small family company was lured into this State by the West Beach Trust and the Government. It was given

a Government guarantee in relation to how it would be backed. These people were enticed to go in and operate something which quite obviously was not in a fit state to be operated and which finally had to be closed down. As soon as the heat was put on by the unions and by Greenpeace, the operation was closed down and these people were put into receivership. What the Abel family has had to go through is an absolute scandal. It is a scandal for the Government to simply tell us that Zhen Yen wanted to pull out of the development, in the final analysis. That is an absolutely blatant untruth, and in the next few days we will show the House how that is so.

This situation contrasts markedly with another operation in this State, in relation to which it appears that if you are a friend of the Premier you can get a Government guarantee, and if you are a friend of the Premier you can hang in for years, while primary producers of this State are put in jeopardy in relation to their payments. I refer to the Manos operation, a well-known chicken producing factory, which has been operating in this State for many years. It was in financial difficulty when this Government gave it a \$6 million guarantee to continue operating, at the behest of the Premier.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The IDC gave the guarantee.

Mr D.S. BAKER: At the behest of the Premier. One weekend with the Premier, we have been told (and we have the documentation), and you get a \$6 million guarantee from the Premier. That was seven years ago, and I do not have to tell this Minister what has been going on since. I have some regard for his ability, but he is in a very embarrassing situation. His head is on the line, and it will fall in the next few weeks. He has been made the scapegoat for the Premier of this State who has been propping up one of his mates. We saw the big advertisement in the paper just before the last election, 'I support John Bannon'. It's a farce!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): During the past two weeks I sat in on many of the Estimates Committees and watched their operation. I am a little disappointed at the way in which the committees are going. I do not think we can point the finger at anyone or any Party in particular, but the net effectiveness of the Estimates Committees has been wasted away and certainly undermined. I am concerned about it, and this Parliament should take another look at the effectiveness of the Estimates Committees to see whether their true value and worth is being achieved. We are dealing with a \$5 billion budget, and proper scrutiny of the budget should be an obligatory part of the proceedings of this House. I just hope that all members can see that we have a committee structure that could and should work well, but it does not. Many reasons have been advanced for that, the main one being the filibustering both with the length and detail of the questions and the answers. I am not trying to apportion blame, because it happens both ways. I just hope that the workings of the Estimates Committees are not undermined to the extent that we will see their demise. I just hope that a renewed enthusiasm for the worth of the committees will put them back on track and make them work better.

One issue that arose a fortnight ago was the announcement by the Government to spend \$300 000 on the planning and development stages of the sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln. I raise this matter because the Finger Point sewage treatment works was in the planning stages 10 to 12 years ago and it has just officially opened. I hope that Port Lincoln does not have to wait that long before a treatment works will be in operation. I am very pleased that the

priorities of the Government have been upgraded to the extent that the matter will be seriously considered and hopefully, before long, a commitment will be given ensuring that the treatment works will be commenced.

I wrote a letter to the Minister a few days ago, a copy of which was sent to the Premier, relating to the overall waste management of the Port Lincoln area. I sent that letter in response to one I received from a group of concerned residents of Proper Bay in response to a proposal by the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln to locate a landfill rubbish tip in their vicinity. The local community was responding to some problems associated with that proposal. My letter to the Minister states:

The letter relates to the concern of residents in that area about the possible relocation of a rubbish dump site at section 467 hundred of Lincoln. I have met with the residents of the area and I believe their concerns to be well founded.

In addition to these concerns, I raise the point with you that as the Government has now indicated initiation of the planning process for a sewage treatment works, an announcement which was received most enthusiastically by the community, it may be an appropriate time to consider the overall waste management of Port Lincoln.

The city council is considering the relocation of the rubbish dump, the Government and E&WS are considering the sewage treatment plant, proposed legislation on point source pollution will also affect the fish factories and meatworks and there has also been a recent announcement about a proposed fishmeal factory for Port Lincoln. As well as this, there is the need for a high temperature incinerator for the disposal of waste from overseas vessels and all of these issues are being considered at this time.

I respectfully suggest that now would be the appropriate time for a complete waste management appraisal, inquiry and report to be undertaken for the Port Lincoln area, in which case, Port Lincoln could well become a model of waste management for other cities and communities to follow.

I would be pleased if you could indicate the practicalities of undertaking such a report, for I see that the timing would be most opportune, considering that all aspects of waste management in its various forms are now under active consideration.

I raise that point because I believe that now is the time for all those aspects of waste management to be considered. We are in an era when the whole community is waste management conscious. It is not hard to sell to people the need for proper waste management. To that end this issue needs to be considered.

The waste from the fish factories and the meat works has been flowing into Proper Bay for 55 to 60 years. That is of concern to all. There is no doubt that in the area immediately adjacent to the outfall there has been a considerable change in the ecology. People who fish in the area tell me that there is a change in the weed pattern and that change is growing markedly, and the fish feeding areas are changing accordingly. That problem needs to be addressed.

The Government is foreshadowing in the point source pollution legislation that those persons or companies which are responsible for pollution of the sea will be made accountable. The Government has initiated this planning stage because it will have an obligation to address the problem of raw sewage outfall in order to comply with its own proposed legislation. Probably the greatest thing for Port Lincoln is that the Government is hardly in a position to introduce new legislation if it is not prepared to address the problem for which it has an obligation.

The other issue in relation to a high temperature incinerator for the treatment of refuse from ships concerns exotic diseases. There is no doubt that that is a potential entry point for exotic diseases. The handling of it by the Department of Marine and Harbors or the DPI inspectors has been very good and prudent so far. However, we all know that the entry of an exotic disease into Australia is not so much if as when. With transport being the way it is—I was

going to comment about air travel, but perhaps it is the wrong time to make that comment—a person can be on a farm overseas which could have an exotic disease present and, within a matter of hours or certainly days, can be on an Australian farm wearing the same pair of shoes and unknowingly and unwittingly bring in a disease that Australia does not want.

We are accused of exporting diseases of some kinds, as has been demonstrated recently in the live sheep market, when we do not have those diseases in Australia. The accusation has been made and we must do everything that we can to keep out such diseases. That is the point that I was making about the need for a high temperature incinerator to dispose of waste from foreign vessels when they come into Port Lincoln for berthing and taking on cargo. There are about 100 shipping movements a year in Port Lincoln, so it is a significant port in that sense. I believe that those shipping movements may increase as more larger vessels are used. It is possible that it will be used as a top-up port as well as a second port at which grain from other silos can be shipped or barged for on-loading to overseas ships.

I think that my all-embracing waste management plan should be addressed. The Port Lincoln council is very worried, because it knows that it has an obligation to move the present rubbish dump. Unfortunately, it does not have land or an appropriate site in the council boundary areas, so it has to look at a site within the district council area, which creates problems for the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln. I believe that this suggestion of an all-embracing waste management plan could set up Port Lincoln as a model that could be used not only in South Australia but also elsewhere in Australia. I further believe that the appropriate addressing of a waste management system in a city of 13 000 people would be a feather in the cap of any Government if it had the courage to accept such a challenge.

I now turn particularly to the rural scene. The member for Eyre referred to articles which appeared in this afternoon's *News* about some of the difficulties being experienced by his and by my constituents. It is rather ironic that, on the very same day in the *Advertiser*, an article referred to the rural vote of confidence. I know that we are talking about two different scenarios, but I do not wish the general public to gain the impression from the *Advertiser* report about a rural vote of confidence that all is well, because it is not. Even on Eyre Peninsula where, hopefully, we are facing one of our best years of agriculture production, it does not mean that the problems have been overcome.

I have attended three country shows this season and the small business community and the machinery firms are not receiving any response to the prospects of a good year, because no money is circulating in the community. In addition, wool prices are depressed by some 25 per cent when compared with this time last year, so is it any wonder that the rural community is hesitant? Those farmers who it would seem are facing a good grain season will only be paying off—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. Will members allow the member for Flinders to make his contribution in relative silence.

Mr BLACKER: Some of those accumulated debts are getting out of all proportion. That then brings me to the whole crux of the matter and I refer to interest rates. As the article in today's *News* indicates, the problem of many farmers is not really the drought but, rather, the interest rates and their ability to handle those interest rates when they are snowballing and compounding to such an extent.

The *News* also refers to the fact that about 25 families have walked off their farms. I know a few of those families personally, but not all of them. However, I know the trauma suffered by those people who have faced such a prospect and, more particularly, by those who may still have to face it, and it is quite overwhelming. Whilst some financial institutions granted farmers the financial assistance to plant their crops and to buy the super and fuel earlier in the year, I am concerned that the same letter granting that financial approval also stated that their position would be reassessed in September or October.

Of course, that means that, if there is a good season and good prospects facing those farmers and a buyer comes along, the farmers will not be allowed to reap their crop. They will be allowed to plant it—in the interests of the bank—and as soon as a potential buyer comes along the farm will be sold from under the farmer, and that farmer will be forced off. In my view, any farmer who has been allowed the finance in order to plant his crop should at least be given the common decency of being allowed to harvest the crop, and if the banks then wish to renegotiate they should do so at the end of the farming year, which is usually the end of February.

As I have indicated, the rural season is far from over. There is the prospect that it will put considerable wealth back into South Australia. In fact, Eyre Peninsula may well produce half the grain of the State. However, less than 12 months ago that area was being wiped off by many so-called experts. We were told that the area should never be farmed and that Goyder's line should be shifted. Instant experts were flying over the peninsula saying that it was all desert. On one occasion, not so very long ago, a chap flew over and said that the whole of the peninsula should be planted to pines, which is rather a silly thing to say, because the E&WS Department would have kicked up immediately. One does not plant pines over the top of a water basin.

There were several conflicting stories, but, with the prospect of a good season, it is interesting to note that all those instant experts seem to have disappeared. I looked through the production statistic records of the past 80 years for the statistical division of Eyre (which takes in all the area about which I have been talking) and I noted that the fluctuations we have had over the past three or four years are not inconsistent with what has happened over the past 80 years. The problem gets back to interest rates and to the Government of the day removing such things as income equalisation deposits, therefore not enabling farmers to make provision for their own drought reserves and fodder stocks as they would have done in years gone by. Because of financial pressures, not having the ability to use income equalisation deposits and not having the ability to put away large fodder stocks, the farmer is living from day to day instead of living over a five year averaging system. The farmer is living from one year to the next, which is where the whole system has gone wrong.

We need to get back to a situation where farmers can be encouraged to look after themselves, with income equalisation deposits and similar schemes. I believe that the State could play a role in that, even though the old IED was a Federal scheme. That is another issue which needs to be addressed. Earlier this year, I took a deputation to the Minister and the Premier on behalf of local government and small business, because of concerns about the drought and the difficulties the farmers were having. Many councils believed that they would not be able to recover rates from farmers because they were not in a position to pay. Small businesses were going to the wall because farmers could not pay some of their accounts and farmers, in turn, were not

buying, which all creates another problem about the supply of machinery necessary to take in harvests in future. I will go into that on another occasion. The Government ultimately responded with an offer of a \$500 000 package to help subsidise interest rates for some of those small businesses that were predominantly dependent on the rural areas for their business.

I have yet to find out why that scheme has not been enthusiastically taken up. Obviously, there is a management problem. Whether the criterion was too stringent or whether the small businesses could not visualise themselves being in the area for a longer period, I do not know. I have spoken with the Minister and I hope that this matter can be addressed, because I believe that the Government's intent in offering that money was genuine. However, it appears not to have been taken up in the way in which it was expected to be.

The other issue relates to Government assistance to local government for the clearing of sand drifts from roads. I know that the District Council of Franklin Harbor had a massive problem in relation to sand drifts which required expenditure of about \$230 000 to \$240 000. The District Council of Cleve had even greater problems, with two floods occurring in rapid succession, which resulted in a damages bill of about \$1.2 million. The Government has made available \$500 000 for distribution amongst all councils. Those funds are to be dispersed by the Local Government Advisory Committee and, as yet, I am not aware of the break-up of those funds and just which councils will receive funding. However, at least those funds will be going out to communities.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I noted with a great deal of interest an article on page 2 of today's *News*. Under the heading 'New SA scheme targets thieves', it is stated:

The State Government's \$10 million assault on crime continued today with the release of a booklet listing ways to make the home and other personal property safer from thieves.

It comes in the wake of predictions that one in six—or 60 000 South Australian homes—will be robbed this year.

Insurance experts warn the main targets are the double-income homes in mortgage belt suburbs.

The article goes on to state:

In the event of theft of personal possessions, the chances of recovery are greatly increased. This is a simple but effective booklet.

The booklet includes a special section for the elderly, including hints on dealing with con artists, as well as a lengthy list of tips on how to make the family home less of a target.

Talk about con artists! The greatest con I have ever seen occurred in the lead-up to the 1979 State election. In those days, in conjunction with very conservative forces, including Mr Nigel Buick of Kangaroo Island, the Liberal Party embarked upon one of the most disgusting and filthy campaigns that I have ever seen. As the candidate for Albert Park at the time, I have never forgotten those events, and I constantly remind the Opposition that I will never forget them as long as I have a place in this Parliament.

This was one of the most outrageous campaigns that I have ever seen. One of the good sides of that campaign was that I decided to work with all the vehemence and force-

fulness that I had to pursue the issue of law and order. It is fair to say that very few members in this Parliament have pursued this issue with the strength and dedication that I have shown. On 17 November 1983 I asked the then Minister of Emergency Services to investigate the feasibility of introducing a Neighbourhood Watch scheme into South Australia. I did that in response to the issues I raised previously. There is no question that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme in this State has been an overwhelming success.

I believe very strongly that the Liberal Party and, indeed, members opposite, are the greatest bunch of hypocrites that I have ever seen in my life. One has only to look at their contributions in this place since 1983 in terms of law and order issues. One of the greatest hypocrites, who of late is hiding behind a corkscrew, is the member for Morphett. The member for Morphett stood in this House for years and talked about law and order issues and attacked this Government. Having researched this matter, I can say that the member for Morphett has never put up a constructive proposition about positive action that could be undertaken in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I will not be shouted down by those clowns opposite, who can yell and scream as much as they like. The reality is that some members on this side of the House who have long memories will not be persuaded by those silvertail members opposite who believe that they have a God given right to rule this State. They do not have that right and they will learn that at the next State election. They have no God given right to rule this State, and people such as I from working class backgrounds are willing to get off their butt and knock on every door in their electorate to talk to people on the issues about which they are concerned.

Before the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch in South Australia—and I want to link my remarks to the article in the *News*—it had been my intention both in Opposition and in Government to clearly address such issues. This is contrary to what Opposition members do, because the only time they talk about law and order is when they are in Opposition, not when they are in Government.

Tonight, I asked the Parliamentary Library staff to dig out one of my newsletters which was circulated in my electorate in December 1982. As the House would be aware, I distribute a newsletter on a whole range of issues every three months to my constituents in Albert Park. Invariably, on the back of the newsletter at Christmas is a message, as follows:

Going away over Xmas or New Year? Protect your home.

Depicted on the back page of the newsletter is a house with a bandit wearing a mask and walking away with a television set under his arm and a half-eaten drumstick in his hand. Many people have appreciated the drawing. The caption goes on to state:

- Lock all doors and windows.
 - Don't hide the key.
 - Don't leave notes.
 - Don't leave money on premises.
 - Leave an inside light on during the evening.
 - Leave a radio on.
 - Mark your property for identification—
- time permitting, I will come back to that—
- photograph antiques, jewellery, etc.
 - On holidays . . . also
 - Cancel milk, bread and paper deliveries.
 - Lock away gardening and other tools.
 - Get a neighbour to collect your mail and generally look after your home.
 - Tell the local police your address during your absence.

There is no doubt that those messages have got through to people in the western suburbs. I ask members opposite to note the number of my contributions in this House and particularly the introduction of the property identification card, which has been fully endorsed by the Police Department and by the Superintendent in charge of the Neighbourhood Watch program. That action is in marked contrast to the contribution made by members opposite. They do not like to hear this because it is unpalatable.

The reality is that when members opposite were in Government they did little in terms of law and order. However, when one looks at what this Government has done since its election to office in 1983, one sees that the record is in marked contrast to that of the Opposition. I encourage people to read some of the contributions that I have made about law and order issues, because I found out, by going out and doorknocking, exactly what were the concerns of local people. I know that—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Mount Gambier, who interjects out of his seat, knows, as do all members in this House, that I am not the best politician here. However, I am not lazy or frightened to doorknock and letterbox every house in my electorate on an ongoing basis, as I have done over 10 years. The reality is that, when we have members such as the present member for Bragg attempting to knock me off as in 1982, they find to their dismay that I go from 4 per cent to a massive 15.2 per cent. Members opposite are basically lazy when it comes to issues confronting the electorate at large. This Government has addressed the law and order issues. I wish I had another 20 minutes to address the real law and order issues in this State. Whenever the next State election is held, one issue by which this State Government will be remembered is its contribution to law and order issues in this State.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I will address the problem of the crisis facing St John Ambulance volunteers in this State. We have heard recently of problems being faced by the career or paid staff of St John, but a much greater crisis is creeping into country areas and will affect all people in the State if they venture into country areas, be it as a tourist or in some other capacity. The matter was recently brought to my attention when a town in my electorate—Balaklava, which has had a strong brigade for many years—had five potential recruits seeking entrance into St John. All five failed the medical test. On further inquiry it appeared that three failed because they were classified as being overweight. One was failed because it was considered that they still had the effects of a whiplash injury from a long time earlier. The fifth person, who has played football with a league under-17s club, was failed for a couple of reasons, one being colour-blindness. However, St John volunteers indicate that quite a number of colour-blind people currently work for St John.

I fully appreciate that a medical test may be necessary when a volunteer wishes to come into an organisation, particularly where they have the responsibility of caring for sick and injured and need to drive a St John ambulance vehicle. However, on further investigation it appears that the same medical test is being used for career staff and volunteer staff. Everyone should know that volunteers are not going into St John to earn extra money—they are losing money, as they spend many hours working voluntarily.

It is interesting to note the criteria that are mentioned in the medical forms. One notice to all brigade doctors states:

A number of the criteria may appear to some to be rather severe. However, they should be viewed as guidelines only.

Another memo to doctors states:

Meeting the standards set will ensure a smoother transition to the career staff should the volunteer decide to apply at a later date.

Why should tough medical conditions and standards be set if the note to the doctors says that it is only a guideline and that they can water it down as they like? If we are going to have that option, let us make clear what the doctor is or is not supposed to do. It has been pointed out that it seems to vary from town to town.

I spoke with one of the doctors who had to carry out the tests and, so that his reputation was untarnished, when filling out the medical examination report, which includes personal information, he wanted to state the truth as he saw it. To say that the criteria can be a guideline only is really saying that a doctor can water it down. I am very concerned about that and believe that it should be corrected.

Let us briefly consider the situation of volunteer ambulance personnel. Until a couple of years or so ago (maybe a bit less) St John volunteers undertook an eight-week first aid course and a 20-week emergency care and transport course, and no medical examination was required. That was a sensible entry to St John, so far as I can see, in that those who wanted to help others were encouraged to do so. Today, in addition to the first aid and emergency care and transport courses, volunteers have to pass a stringent medical test, undertake a 12-week bridging course, an ergonomic test and a literacy and numeracy test: in other words, they have to do a huge amount if they want to get into St John.

I was told that one of the five people who was refused entry at Balaklava had been a St John cadet for a year or two and had been carrying out his duties responsibly for some time. However, when he had to sit for the medical he was not permitted to enter St John. If those who fail their medical test want to appeal, they can, but they have to go to a specialist at their own expense. Why would a specialist overrule the observations of a general practitioner, particularly in relation to such things as scar tissue? Either there is or is not scar tissue from an operation, and it will not make any difference who observes it.

Another disturbing feature is that some of the people classified as being overweight are able to lift the minimum 63 kilogram weight that is required, whereas many other St John volunteers are not able to do so. They found it difficult or impossible to lift that 63 kilogram weight by themselves and needed help.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is a pity that members opposite do not treat this matter with the seriousness it deserves. I am upset that they are laughing at St John volunteers. That is indicative of the way the Government treats St John volunteers, and maybe it explains the current situation. I remind members—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: —that the St John Volunteer Brigade raises an enormous amount of money for equipment and capital, and last year sent St John some \$682 351. This money was raised entirely by country volunteers, and we must applaud them for their efforts. Annually, the St John Ambulance Service in South Australia travels over 5.6 million kilometres transporting some 200 000 patients; it teaches first aid and associated subjects to over 21 000 members of the public. The 4 700 uniform St John Ambulance volunteers put in 190 000 hours of unpaid first aid and patient care duty at various public gatherings, and treat almost 17 000 cases. These figures do not include 460 000 hours of voluntary service that these members perform to support the St John Ambulance Service. No other State in Australia can

match the service that St John provides to the South Australian community or the commitment of its members.

I think it is very important to remember that. It is tragic that now in the case of Balaklava we are finding that some of the members are having to put in over 50 hours of voluntary service per week on ambulance duties. That is in addition to their normal work. Furthermore, with the rejection of the five prospective volunteers it means that extra duties will have to be undertaken. I have been told that the normal day shift of five has now been reduced to four persons and that, further, because one person must have some treatment shortly, the number will drop to three volunteers being on duty. Only last week one of the volunteers had six calls and three trips to Adelaide in a 24-hour period.

The pressure is on the St John volunteers. The union movement is obviously determined to get rid of them. I appeal to the Minister of Emergency Services to step in and see that protection is given to the volunteers. I also appeal to him to ensure that commonsense prevails and that the ambulance services that we have in the country are maintained. They will not be maintained if they go to paid personnel.

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

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): The first matter that I want to raise tonight relates to a problem that has plagued various residents of my electorate, certainly for as long as I have been associated with it, namely, the blasting and noise around the various quarries in the area.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROBERTSON: I think I will demand extra time if this continues. Residents of Columbia Crescent, Hallett Cove and, indeed, residents from as far away as Falcon Avenue, Hallett Cove, have complained consistently for the past five years about suffering from wind blown dust from the Reynella quarry and from the vibrations, which have dislodged roof tiles and cracked walls, and so on. I am not sure exactly how much of that emanates from the Reynella quarry, but I am absolutely certain that the dust does. It is arguable though that a fair proportion of the air blast and indeed ground vibration emanates from Reynella quarry. Similarly, a little further north, the residents of Jervois Terrace, Spinks Road and Yalpa Road, Marino, have complained for a number of years about the dust from the Linwood quarry. I have personally inspected houses at Marino, and also at Seacliff Park, where ceiling spaces have been absolutely full of quarry dust, which has been blown in from the adjacent quarrying operations at Linwood.

Now, to add insult to injury, I suppose, for the people of Perry Barr Road, Karrara, the Linwood quarry has come marching southward over the hills. The people there can now see overburden from the quarry as it is dumped into an adjacent gully, and they, too, are beginning to complain about blast noise, dust and vibration from the Linwood quarry. Ultimately, of course, the problem is that quarrying is not an activity that is compatible with residential development. As in the case of airports, one has to ask the sort of chicken and egg question relating to who was there first. In fact, the Linwood quarry has been there since 1892 and, arguably, in some cases residents do not have a particularly strong argument. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the people in the area must put up with a considerable amount of dust, ground and air vibration.

As the local member, I must ask myself just what I can do to ameliorate the effects of quarrying for these people. The answer that I have to give them is 'Not very much.'

The reason why I cannot do very much for them is that, to my knowledge, the only Act that controls quarrying is the Mines and Works Inspection Act. Under that Act, the local mines inspector is authorised to consult with quarry management, to suggest that they water the roads and stop the dust from blowing around, that they perhaps blast in certain ways, and, indeed, that they use certain noise control measures in blasting. This does not have a great deal of effect, though, on quarrying operations, because it is not possible to water roads every five minutes on a hot, dry summer's day. Ultimately, dust, blasting and air blast are an effect of quarrying which cannot be overcome using the Mines and Works Inspection Act.

I then have to ask myself, and indeed answer residents' questions to this effect: 'Why is it that the Mines Department or the Department of Environment and Planning do not have any more power than appears to be the case under the Mines and Works Inspection Act? Why not in fact control the operations of quarry operators by using the Planning Act?' The simple reason is: it cannot be controlled by the Planning Act because, under the Tonkin Liberal Government in 1981, section 60 was amended to exempt private mines from the workings of the Act, leaving them only under the control of the Mines and Works Inspection Act which has comparatively little clout. New section 60 of the Planning Act gave complete exemption to private mines under that Act. It does not need to be stated that both the Linwood quarry at Marino and the Reynella quarry are held under that form of title. They are private mines held under the Mining Act.

It is interesting to note that both quarries have been owned by Quarry Industries since 1972 and, according to the appropriate *Government Gazette* notices which I have in front of me, they were taken out in the name of the Sheidow family and Quarry Industries. But guess what position the Managing Director of Quarry Industries held in 1981 when the Tonkin Liberal Government amended section 60 of the Planning Act? He held no less a position than Treasurer of the State Liberal Party, and that is a fact that the people of Seacliff Park, Hallett Cove, Karrara and Marino ought to know. Furthermore, they ought to know why officers of the Mines Department and Department of Environment and Planning are not in fact able to do more than fire peas at elephants and use the very limited powers that they have under the Mines and Works Inspection Act. When the Liberal Government was last in power in this State, namely, 1979 to 1982, it amended the Planning Act to exempt private mines, and did so at a time when the State Treasurer of that Party was also the Managing Director of Quarry Industries who, coincidentally, as it happened, held the leases to both mines.

My second issue relates to the amount of money that ETSA pays to consumers who contribute electricity to the ETSA grid. It is not a widely known fact in this State but, if one produces power in excess of the power one requires, that electricity can be sold back to ETSA. It is a less known fact that the price ETSA will pay for a kilowatt hour of that power is 2.5 cents, but ETSA charges 9 cents per kilowatt hour to consumers. I can understand the differential between the selling and buying prices. Clearly, ETSA is not there as a beneficial institution to give away taxpayers' money. It is there to balance the books and, if possible, to perhaps make a little on the side, but it does not need to have such a large mark-up between the cost of energy from it and the price it pays to people who generate energy and feed it into the grid.

It seems that ETSA could do a great deal to encourage recycling and responsible use of energy resources if it paid

a little more for energy that it bought, and narrowed the gap. That energy comes from a number of sources which could quite readily contribute to the ETSA grid. The most obvious are the E&WS treatment plants at Bolivar, Christies Beach, Glenelg and Port Adelaide, where considerable amounts of methane are generated from the process of sewage treatment. At Glenelg and Port Adelaide, sufficient methane is generated to produce enough electricity to drive the pumps and machinery of those two treatment plants. They are virtually self-sufficient.

Christies Beach treatment plant at the moment is deemed to be too small to install a turbine to generate power while Bolivar, which handles 45 per cent of the total volume of sewage, generates so much methane that it has excess methane at the end of the day and burns it off rather than generating additional power and feeding it into the grid. Operators of piggeries and poultry farms could use the manure from pigs, ducks, geese and turkeys to generate methane. Indeed, the best fuel for methane, because its carbon and nitrogen balance is about right, is chook manure, and pig manure comes close behind it. Those two could be harnessed quickly for the production of methane.

By all accounts the Adelaide Hills are quite windy by world standards, so farmers with windmills could instal wind turbines and generate power which they could kick into the grid. Throughout the south-western suburbs, in places like Brighton, Marion and others where there is groundwater close to the surface, the fashion earlier this century was to have windmills in backyards. There is no reason why that could not be done on a small scale in the suburbs. There are places in the Adelaide Hills where farmers could tap into hydroelectricity. In the final analysis, residents of Adelaide could cover their roofs with the much more efficient photovoltaic cells, which are now available, and kick electricity into the grid. It is a known fact that the roof area of most dwellings is sufficient to generate enough electricity from known photovoltaics to power a house. If residents are encouraged to do that and if they are given a reasonable price for the excess energy, they will take advantage of it.

Motion carried.

At 9.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 27 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 September 1989

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PAYROLL TAX

4. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Premier:

1. Is the Government proposing to introduce legislation to include fringe benefits in assessment of payroll tax and, if so—

(a) why;

(b) what is the estimated additional income from payroll tax on non-cash benefits for this financial year;

(c) what system will be adopted for valuation of non-cash benefits; and

(d) will the 3 per cent productivity superannuation contribution be exempt?

2. Has the Government been requested by the Commonwealth Government to include fringe benefits in assessment of payroll tax and, if so, when and why?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

BLUE LIGHT DISCOS

5. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many Blue Light Discos were conducted in the past financial year and how does this number compare with the previous two years?

2. At what locations were these Blue Light Discos held?

3. What is the approximate cost of operating a Blue Light Disco and what sponsorship is made available to the police to conduct them?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. Number of Blue Light Discos held in:

Year	No. of Discos
1988	140
1987	137
1986	152

Records are maintained on a calendar year basis. Figures for the 1989 calendar year will be significantly higher than the 1988 calendar year, due to the recent opening of the Whyalla Blue Light Disco, which is conducted twice a week.

2. Discos were held at Angaston, Nuriootpa, Kapunda, Berri, Booleroo Centre, Bordertown, Campbelltown, Christies Beach, Coonalpyn, Meningie, Elizabeth, Gladstone, Jamestown, Kimba, Osborne, Wudinna, Poochera, Leigh Creek, Loxton, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Peterborough, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Streaky Bay, Whyalla, Kalangadoo, Adelaide Hills, Parafield Gardens, Roxby Downs, Port MacDonnell and Marla.

3. The average cost of conducting a Blue Light Disco is in the vicinity of \$500, but it can be as high as \$3 000, depending on the rates charged for venues, rates charged by disc jockeys and special guests, and costs of local advertising and promotion.

At present the only sponsor of Blue Light Discos in this State is the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, which provides \$6 000 to cover the cost of the annual insurance premium. However, some discos receive limited local sponsorship by way of small grants from service clubs and prizes from local businesses to be given to patrons. The Whyalla

night club received substantial financial support from the Whyalla council, BHP, local business and the Drug and Alcohol Services Council in establishing the new night club.

PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

7. Mr GUNN (Eyre), on notice, asked the Premier: How many persons employed by the Government are currently on the Pitjantjatjara lands?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On Wednesday 9 August 1989 the total number of South Australian Government employees on the Pitjantjatjara lands was 132. Of these, 127 are resident on the lands, 76 of whom are of Aboriginal descent. The other five employees were on short-term visits.

	Permanent Total	Residents Aboriginal	Casual Visitors
Education Department	110	65	—
Highways Department	—	—	—
Sacon (Works Unit)	—	—	2
Police	11	10	1
Community Welfare	—	—	1
Court Services	—	—	—
Lands Department	—	—	—
Correctional Services	—	—	—
Environment and Planning	—	—	—
TAFE	6	1	1

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

17. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many prisoners have been charged and prosecuted for involvement in the riots at Yatala Labour Prison in July 1987?

2. Have any allegations of brutality been made against correctional services officers in connection with the riots?

3. Was gas used to quell the riots or the behaviour of any one offender and, if so, how many times and in what circumstances in each case?

4. Is 'C S Gas' used in prisons and, if so, why, what are the side effects and who authorises its use?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The police charged and subsequently prosecuted 18 prisoners over matters arising from the riots. In addition, 28 prisoners were charged and dealt with by the Visiting Justice at Yatala Labour Prison.

2. No allegations of brutality have been made against correctional services officers. There were only inferences made during the trial.

3. No gas was used during the riot.

4. 'C S Gas' is used in prisons as a chemical agent to incapacitate prisoners so that neither the prisoner nor officers are injured during a disturbance. There is no knowledge of long-term side effects of 'C S Gas' upon the health of people or upon those who have had gas used upon them. The following are the effects of the use of 'C S Gas':

1. Eyes, respiratory tract, hot sweaty areas of body.
2. Effect lasts 5-10 minutes depending on dosage.
3. Casualties have great urge to evacuate area.
4. Personnel may be affected to a lesser or greater degree.

The following are the symptoms of the use of 'C S Gas':

1. Extreme burning of the eyes causing tear flow.
2. Involuntary closing of the eyes.
3. Burning feeling in the moist areas.
4. Running nose.
5. Coughing, difficulty in breathing, chest tightness.

The use of 'C S Gas' is authorised by the Manager of a prison after conferring with the Director, Operations or his delegate.

DISABLED PEOPLES INTERNATIONAL

28. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs:

1. Is the Minister aware of the auditor's qualified report on the statement of income and expenditure and balance sheet of the Disabled Peoples International for the 17 months period ended 28 September 1988 and, if so, what action does he propose to take in respect of the qualification?

2. What financial assistance was given by the Government to Disabled Peoples International for each of the past three years?

3. How many public servants are employed by Disabled Peoples International and what are their positions?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is aware of the auditor's qualifications to the financial statements of DPI. The qualifications are not unreasonable given the nature of the organisation, a small, self-help group run mainly by volunteers. In fact, the auditor concludes that moneys recorded as income and expenditure have been properly accounted for by the association.

2. The Department for Community Welfare has supplied information on financial assistance given to the association for each of the past three years as follows:

	1986-87 \$	1987-88 \$	1988-89 \$
Minister of Health special grants line	575	1 000	12 515
Department for Community Welfare	2 000	2 000	12 515
Home and Community Care Program	Nil	Nil	13 585

In addition, the Department for the Arts gave a grant of \$1 500 in the 1988-89 financial year.

3. The Department for Community Welfare has supplied the following:

The current administrator was previously an employee of the State Government. One half-time employee of DPI also has employment with the State Government, although the two arrangements are separate and the employee is paid by DPI for the time spent working at DPI.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

35. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Will the Minister table all official reports relating to the Mount Lofty development not made available to the public through the EIS procedures including those associated with the possible fire risk and other safety factors, and the Highways Department's report relating to the substantial increase in the use of Summit Road between Crafrers and Greenhill Road should the project proceed in its present form?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The information sought is contained in the assessment report for the project which was publicly released on 28 August 1989.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING AUTHORITY

37. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What were the rental income, Government subsidy, administrative expenses, interest costs and maintenance and vacancy rents of the Government Employee Housing Authority for 1987-88 and 1988-89?

2. What is the reason for the delay in answering this question since it was first asked on 15 February 1989?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. I draw the honourable member's attention to my letter of 16 August 1989.

2. At the time of asking the question, the information was not readily available nor were there resources to extract the data. This situation arose because of a number of major initiatives being undertaken by the Office of Government Employee Housing, such as the development of a new financial information system, the move to accrual accounting and formulation of a major rent management system. While estimations could have been provided, it was considered more beneficial to delay a response until the actual figures became available.

TAB AGENCIES

43. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. How many and which TAB agencies have toilets for patrons?

2. Have any requests for toilet facilities at TAB agencies been made in the past 12 months by any local government bodies and, if so, which and when?

3. What action will the TAB take in the next 12 months to provide toilets in all TAB agencies and, if none, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. None.

2. Yes. City of Marion on 29 March 1989.

3. TAB is providing all necessary facilities required in accordance with the Building Act. As such, no action will be taken to provide toilet facilities for patrons in TAB staffed agencies.

BLOOD AND URINE TESTING

47. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Has the Government considered blood and urine testing for any person suspected of being under the influence of alcohol or drugs and, if so, when will such testing commence?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Legislation already exists to allow blood samples to be taken from persons over 13 years of age who are involved in an accident and subsequently attend at a declared hospital. Blood samples are also taken from fatal road accident victims. In addition a person may, on exceeding the legal blood alcohol limit as measured on a breath testing device request that a sample of blood be taken. Under the Summary Offences Act, police may have a person examined (including blood and urine samples) by a medical practitioner, but they must first arrest that person. Improvements in breath analysis instruments have now made the breath analysis as accurate as the blood analysis and the possibility of having this fact accepted to reduce the number of blood samples taken is being considered. Also being considered is a proposal to amend the Road Traffic Act to allow for the testing of blood and urine samples from drivers suspected, on reasonable grounds, of having used alcohol or drugs.

DEATHS IN CUSTODY

49. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. How many Aborigines and Caucasians have died in custody or prison in each of the past three years, what were the known causes of death and are these comparable to similar statistics in other States?

2. What is the reason for the delay in answering this question since it was first asked on 18 August 1987?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. —

ABORIGINAL AND CAUCASIAN DEATHS IN CUSTODY
PRISON (DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES)

		CAUSE OF DEATH
1986-87	2 Caucasians	Cardiac Tamponade Cardiac Failure
1987-88	1 Aboriginal 1 Caucasian	Comato-asphyxia Intracerebral Haemorrhage
1988-89	Nil	—
bnPOLICE CUSTODY		
1986-87	3 Caucasians	Comato-asphyxia Comato-asphyxia Overdose
1987-88	1 Aboriginal	Undetermined (Possible Heart Attack)
1988-89	2 Aborigines 1 Caucasian	Overdose Comato-asphyxia Comato-asphyxia

The Muirhead Royal Commission has analysed data over the nine calendar years 1980 to 1988 for all persons (excluding juveniles) who died in custody, i.e. both in prison and police custody. Substantial differences were found to exist between the eight States and Territories regarding numbers of deaths in custody. South Australia has one of the lowest death rates of persons in prison custody of any Australian State. South Australia's rate of 1.6 is lower than that of the Northern Territory (3.9), Queensland (2.2), Western Australia (2.2) and Victoria (1.9), but higher than the rate of New South Wales (1.5), Tasmania (1.1) and the A.C.T. (0.4). A total of 182 deaths occurred in police custody in Australia between 1980 and 1988, 15 of which occurred in South Australia.

2. I have been unable to ascertain why the question asked on 18 August 1987 was not answered.

BLOOD DONATIONS

52. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham),** on notice, asked the Minister of Health: In the past financial year how much blood (litres) was donated at the three major public hospitals (Royal Adelaide, Flinders and Queen Elizabeth), how much of this blood was saved for use by the Red Cross Blood Bank, how much was used in transfusions and, how much was disposed of?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Each of the three major teaching hospitals (Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre) runs an autologous transfusion program, whereby a patient undergoing elective surgery may have their own blood collected and available for transfusion if required. As a matter of policy this blood, if it is not used, is not sent to the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service (RCBTS), since not all autologous collections are tested to the same extent as those collected by RCBTS for general use. The information for the financial year 1988-89 for the three hospitals concerned is as follows:

Hospital	Autologous Collection (Donation) No. Units	Estimated Usage %
Royal Adelaide Hospital	171	77
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	75	79
Flinders Medical Centre	279	68

The above figures do not include donations of platelets collected on an as-required basis from relatives and friends of patients requiring them.

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE ACT

59. **Mr BECKER (Hanson),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: How many persons have been apprehended and prosecuted under regulations pursuant to section 25 of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987 in each of the past three years?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: None.

MARINELAND

61. **Mr BECKER (Hanson),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. On what date did the Minister approve a 40 year lease for Tribond to redevelop Marineland under section 13 (4) (c) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987 and what criteria were used for the decision?

2. On what date did the Minister approve a 50 year lease to Zhen Yun Pty Ltd to build a 300 bed hotel at Marineland Park, West Beach?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. While the Minister was kept informed, her approval was not required as the lease between the West Beach Trust and Tribond Developments Pty Ltd became effective from 14 January 1987.

2. On 6 March 1988 the Minister's approval was given for the Trust to sign the lease with Zhen Yun (Australia) Pty Ltd for a term exceeding ten years. On 8 August 1989 the Minister's approval was given for the trust to engage in lease arrangements with Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd for a period of 50 years.

WEST BEACH TRUST

62. **Mr BECKER (Hanson),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What action is the West Beach Trust taking to develop the reserve as a sporting, cultural and recreational complex pursuant to section 13 (1) (a) (i) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987?

2. What new sporting opportunities have been introduced to the reserve to encourage its use and enjoyment by the public and, if none, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The best endeavours of the West Beach Trust are continuously applied to developing the reserve in accordance with the criteria Parliament determined in section 13 of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987.

2. Sporting facilities continue to be provided by both the West Beach Trust and its lessees and embrace such sports as golf, baseball, softball, soccer, tennis, horse riding and

sailing to the extent that at present there is very little unused area within the reserve.

63. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What skills do the three Government appointees to the West Beach Trust have and what record of performance did these people possess prior to their appointment which are relevant to the trust?

2. When were the Government members appointed to the trust and when do their appointments expire?

3. What annual salary or allowance is paid to members of the trust?

4. Does the Government propose to amend the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987 to replace trustees who lose their seats on council during their term of office and, if so, why?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The West Beach Trust consists of seven member appointed by the Minister of Local Government as provided for in section 7 of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987; three members appointed by the Minister in accordance with section 7 (1) (a) are persons who, in the opinion of the Minister, have experience in fields that best assist the trust in the performance of its functions.

2. Six of the seven members of the trust were appointed for a five year term commencing 31 March 1988, the remaining member having been appointed for a three year term commencing 31 March 1988.

3. The allowance payable to members as determined by the Governor in Executive Council is as follows:

Chair	\$3 811
Deputy Chair	\$2 857.50
Members	\$2 453

4. No.

64. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Why is the West Beach Trust proposing to charge lessees 1 per cent of turnover plus rent on commercial leases, does the Government support such a proposition and, if so, why?

2. What is the reason for the delay in answering this question since it was first placed on notice in November 1987?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Section 13 (2) (e) of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1987 empowers the trust to grant leases on such condition as the trust sees fit.

2. The question was not previously answered due to an oversight.

68. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What has happened to the 'country club' project for West Beach?

2. How much money did the West Beach Trust spend on the project?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. It was withdrawn as a consequence of the arrangements entered into between the West Beach Trust and Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd.

2. A very small amount.

69. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. How much did the West Beach Trust borrow to build the Patawalonga North Golf Course, from where and at what interest rate and term?

2. In establishing the course, what drainage problems were discovered and was it necessary to realign drains and, if so, at what extra cost?

3. What is the estimated amount of sand removed from this site by the Federal Airports Corporation to build the international airport standing apron and was Department of Environment and Planning approval sought for the removal of such sand and, if not, why not?

4. When the course was proposed, did the corporation indicate when it might require the land the golf course is built on?

5. What term of lease does the West Beach Trust have from the corporation over the land on which the course is built?

6. What alterations and additions have been made to the original plan of the course and at what additional cost?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. \$350 000 from SAFA at the prevailing rate of interest.

2. No unforeseen drainage problems were encountered and the realignment of the drain was undertaken to avoid having it bisect the new golf course.

3. This question should be referred to FAC.

4. Advice was given to the trust that it is unlikely the land upon which the golf course was built would be required before the year 2010.

5. A three year lease with the continuing right of renewal.

6. The course has been subject to continuing improvements within financial limitations.

70. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: Did Tribond Developments Pty Ltd, or an associated company agree to pay approximately \$325 000 for Marineland and, if so, how was this amount arrived at?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This information is contained within the lease that was negotiated between the West Beach Trust and Tribond Developments Pty Ltd, and the lease is registered with the Lands Titles Office.

73. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What is the corporate plan for the West Beach Trust and when was it adopted?

2. What was the result of the development plan prepared by Kinhill Sterns in about 1985?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The West Beach Trust Corporate Management Plan was adopted by the trust in late 1985.

2. The preparation and subsequent adoption of the supplementary development plan for City of West Torrens and City of Henley and Grange for West Beach Recreation Reserve area.

77. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: What was the animal related disease (contagious to animals and humans) one of the former Marineland staff contracted whilst working under West Beach Trust supervision? Has this person's employment been terminated and what workers compensation was paid to this employee and, if none, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The West Beach Trust has no knowledge of any of its staff, present or former, contracting the disease referred to.

84. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: Did the Chairman of the West Beach Trust and the then General Manager the late Mr R.H. Porter, travel to Victoria to induce Mr R. Abel to take over and redevelop Marineland and, if so, when and what written report was given to members of the trust of visits to and discussions with Mr Abel and, if none, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: As a result of a prior mutual arrangement the Chairman and the then General Manager of the West Beach Trust travelled to Melbourne in late 1986 to further discuss the proposal made by International Oceanaria Development Pty Ltd to lease the Marineland complex. At the meeting Mr G. McRae on behalf of IOD stated that the company had now decided to lease the Marineland complex and tabled a proposed schedule to this end. Subsequently the trust was fully informed of the meeting and its decisions and as a result authorised the details contained in a letter of intent between the trust and IOD to be signed.

ZHEN YUN PTY LTD

86. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What is the reason for the delay in finalising and registering the lease between Zhen Yun Pty Ltd and West Beach Trust?

2. Is the delay hindering Government dealings in introducing overseas investors and developers into South Australia?

3. Why is the Government not aware of any penalty clauses in the Zhen Yun Pty Ltd/West Beach Trust lease?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The lease was signed and sealed last April and steps are currently in train for it to be registered.

2. Refer to Minister of State Development and Technology.

3. The terms and conditions of the lease agreement between the West Beach Trust and Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd will be available publicly once the lease is lodged at the Lands Titles Office which is a procedure strictly in accordance with standard commercial practice.

WEST BEACH TRUST

87. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: What correspondence does the West Beach Trust hold concerning the recovery of costs incurred by the trust on behalf of the developer in preparing a cleared site for Zhen Yun Pty Ltd?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not proposed to make public commercial considerations associated with the lease between West Beach Trust and Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd.

JACK WRIGHT THEATRE

88. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. How much did the Jack Wright Theatre cost to build and how was it financed?

2. How long was the circle cinema in operation and what has happened to the film?

3. How much was spent on making another film for a theatre in 'the round' and why did the project fail?

4. Was an undertaking given to Jack Wright's family that the theatre would never be demolished?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. As the Marinarama building was erected some 10 years ago, detailed costs cannot be provided without considerable time being spent in research, which is considered unwarranted.

2. About five years, after which the film reverted to its owner, the South Australian Film Corporation.

3. West Beach Trust has no knowledge of any other film.

4. The West Beach Trust has no knowledge of any undertaking having been given.

MARINELAND

91. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. When was Tribond Developments Pty Ltd told it would be necessary to purchase the water filtration plant associated with Marineland?

2. Did Tribond ever pay for the plant and how much rent did they pay the West Beach Trust during their tenancy?

3. Were there any rental arrears and, if so, why?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Details regarding the water filtration system were discussed and included in the lease entered into between the West Beach Trust and Tribond Developments Pty Ltd.

2. This information is contained within the lease that was negotiated between the West Beach Trust and Tribond Developments Pty Ltd and is registered with the Lands Title Office.

3. It is not intended to make public commercial considerations concerning the lease between West Beach Trust and Tribond Developments Pty Ltd.

92. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What were the recommendations of the Public Buildings Department's assessment of the main Marineland building and why were the findings never published?

2. What information was withheld from the public in 1974 or thereabouts concerning this building when the West Beach Trust took over Marineland?

3. What was contained in the final report?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Insufficient detail in the question prevents an answer being provided.

2. As above.

3. As above.

93. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. In providing a cleared site for Zhen Yun Pty Ltd, why is it necessary to move 17 villas?

2. Why has the estimated cost of moving those villas risen from \$300 000 to \$1.12 million as quoted in the *Advertiser* of 18 July 1989?

3. Where will the villas be relocated and does the estimated \$1.12 million cover the cost of relocation and loss of income during the transition and, if not, why not?

4. How will these villas be transported and relocated?

5. Were the villas constructed so they could be relocated and, if not, why not?

6. What EIS has been prepared for the re-siting of the villas?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of villas necessary to be relocated is currently the subject of discussions between the West Beach Trust and Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd.

2. Neither the Minister nor the West Beach Trust accept any responsibility for newspaper reports.

3. As for 1.

4. As for 1.

5. Yes.

6. No EIS has been carried out as it was not considered necessary.

MARINELAND

95. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What soil testing has been undertaken at Marineland Park, West Beach and, if none, why not and how can the Government and the West Beach Trust approve a substantial construction project without a soil test?

2. What type of piers will be necessary to support the hotel building and how deep will it be necessary to place those piers into the ground?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. Soil testing is the responsibility of the lessee.

2. The detailed plans have not yet been finalised or submitted for the West Beach Trust's consideration.

FEDERAL AIRPORTS CORPORATION

96. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: Has the Federal Airports Corporation given the West Beach Trust any indication whether it will need to resume the land it reserved between Tapleys Hill Road and Military Road for an additional runway in the future and, if so, when was the indication given and when will the resumption take place?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Advice was given to the trust that it is unlikely the land upon which the golf course was built would be required before the year 2010.

WEST BEACH TRUST

98. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Is the West Beach Trust loss of \$44 055 for the financial year ended 30 June 1989 the first such trading loss in 17 years?

2. How can such trading losses be avoided in the future?

3. Are staff jobs assured at the trust?

4. How many staff are employed by the trust and why are all jobs not permanent?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The audited financial result for 1988-89 reveals a deficit of \$27 752 for the year ended 30 June 1989, against a budgeted deficit of \$25 644.

2. The West Beach Trust budget for 1989-90 provides for a surplus of \$71 710.

3. Yes.

4. There were 37 permanent employees and 24 casual cleaners and reception staff, of the West Beach Trust as at 30 June 1989.

100. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Is a subcommittee of West Beach Trustees handling the negotiations with Zhen Yun Pty Ltd and, if so, when, why and how was such a subcommittee appointed, who are the members of the subcommittee and what expertise and qualifications do they possess to handle such negotiations?

2. Who are the members of any other subcommittees of West Beach Trustees and what are the reasons for their appointments?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The subcommittee consisting of the Chair, a trust member and the CEO have been constituted as a subcommittee and presently are charged with the task of handling negotiations between Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd and the West Beach Trust. The subcommittee was appointed over two years ago by the trust and regularly reports to the trust.

2. One other subcommittee is presently functioning, consisting of the Deputy Chair, a member and the CEO and is charged with the task of beautification of the reserve adjoining Tapleys Hill Road. In addition the trust has a policy of appointing *ad hoc* committees as required.

101. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Are copies of minutes of West Beach Trust meetings available to council and do they contain all matters discussed including written reports on negotiations of any development proposals and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Chairman of the trust provide written reports of his activities on behalf of the trust and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. West Beach Trust minutes are not made available to other than trust members.

2. No.

MOUNT LOFTY PROPERTY

104. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the Government recently purchased a property off Summit Road, Mount Lofty known as 'Arthur's Seat' and, if so, what use is intended to be made of it?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No.

FULHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL PROPERTY

105. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education:

1. Who in the Education Department has authority verbally to promise a portion of land of the former Fulham Primary School worth about \$1 000 000 to Saint Hilarion Nursing Home?

2. When was this 'hand shake' agreement made and by whom?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. No promise was made. The site was sold through the Department of Lands to the South Australian Housing Trust.
2. No agreement was made.

MOUNT GAMBIER GAOL

112. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Has the Minister decided upon a site for the relocation of the Mount Gambier Gaol and, if so, where will the gaol be built and, if not, when will a decision be made?
2. Will the strong local objections to construction of a gaol in the Mil Lel area be given consideration in the decision as to where a gaol will be built?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has been made regarding the location of the new prison site at Mount Gambier. Numerous sites have been considered, but until some consensus can be reached within the community as to its approximate location, no decision will be made.
2. I have requested that the general location of the gaol at Mount Gambier be determined by community involvement through the local governments, and that local opinions be considered.

LOG PROCESSING

115. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests: What is the value of logs salvaged from the 1983 bush fire still remaining in Lake Bonney in the South East?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The volume of logs remaining in Lake Bonney is estimated to be up to 70 000 cubic metres. The market value of these logs would be between \$2.5 million and \$3.5 million. The value of final products would be between \$12 million and \$14 million.

116. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests: Has the incidence of sickness and absenteeism changed at the Department of Woods and Forests' Nangwarry sawmill since the commencement of processing of logs retrieved from Lake Bonney and how many workers have attributed their sickness to toxic or noxious fumes emanating from logs?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There is no evidence available of increased sickness or absenteeism at Nangwarry's sawmill since commencement of processing of logs retrieved from storage in Lake Bonney. A departmental survey of employees of Nangwarry Mill working in the Green Mill and maintenance areas identified twenty-seven employees suffering from allergy headaches or nasal problems. The survey did not segregate casual factors, for example, pollens, dust, fumes or naturally occurring organic chemicals in all pine logs. The department has carried out air monitoring tests of the Green Mill utilising the South Australian Health Commission. Terpenes, naturally occurring chemicals in pine and sawdust, were isolated but no other exogenous substances were detected.

NANGWARRY SAWMILL

117. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests: Have chemical tests been

conducted on flue gas emissions from the wood digester at the Department of Woods and Forests' Nangwarry sawmill and, if not, why not, and, if so, who performed the test, what were the results and will the Minister release all reports of the tests conducted at the mill on salvaged logs?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Woods and Forests Department Nangwarry sawmill processes sawn wood products only and does not have a wood digester in its processing plant.

118. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests: Will the Minister investigate allegations that pollutants have been dumped in past years, including creosote and copper chrome arsenate sludge, in a sinkhole at the rear of the Department of Woods and Forests' Nangwarry mill near the present garage facilities, and that the area has been covered over with sand and other filling to conceal the dump?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There is no sinkhole known to exist at the rear of the Woods and Forests Department's Nangwarry sawmill. There is a sinkhole near the garage in the Woods and Forests Department's Mount Gambier mill and as this was the subject of several allegations of dumping of CCA sludge during the recent phone-in conducted by the the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I assume the question relates to this sinkhole. These allegations have been investigated by senior officers of my department who have co-operated fully with the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this matter. These investigations have not established any substance to these allegations.

LAKE BONNEY

119. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests: How does the toxicity of logs recovered from Lake Bonney compare with logs felled and milled during normal forestry operations?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Comparative chemical testing has revealed no exogenous organic chemicals in either 'Lake Log' or 'Green Log'. The differences between the two types of log identified through extensive chemical testing were:

- Para cymene levels of Lake Log were considerably more prominent than in Green Log. This is regarded as a function of the age of the log as cymenes are reportedly a natural product of pinene degradation.
- Sulphate salts in the surface of the Lake Log were not found in Green Log.

The tests were conducted by AmdelCare Pty Ltd at the request of the department.

120. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Forests:

1. Are sulphur dioxide and sulphur trioxide contained in and/or emitted by logs salvaged from Lake Bonney during processing at Nangwarry or any other sawmills?
2. Are these gases noxious or toxic to humans and are other noxious or toxic gases emitted?
3. Have any reports recommended improvements to mill ventilation and, if so, what were those recommendations, who made them and have they been implemented?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. There has been no testing specifically undertaken for sulphur dioxide or sulphur trioxide at any Woods and Forests Department's sawmill.
2. Airborne testing has been performed to evaluate any organic fumes/vapours. Pinenes and their derivatives (all naturally occurring in pine) were detected in the air. These

are potentially harmful if present at sufficiently high levels in the breathing zone of exposed persons. The levels detected at Nangwarry sawmill were below the current acceptable level for occupational exposure (the so-called Threshold Limit Value).

3. As part of a report prepared by AmdelCare Pty Ltd confirming a safe system of work with respect to the processing of Lake Bonney log at Nangwarry sawmill, several activities and areas were found to contribute to unacceptably high dust loadings. Recommendations by AmdelCare Pty Ltd to improve housekeeping and to reduce the blowing down of dust surfaces have been implemented. They also recommend that a personal protection program be implemented in two areas of high risk exposure to alpha and beta pinene. This has been done. They recommended a further review by occupational health and safety experts be carried out after the current equipment upgrade in the Greenmill is completed. This will be undertaken when appropriate to do so.

121. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Forests:

1. Has the processing of logs retrieved from Lake Bonney in the South-East been banned by the Australian Metalworkers Union, or any other industrial union, at the Department of Woods and Forests' Nangwarry mill?

2. Have the logs been chemically analysed for the presence of toxic chemicals and, if so, who performed the analyses, which chemicals were tested for, and which, if any, were detected and, if no chemical analyses have been undertaken, why not?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, pending satisfaction by the union that employees are not at risk by the processing of lake-stored log. With the independent report now available from AmdelCare Pty Ltd confirming Lake Bonney logs contain no exogenous organic chemicals that have been absorbed from being stored in Lake Bonney, I am confident these bans will be lifted.

2. Yes, Amdel Ltd and Forensic Science Centre (South Australian Department of Services and Supply). A very extensive range of organic chemicals were tested for using gas chromatography and gas chromatography mass spectrometry. Typical volatile compounds which are the major components of turpentine (the volatile oil derived from *pinus radiata*) namely, alpha and beta pinene and camphene. In addition, cymenes and menthenes were detected, these being formed from the pinenes as a result of water storage. No exogenous chemicals were detected.

MOUNT GAMBIER SCRIMBER PLANT

122. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Forests:

1. Was an environmental impact statement completed or undertaken prior to commencement of construction of the scrimber plant in Mount Gambier and, if not, why not and, if so, what were the findings?

2. Are noxious or toxic chemicals or chemical fumes emitted from the plant?

3. Does the plant comply with all aspects of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. In February 1987 a letter was written to the Director of the Department of Environment and Planning. The letter detailed the scrimber manufacturing plant which was to be erected in Mount Gambier, listing all characteristics of any discharges which would eventuate from the plant. On 18 February 1987 a letter was received from the Department

of Environment and Planning stating that the information supplied about the process and the predicted emissions from the proposed pollution control equipment was satisfactory to the department. The department then went on to list three conditions which had to be met prior to full approval being given. These points have been complied with and Scrimber International now has a licence to carry on a prescribed activity under the Clean Air Act, 1984. Although an environmental impact statement was not completed, approval for the site was gained from other environmental sources.

2. The chemical emissions from the scrimber plant and details of their toxicity are as follows:

Pine sap, expressed from the logs during the crushing process, is not considered toxic or noxious and approval has been gained from both the Woods and Forests Department and the E&WS Department to spray this by-product onto the forest floor. Water vapour and volatized pine resin present in the drier exhaust gases are not considered toxic or noxious. Exhaust gases emitted from the heat plant combustion process are produced at combustion temperatures high enough to dispose of most chemicals. Accordingly, these gases are not considered noxious or toxic.

It has been established that the concentration level of airborne formaldehyde emitted from the press during the final curing of tannin formaldehyde adhesives is in the order of one part per million (from pilot plant). This is below the level known to cause slight discomfort to eyes and mucous membranes. Formaldehyde emission levels from the manufacturing plant will be monitored from the commencement of production and equipment has been obtained for these purposes. New adhesives are currently being developed which will reduce the emission of airborne formaldehyde even further. Formaldehyde and other adhesive chemicals are present at a very low concentration level in the washdown water used in the glue kitchen. Disposal of this waste level is currently being investigated and there are very positive indications to date that washdown liquid can be recycled back into the process as an adhesive mixing medium.

3. Scrimber International safety policies will ultimately cover compliance with all aspects of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act and more. A company safety policy has been established and prominently displayed. Safety representatives have been elected for three individual work groups on the site and each has attended a one week training course run by the Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA).

Detailed safety/work procedures have been developed and displayed for most areas around the plant. Some procedures cannot be developed until the plant is operational. Scrimber International is entering into a Five Star Safety Program with the National Safety Council and a regular safety check on the plant is being carried out by the safety officer in conjunction with the council. Qualified first-aid personnel are available in each work team and a first-aid room is being installed. Chemical safety data sheets are available for all chemicals on site and are displayed where necessary. All new staff and employees undergo a comprehensive induction program incorporating company safety procedures as one of the major ingredients.

APCEL AND CELLULOSE AUSTRALIA LTD

123. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Forests:

1. To what extent are the original indentures between the South Australian Government and Apcel and Cellulose Australia Ltd, still binding upon the Government?

2. Have any amendments to the indentures invalidated the Government's responsibility for the disposal of effluent into Lake Bonney in exchange for annual financial payments?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. Still binding.
2. No.

ACACIA KINDERGARTEN

124. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Education:

1. Did the Office of Childhood Services or any of its officers, in writing or verbally, give an undertaking to the Acacia Kindergarten in Mount Gambier to fund landscaping of the kindergarten's environs?

2. Is the Minister aware that the board of Acacia Kindergarten believed such an undertaking was made and will the Minister investigate the possibility of the CSO reimbursing the kindergarten for the work?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. I am aware that the board of Acacia Kindergarten believed that an undertaking to fund landscaping of the kindergarten's environs was made. The Director of Children's Services has had the matter investigated and, by way of assistance, has provided a grant of \$2 000 and invited the kindergarten to apply for a low interest loan of \$2 000. The kindergarten has accepted this grant.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT WORKERS

126. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Highways Department construction staff numbers be reduced by 1 000 in the 1988-1990 period and, if not, what reduction will occur?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the period 1 July 1988 to 30 June 1990, the Highways Department anticipates reducing its construction personnel by approximately 50. It is intended that the reduction be achieved by natural attrition. This strategy will be influenced should the department successfully tender for federally funded road construction projects prior to 30 June 1990. In that event, the number of construction personnel required will need to be adjusted for the duration of the project(s).

FINGER POINT SEWAGE PLANT

128. **The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Will the domestic and industrial wastes emerging from the Finger Point Sewage Plant be fully treated to a standard of absolute safety and potability?

2. Will chlorination of the effluent present any threat to marine life in the sea adjacent to Finger Point?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The discharge from the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works will be a high grade, secondary treated effluent. However, this will not reach the standards required for drinking water, nor is it considered necessary.

2. Chlorine in the effluent will affect organisms within the water column only in the immediate vicinity of the discharge. However, as it is highly volatile it will rapidly disappear in seawater.

ACCESS CABS

129. **The Hon. A. ALLISON (Mount Gambier),** on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Following the recent announcement by the Premier and the Minister that the Access Cab System would be further expanded to meet the needs of the disabled, will the Minister allocate funds to Mount Gambier for additional vehicles and, if so, when will the Minister advise the member for Mount Gambier, if not, why is the Minister disregarding the recommendation of the Review into Access Cabs that the service be extended into country areas?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government in the context of the 1989-90 budget has allocated up to \$900 000 additional funding in a full year to transport for people with disabilities. This amount brings the full year allocation for this scheme to approximately \$2.7 million. This additional allocation is primarily targeted to the main country centres of South Australia which include: Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and the Riverland. An amount of \$730 000 has been allocated to introduce the subsidised taxi scheme to these country areas. It is anticipated ambulant members of the scheme (M40s) will be able to access local taxi or local disabled transport services from 1 January 1990. Members confined to wheelchairs (M50s and M60s) will be able to access specialised transport within 12 months of that date utilising specialised transport resources already existing within these centres.

In addition, the Government has decided that people with the most severe disabilities (M50s and M60s) will receive:

- (1) an increase in the transport subsidy from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the metered fare, with a maximum fare of \$30;
- (2) fully subsidised transport to attend employment related tertiary education.

WEST BEACH TRUST

133. **Mr BECKER (Hanson),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: What other positions has Mr Haslam occupied and at what salary classifications since his transfer from West Beach Trust to the Department of Local Government, what is his current classification, when were the requests for any transfers made and when were they approved by the Government Management Board?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Mr Haslam left the West Beach Trust on 21 October 1988 and after a period of leave, commenced work in the Department of Local Government on 3 January 1989 as a Senior Project Officer at the A03 classification, which is his current designation. The transfer back to the public service was requested by Mr Haslam with the support of the West Beach Trust in September 1988. The arrangements for the transfer to the Department of Local Government were confirmed on 9 December 1988, and agreed to by the Commissioner for Public Employment as appropriate in the context of Mr Haslam's continuing public sector career.

136. **Mr BECKER (Hanson),** on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government: Did the Chairman of the West Beach Trust fly back from Maroochydore, Queensland recently to settle a dispute with Zhen Yun Pty Ltd regarding removing villas at West Beach and, if so, what was the air fare, what out of pocket expenses were incurred and who paid for them?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes. The airfare of \$978 and travelling expenses of \$40 were paid by the West Beach Trust.

JUSTICES ACT

140. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. Is the Government considering amending the Justices Act to allow insurance industry personnel to be appointed as Justices of the Peace and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Government recognise persons who are appointed Justices of the Peace in other States when applying for similar appointments in South Australia and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.J. GRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. In 1972, a committee was formed to advise the Attorney-General on the appointment of Justices of the Peace. The committee was authorised to establish procedures for the nomination of Justices, to set guidelines for deciding a person's eligibility or ineligibility for appointment, to screen applicants and to make recommendations to the Attorney-

General on each applicant. The occupation of insurance salesman is one of the occupations that is included in the guidelines as to what circumstances should render an applicant ineligible because a conflict of interest may arise between the person's business interests and the duties and responsibilities attached to the position of a Justice of the Peace. I see no reason to alter that guideline particularly when insurance industry personnel, other than salesmen, have been appointed as Justices of the Peace in the past.

2. Other circumstances included in the guidelines which would usually render an applicant ineligible are where an application is received from within a locality where, by virtue of a given formula, that area is already served by a sufficient number of Justices and a requirement that Justices should be naturalised or an Australian citizen. If an applicant, who is a Justice for another State, does not fall within the abovementioned guidelines on ineligibility, then that person's application will be considered in the normal manner. The fact that an applicant is a Justice for another State would be taken into consideration by the committee when making a recommendation to the Attorney-General on the application.