HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 October 1989

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

PETITIONS: HUNTING AND FISHING

Petitions signed by 4 611 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to further restrict hunting and fishing were presented by Ms Gayler and Mr Robertson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: AUSTRALIA DAY

A petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to provide for the Australia Day public holiday to be observed on 26 January each year was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

PHARMACISTS FEES

In reply to **Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell)** 17 August.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has received few complaints in this area. The Commonwealth Health Insurance Commission is responsible for ensuring that South Australian pharmacists do not overcharge for prescription items listed in the Commonwealth benefits schedule. Consumers who purchase items listed on the schedule should request the dispensing pharmacist to record this on a 'prescription record form'.

If a consumer wishes to check whether an overcharge has occurred, the form should be presented to the Health Insurance Commission for verification. Under provisions of the National Health Act 1953, the commission has power to take appropriate action against a pharmacist charging excessive fees.

FISH PROCESSOR LEGISLATION

In reply to **Mr BLACKER (Flinders)** 6 September.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Fisheries (Fish Processors) Regulations 1984 were amended on 18 May 1989 following an amendment to the Fisheries Act 1982 on 15 December 1989 as a part of a package of measures designed to place greater responsibility on all persons, processors, retailers, licence holders and recreational fishers to ensure that fish in their possession were taken legally.

Illegal fishing and the sale of illegal catches is a large problem which has increased in prominence with regard to abalone poaching and is a recurring issue in the marine scalefish fishery. Most enforcement attention has been directed at detecting illegal fishing within the catching sector. However, illegal catches are clearly being disposed of through the processing and marketing sector but the capacity to take action in this area has been limited by the absence of appropriate regulatory provisions. Both the commercial and the recreational sectors recognise that this is a common problem and have sought that the Department of Fisheries take greater action against the illegal catching and selling of fish.

Much of the illegal catch of abalone and scalefish is sold through domestic outlets (in South Australia and interstate), and small traders are often involved. This includes restaurants, hotels, and fish retail outlets which have a financial incentive to purchase many of the premium seafood species of South Australia at cheaper prices from illegal fishers.

With regard to fish processors, the effect of the amendments is that businesses which obtain or process fish for final sale are required to register as fish processors. A fish processor is defined as a person who processes, purchases or obtains fish for the purpose of trade or business, while processing is defined as any activity involved in preparing fish for sale. However, retailers are exempt from payment of the registration fee and the imposition on them is simply that they make (and retain for 12 months) records of fish purchases. It is expected that most such businesses would need to keep records of this nature as part of their ongoing business operations.

Whilst the intent of the legislation is to detect and prosecute processors who sell fish taken illegally, it is difficult to exclude (by regulation) retailers who sell processed and packaged fish because such outlets have been used at times to sell illegally caught fish. It is recognised that the sale of processed and packaged fish (for example, brand names of frozen fish dinners, tinned fish, etc.) is caught up in the definition of processing, but the sale of such product would not be of interest to the Department of Fisheries if that was the only type of fish product sold by that trader.

I emphasise that the requirements for fish retailers to register as fish processors and to maintain records of fish purchased have been designed to minimise the imposition of Government requirements on trading activities. The recent amendments have been supported by both the commercial and recreational fishing sectors. Indeed, both sectors have sought that the Department of Fisheries take strong action against the illegal catching and selling of fish. Accordingly, fisheries enforcement officers will exercise discretion and common sense with traders who only sell processed prepackaged fish such as fish fingers, fish dinners, tinned fish, etc. where it is clear that such products have not been taken illegally from South Australian waters. Departmental enforcement officers would welcome inquiries from those traders unsure of their status with a view to alleviating concerns which people may have in this regard.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee for 1988-89.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Dental Board of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.

Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Seeds Act 1979—Regulations—Seed Analysis Fees.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Report of the Attorney-General on Suppression Orders, 1988-89.
Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Licence Exemptions (Amendment).
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Liquor Consumption—Berri.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.
West Beach Trust—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Department for the Arts—Report 1988-89.
Cultural Trusts Act 1976—Regulations—Membership and Elections.
Urban Land Trust Act 1981—Regulations—Operating Surplus.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Department of Lands—Report 1988-89.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Country Fire Services—Report 1988-89.
South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service—Report 1988-89.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Berri Forrest Reserve.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Department of Labour—Report 1988-89.
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report 1988-89.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Wharfage Fees.

QUESTION TIME

GRAND PRIX

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier say who ultimately will decide whether this year's Grand Prix is televised in Adelaide and, if it is the Grand Prix Board, how many tickets must be sold to guarantee live local television coverage? The Premier's statement in the *Advertiser* this morning suggesting that local public interest in attending the Grand Prix is declining, and raising doubt about live television coverage of the event in Adelaide, sparked many calls to radio talk-back programs this morning. Many callers expressed the view that Adelaide had a right to a live coverage because of the traffic disruption and other disruption caused to many people by the event. The fact that many elderly, handicapped, and hospitalised people cannot attend the event was also prominently raised.

In response, an official of the Grand Prix Board has added to the confusion over this issue. I refer to comments made on the Keith Conlon show this morning by Mr Stephen Marlow, a publicity officer for the Grand Prix Board, who said that arrangements for the television coverage were made between Channel 9 and FOCA. However, this was disputed later by an official of Channel 9 in Sydney, who informed the Conlon program that the final decision is made by the Grand Prix Board. Will the Premier clear up the confusion so that all South Australians know what conditions have to be satisfied to guarantee live television coverage and who will make the final decision?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, I would like to set my remarks in context. What I was saying—and I think it is worth saying it loudly and clearly—is that we must not get complacent about the Grand Prix. We must not assume as South Australians that we can just sit back and let someone else run it, that it will just tick on merrily and that we do not have to see the community involved. One of the great strengths that this event has had, one reason it is the best in the world, one reason why we are retaining it here in Adelaide and why we are able to extend our contract to 1995 has been the enormous community involvement and participation in the Grand Prix. We have to ensure that that continues, so that the atmosphere, the activity, and everything else reflects that community support. That means getting people on track, and each year, of course, the event is different; there are other ancillary and related activities that make a marvellous four days, and race day itself is terrific.

I was simply saying that, if we develop a kind of culture that says somebody else does the Grand Prix and we can sit at home in front of the television, have our barbecue at home and not bother to go to the track, then after a while we will find that the race is being beamed to us from somewhere else in Australia—not from Adelaide. So, that was the point I was making. We need the ongoing and active support of people participating in what is our Grand Prix in South Australia. As to the point about television, I have always been a strong advocate for the Grand Prix to be televised here in Adelaide—and for strong reasons. A number of people, because of illness, incapacity and so on, cannot get to the track; others cannot afford to get to the track. There are all sorts of reasons why, as part of our participation in the Grand Prix, we should be able to view it in our homes if we so choose. That has always been my position and that remains my position.

Of course, the commercial considerations involved in this area are always important, as they are in relation to football grand finals and other things of that nature. An actual decision on the definitive telecasting of the event is usually taken somewhat closer to the event at a time when people can be assured that tickets are selling well and things will be successful, because there is no point in staging an event before empty tracks. As to who actually makes the decision—and this has gone on from year to year—my understanding is that ultimately the decision will be made by FOCA, which holds the television rights in conjunction with Channel 9. FOCA will obviously consult the Grand Prix Board in that context. It will certainly accept representations from me, as it has in the past. All I can say is that I believe the event should be telecast live but I also think it is very important that we do not become complacent about the event. We have heard the statements made by people like New South Wales Premier Greiner to the effect that he wants to take this event from South Australia and that New South Wales could do it a lot better.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I wish that, instead of carping criticism of this kind from the Leader of the Opposition, he would get onto his colleague in New South Wales and say, 'Hands off our Grand Prix.' If he told—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —his New South Wales Liberal colleague plainly and clearly to get his nose out of our Grand Prix and his hands off it, we would all be better off. Does he do that? No. He gets up and asks a carping, niggling,

nitpicking question. The Leader of the Opposition should get behind the event, I suggest, and we would accept his credentials a little more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INDEPENDENCE EQUIPMENT

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Is the Premier aware of the customs duty and sales tax applied to aids used by people with disabilities? Constituents belonging to Apex have approached me seeking the removal of this tariff which they consider an unfair burden on people with disabilities. They tell me that the tariffs on these aids can be as high as 19 per cent and they sometimes apply to items which are covered by worldwide patents and so which cannot be manufactured in Australia. I understand that this equipment is often purchased by service clubs such as Apex and they argue that the removal of the tarrif would mean that more people could benefit from the help available. They also believe that people with disabilities would have access to more and better equipment, which would significantly improve their quality of life.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I am aware of the matter raised by the member for Fisher. In fact, last month I wrote to both the Federal Treasurer and the Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce (Senator Button) asking for an exemption of the imposition of duty on independence equipment for people with disabilities.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What did he say?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have yet to receive a reply to that letter. I have been advised by my disability adviser, Mr Llewellyn, that a number of independence aids are exempt from sales tax and I sought clarification from the Federal Treasury and the Minister. In other words, there is not a blanket imposition of sales tax. It is important that we actually find out which items are so covered and which are not. My general position is that there should be a total exemption of duty in these cases. I understand that the Federal Minister for Social Security (Mr Howe) has given an undertaking to examine the serious economic disadvantage that people with disabilities face in meeting the extra costs as a result of that disability. We at State level can assist in some ways and, I guess, the Access Cab scheme is the most clear example of that, but there are a number of other things that we are doing as a State Government.

Incidentally, the question focuses on those aids which are currently not available in Australia and which can be imported from other countries. I remind members that a number of things are done here in Australia. For instance, Rollerchair Pty Ltd, a South Australian firm, produces what is recognised as one of the best electric wheelchairs on the Australian market. It is one of the few chairs that pass the wheelchair manufacturing standards of the Australian Standards Association. That is an example that the best equipment need not necessarily come from overseas. I will certainly apprise the honourable member of any developments in this area so that he can keep his constituents and Apex fully informed.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Following his statements reported in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Grand Prix could be lost to Adelaide unless local people showed a greater commitment and attended this year's event, and also that there is no guarantee that this year's race will be televised in Adelaide, will the Premier, to indicate how much more commitment he wants South Australia to make, reveal how many tickets have been purchased by the public so far, whether sales are slower than in previous years and how many tickets the public must buy before the event is regarded as a success from the point of view of local commitment?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Here they go again. Obviously, the intention—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order and I call the member for Coles to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member interjected that I raised—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I raised this issue in what I felt was a positive and active context of pointing out to South Australians how valuable this event is and how we need to ensure that we retain it. Is that the spirit in which these questions are being asked? No way! They are being asked in the hope that I will be able to place before the House evidence that this year's Grand Prix will be a failure, that there is inadequate support for it, that there are problems connected with it and that Mr Greiner's wishes might come true and we will see the event taken away. Opposition members will dance delightedly up and down if they hear facts of that kind. I am sorry to disappoint them. In fact, ticket sales are going well. Of course, we have had problems, which we flagged, in relation to interstate and international visitors; we must attempt to ensure that the airline flights and services they require are available. A lot of work has been done in order to do that. Later today we are hoping to see the publication of domestic schedules that will reinforce that we will be able to provide appropriate seats. Last week we announced assistance with special international flights with Qantas. In the corporate, interstate and overseas areas, things are going very well.

However, we have noticed year by year that locals buy their tickets later. In the first year, most tickets were sold early in the piece. That is reasonable; as people become more familiar with the event, where the seating is placed and what a particular ticket classification offers, they will obviously defer their purchasing option. The pattern this year is no different from the pattern we have perceived in previous years. We have no evidence that we will not have an enormously successful Grand Prix. I simply make the point—it is an important one, an I hope the Opposition will get right behind us—that we South Australians need to support our Grand Prix and to attend the race in order to create an atmosphere. People should enjoy it, because there is nothing like being on the spot. I sincerely hope that, whatever negative attitudes members of the Opposition express in this House, we will see them purchasing their tickets, encouraging others to do so, attending and getting behind the Adelaide Grand Prix.

OVERSEAS QUALIFICATIONS

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs advise what plans are in hand to deal with people whose qualifications, gained overseas, are not recognised here? Has the Government 'played a cruel hoax' on the

ethnic communities in this matter, as has been alleged by the Hon. Julian Stefani?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I can certainly state that the Government has not perpetrated a cruel hoax on ethnic communities. This is simply the ramblings of a member in another place who does not know enough about how budgeting in government is organised, nor does he—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you have reminded us on a number of occasions that it is improper and contrary to Standing Orders to reflect on members of another place.

The SPEAKER: It is possible that either of the two remarks that the Minister made in isolation would not be considered reflecting on a member of another place. However, the close association of the two comments about a member of another place is clearly a reflection and I ask the Minister to withdraw.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly withdraw the reflection on a member in another place, but I know that he is a new boy on the parliamentary block, so to speak, and really does not understand how budgets work in government. With respect to a number of comments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. Allison: At least he doesn't burn the Australian flag.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Neither did I, Harold—ever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to pause for a moment to allow the temperature to subside. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I must for the benefit of *Hansard* state that I have never burnt an Australian flag and I take offence at the suggestion made by the member for Mount Gambier. This is the smear campaign that this Opposition resorts to. With respect to the budgeting process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor—no-one else.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This Government has presented a budget this year which has provided for a number of new initiatives. In providing for those new initiatives, it has minimised the extra call upon the community for revenues to pay for those initiatives by reordering priorities within government. That is essentially what has been happening in each area of government to provide for the exciting initiatives in this year's budget. In terms of reallocation, funds have to be found somewhere, with perhaps less concentration on some other activity than it has received in the past.

Three important initiatives in the ethnic affairs area are being dealt with this year. The first is the matter of language services and the centralising of those services to improve service delivery. The second is the very expansion of the commission's activities and the creation of an administrative unit to support the commission. The third is the matter of the Overseas Qualifications Board. The Hon. Julian Stefani is a new boy on the block and does not understand how things work. The Ethnic Affairs Commission has been the recipient of a real increase in funds by reallocation from other areas of activity within government with respect to the expansion of the commission's own functions. That runs to $130 000 this financial year and $210 000 in a full financial year.

With respect to overseas qualifications, in excess of $100 000 has been provided to the commission from other sources to meet that activity. The Hon. Julian Stefani said that he could not see anything in the budget papers about that. I addressed that matter in the Estimates Committee, but he obviously chose not to read the report of that Committee. I addressed that matter in answer to a question at a public meeting last night at which he was present, but he obviously chose not to hear what was being said on that occasion. The funds involved were not defined in the budget papers drawn up in July, because the final amount was not known at that stage. We were still awaiting a report from the Commissioner of Public Employment, Mr Andrew Strickland, as to the best form of that unit. Once we knew that, funds could then be allocated and, indeed, had been set aside within the round sum allowance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to behave in a somewhat more mature manner.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The best that the Opposition can do is get into ribaldry or heavy interjection. The third matter relates to language services. Apart from the new and additional funds being supplied in the capital budget in connection with the Ethnic Affairs Commission, we hope that the recurrent funds will largely be found by reallocation of resources within the commission. As we move from one type of service delivery of interpreting services at hospitals at different sites and centralising it, we will be able to employ more people full-time, and that will be a net saving even though the service will be extended. We look forward to providing a 24-hour service. It is an indication of the fact that the Hon. Julian Stefani did not know enough about what was going on when he said that he did not know how we would deliver a 24-hour service located at the hospitals. The very point is that it will not be located at the hospitals: it is a centralised service available to the hospitals.

In relation to the overseas qualifications, South Australia was the second State in Australia to establish a unit for this very important issue and we did that in 1987. Since that time we have received 700 inquiries. We now know that the next stage involves the issue of registration procedures for professions and trades in this country to ensure that they address the real questions of skill and not the false questions that may discriminate against people. That process will see the establishment of a board and a support unit, and funds have been provided for that purpose. In the words of Mr Stefani, it is not a cruel hoax; rather, it is a very exciting initiative that has been widely welcomed by South Australian communities.

MOUNT LOFTY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm that the Federal Department of Transport and Communications is maintaining its opposition to the proposed communications tower on Mount Lofty? I have copies of two letters to the Government from the Federal Department of Transport and Communications. The first, in April last year, advised the Government that the department was opposed to the communications tower for the following reasons: first, the high potential for the proposed tower to disrupt ABC television services to Adelaide by introducing multipath reflections, or ghosting which would be impossible to remove; and, secondly, 'a high risk' that ionising radiation levels gener-

ated by the very close proximity between the existing national tower and the proposed new tower could exceed safety standards.

The proponents of the project addressed these issues in the supplement to the draft environmental impact statement and stated that they could be dealt with satisfactorily. However, the Department of Transport and Communications wrote a further letter to the Minister on 21 December last year disputing this and stating:

> This department sees no advantage in relocating any national service, radio or television from the existing national tower to the proposed tower.

While these concerns of the Federal department have not been made public, the South Australian Government has said that it intends to proceed with a communications tower in the first stage of the scaled down Mount Lofty development, in which it intends to be a joint venturer.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. An announcement was made by the Government that the scaled down, and I believe very environmentally sound, proposals for Mount Lofty would be thoroughly investigated, and obviously this is one area that would be thoroughly investigated. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —the concerns that have been raised by the Department of Transport and Communications will be thoroughly investigated in such an assessment. The honourable member is well aware that such an assessment is being carried out, and I am sure that he will have a full answer to his question once the assessment is completed.

ULTRAVIOLET RADIATION

Ms GAYER (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. With the approach of summer, will the Government say what steps it is taking to warn the general community about the dangers of over exposure to ultraviolet radiation from activities such as sunbaking and working outdoors without adequate protection? According to a television report last Friday night, scientific evidence suggests that the hole in the ozone layer over Antarctica has again returned to the worrying levels of 1987. I know that many people in the community, particularly mothers of young children, are seriously concerned about this problem.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is plenty of evidence to suggest that there is continuing thinning of the ozone layer, but I remind members that that is merely exacerbating a problem that has been with us for a long time. Australia has the highest incidence of melanoma in the world, because of a conjunction of three factors: first, an overwhelmingly caucasian population; secondly, a subtropical climate; and, thirdly, the fact that cultural attitudes are such that the sort of precautions that are taken at similar latitudes in the northern hemisphere, for example, in Arabia, tend to be sneered at here. It is still true to say that mad dogs and Australians go out in the noon-day sun.

This morning I was present when SGIC Health presented a spectro-radiometer to the Flinders University to enable research into the effect of ultraviolet radiation, particularly on the immune system in the body. It is not often recognised that there is a depressing effect on the immune system as a result of ultraviolet radiation, and that in turn acts against the body's capacity to be able to resist the onset of melanomas which are initiated by that same factor, that is, overexposure to ultraviolet radiation.

This new device will not only allow the university to continue its research into this unfortunate conjunction between ultraviolet radiation and reduction in the immune system of the body but also enable us to do things like giving daily bulletins on ultraviolet exposure. Private bodies and the Health Commission in the past few years have put much effort into warning people about the hazards of exposure to ultraviolet radiation, particularly during the period 10 a.m. until about 3 p.m. or 4 p.m.—that is, in the middle of the day—because of the quite predictable but large diurnal variation in ultraviolet radiation.

These efforts will continue, and indeed they will be stepped up wherever possible. It is increasingly becoming clear that there is no safe dose of ultraviolet radiation for people with European backgrounds—it is all cumulative. Some evidence in the United States that my gut feeling perhaps indicates is well borne out concerns advertisements about soft suntanning which is perhaps a matter of some concern for those who have very light complexions. I say no more than that at this stage.

It is important that people take precautions. I can hardly believe the figure I have in front of me, but it was given to me in good faith: that perhaps 60 per cent of the South Australian population will, at some stage in their lives, require treatment for skin cancer—that is, 27 or 28 members of this Assembly, if we are a representative sample of the South Australian population. It is important that in our tourist development we boost the attractions of our beaches and our climate, but one wonders whether we should not be pushing, in our tourist promotions, the advantages, indeed, the seductions, of the moonlight swim.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport does not have the call; the honourable member for Hanson does.

Mr S.G. Evans: I should have.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. The honourable member for Hanson.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of Correctional Services explain why an officially sanctioned meeting of some 50 prisoners at Yatala that ended in the fatal stabbing of prisoner Stone last Thursday was allowed to go ahead, given that a knife had been stolen many hours earlier and was still missing at the time of the meeting, and can he say how many prisoners were searched in the inquiry into the missing knife and whether this inquiry included body searches?

We have received many complaints of severe unrest at Yatala during the past months which the Minister has ridiculed both inside and outside Parliament. It was proved that zip guns had been found there, at least three fires were started and the prison industries complex was closed after an inmate hot-wired a work machine.

There is also evidence of dozens of prisoners losing remissions for their unruly behaviour, including on one day, 27 September, 86 prisoners losing three days remission for refusing to obey orders. These facts show a picture of escalating unrest which culminated in the murder of an inmate during a meeting sanctioned by prison authorities.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The details of the action that was taken by the management of the institution will be made available to the honourable member, if he chooses

to read it. There is no doubt that over the past two or three weeks there has been a fair bit of unrest at Yatala, but that has not reached the stage that was implied in the member for Hanson's question concerning the lighting of fires. Occasionally we get someone who thinks it is rather clever to put a match or a piece of burning paper underneath a sprinkler because they know that it automatically records at Fire Brigade Headquarters and brings a fire engine—which brightens up an otherwise dull existence, apparently. Also, there is no doubt that one prisoner has been particularly disruptive. That prisoner was put in G division. He and a few of his mates thought that he would get out of G division more quickly by staging a few what I feel were quite silly and dangerous acts. However, it did not have the desired result, and such actions never will.

I am not sure whether the member for Hanson is being critical when he says that prisoners are losing remissions. I can tell the honourable member that prisoners lose remissions in all our prisons every day, because all remissions in our system have to be awarded by a prison officer. There are no automatic remissions.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can assure the honourable member that that constitutes just a small part of the remissions that are lost in Yatala. Remissions are lost every day. There are now three inquiries going on into the events that took place last Thursday. There is the Department of Correctional Services inquiry; there is a very intensive police inquiry; and also, of course, the Coroner will hold an inquiry. I cannot speak for the police, but I assume that the Coroner's inquiry will be made public, and the Department of Correctional Services' inquiry will be made public, consistent with the safety requirements of the institution. In respect of safety requirements, any reports will be made available to the member for Hanson or any other member of Parliament.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Murray-Mallee seems to want to engage in a debate in relation to this, Mr Speaker. I would be very happy to have one. I do not know whether I would be pleased about having it with the member for Murray-Mallee but, certainly, I would be very pleased to have a debate in the House. I think everyone in South Australia ought to understand the degree of difficulty which we have, and which all prison authorities have, in managing high security prisons in particular. We do not have 230 Sunday school teachers in Yatala: we have a couple of hundred prisoners who, in my view, want to serve their sentence, leave the institution, and go about their business afterwards. We would hope that that business is legal, although, unfortunately, quite often it is not. Nevertheless, once they have served their sentence, off they go, and they want to do that as quickly and as quietly as possible.

Unfortunately, there are two or three dozen prisoners in Yatala whose sole aim in life appears to be to disrupt the institution and to threaten violence on prison officers, but more frequently on each other. There is no doubt that the biggest danger to prisoners in maximum security institutions comes from other prisoners. The larger part of the violence that occurs in maximum security prisons occurs in relation to prisoner upon prisoner, rather than prison officer on prisoner or prisoner on prison officer.

I want to mention briefly Anthony Wesley Stone, the prisoner who was murdered. Of course, we all regret any incident where a life is taken, and particularly where one is taken as violently as that, but Anthony Wesley Stone had been in the prison system for very many years. I can remember an incident in 1982 in which he was involved. Anthony Wesley Stone, in Yatala, when he was serving a previous sentence, got a 12-gauge shotgun into Yatala and shot another prisoner. That was on 22 June 1982. The present Leader of the Opposition was in charge of the prisons in this State at the time.

The point I am making is that, when dealing in the prison system with the kinds of people who can only be described as 'psychotic killers', because that is what they are, under the quite proper constraints of an Act of Parliament, there will always be incidents of this nature. The only question is how low you can keep them, not if you can eliminate them. I am afraid that I am not in a position to guarantee the safety of the likes of Anthony Wesley Stone without his compliance of staying in G Division, any more than the Leader of the Opposition could guarantee the safety of Jorgensen who was shot with a 12 gauge shotgun by Anthony Wesley Stone on a previous occasion.

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT MARKET

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology report to the House on the state of the Adelaide property development market? It would be evident to all members that a healthy state of activity in this area is a good barometer to the well-being of the State's economy.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member is quite correct: a healthy activity in this area of the economy indicates that the economy at large is in a healthy state. As identified in figures last week, the other sectors of the economy, in particular manufacturing, are also very healthy indeed. In terms of giving some information about how this is being reported elsewhere, I will quote from an article that appeared in the 19 September edition of the *International Herald Tribune*, a newspaper edited in Paris, published in 12 locations around the world, and read by the leading people within the international business community. In a supplement on Australian property, it looked particularly at Adelaide, amongst others, and stated:

> Investment yields available in . . . Adelaide offer attractive margins over those in other capitals without any corresponding loss of security.
>
> Adelaide's property markets have recently been buoyed by defence contracts for new submarines for the Australian navy and new frigates for the Australian and New Zealand navys. These contracts will involve a total expenditure of about $A9 billion, a high percentage of which will be focused on Adelaide . . .
>
> The city's commercial property markets have always been more restrained than those in other capital cities. Adelaide has shown a more planned and controlled rate of growth, and although the central business district is facing a major increase in supply over the next two years, it is expected to be largely absorbed by the end of 1991, when vacancy rates should fall from their existing levels of 10 to 11 per cent down to 6 per cent.

It further refers to the returns to investors in the property market, and indicates that they compare favourably to markets such as Brisbane. It then states:

> The stability of the Adelaide market and its key role in the new defence contracts make it a market worth considering.
>
> While many of Australia's property markets have been marking time over the last three months in the face of rising interest rates, investor confidence in Adelaide's commercial office market has been shown in several recent purchases.

That really sums up the property market in South Australia. It is buoyant. The point also made is that the returns are not good or the vacancy rates are too high. The reality is that the vacancy rates in South Australia are not the highest in the nation. They are very high in a number of other cities, higher than Adelaide in Brisbane, for example. Some

private sector investors involved in all markets in Australia tell me that in Melbourne vacancy rates are running up to 25 per cent. With respect to the return on investment, a number of people allege that South Australia is not a good market to invest in property: one will not get the return. The facts are that, in its most recent property report, Jones Lang Wootton provides some very interesting information on the rate of return likely on property. In a few minutes I will ask to have this table inserted in *Hansard*. With respect to prime CBD office rental, suburban office, suburban secondary retail and regional centres retail, Adelaide provides the highest rate of return of any State capital city. With respect to secondary office CBD, city retail, suburban prime retail, industrial prime and industrial secondary, South Australia provides the second highest rate of return on investment in those properties.

That indicates a buoyant property market in this State. It is the sort of thing this Government has gone for—not massive peaks and massive troughs but a stable steady trend line of growth. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a statistical table without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EQUIVALENT YIELD (%) RANGE SUMMARY 1989

Office	Adelaide	Sydney	Melbourne	Brisbane	Perth	Canberra
Prime CBD	6.00-7.25	5.00-5.50	5.00-6.25	5.75-6.75	6.00-6.75	7.75-8.50
Secondary CBD	7.50-9.50	5.75-6.50	—	7.25-9.00	7.25-10.25	N/A
Suburban	8.00-9.75	—	8.00-9.00	7.50-9.50	—	N/A
Retail						
City	5.50-7.50	5.75-7.25	4.50-5.75	6.00-6.75	7.00-8.00	7.25-9.50
Suburban Prime	7.75-9.00	—	6.50-8.50	N/A	9.00-10.00	9.00-10.50
Suburban Secondary	9.00-11.00	8.00-9.50	8.00-9.00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regional Centres	8.00-9.25	7.50-9.00	7.25-8.00	7.25-7.75	7.00-9.00	8.50-10.50
Industrial						
Prime	9.00-10.25	8.75-9.25	8.00-9.00	9.25-10.00	9.50-10.50	10.00-12.00
Secondary	10.50-13.00	9.50-10.75	9.00-12.00	11.00-12.50	11.00-13.00	12.00-15.00

ANTI-CORRUPTION BRANCH

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Following the revelation in the annual report of the Police Commissioner that 171 cases were registered with the Anti-Corruption Branch in its first four months of operations, will the Minister of Emergency Services identify how many of these cases relate to allegations of corruption with the Police Force, corruption within other areas of the public sector and corruption within the private sector?

The Anti-Corruption Branch of the Police Department was established in late February this year following recommendations of the National Crime Authority last year. The role of the branch is to prevent and detect corruption within both the Police Force and the public and private sectors. The annual report of the Police Commissioner reveals that at the end of June a total of 171 cases had been registered with this branch—a very large number in such a short time. The report also states that it is anticipated that the workload of the branch will continue to increase as it further expands its role into the private and public sectors generally.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: A number of these cases are still pending, not having been resolved as yet. I have no intention of giving information that might hinder the police in their inquiries. Within that constraint, I am prepared to ask the Police Commissioner whether he can supply information that may be of assistance to the honourable member.

ELECTRICITY GRID

Mr RANN (Briggs): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise the House when the three State electricity grid is expected to be operational and, following recent difficulties, what benefits South Australians can expect to receive from interconnection?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: This is a timely question because, of course, the Opposition has been making hay in relation to blackouts, knowing full well that that will largely disappear as a result of interconnection.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Mount Gambier indicates that blackouts are good for the birthrate: I wonder whether that comes from personal experience. It is expected that the interconnection of the electricity grids of ETSA, SECV in Victoria and Elcom in New South Wales will occur as originally planned on 1 December 1989. Following a period of commissioning and testing, commercial operation is expected to commence in March 1990. Interconnection will be facilitated by the transmission line stretching from ETSA's existing substation at Tailem Bend, via a newly constructed substation at Mount Gambier, to the interconnection point at Heywood in Victoria. ETSA's customers can expect to derive significant benefits from interconnection, not the least of which will be enhanced security of supply, to which we have already referred, and lower tariffs as a result of reduced electricity generating and production costs.

By way of illustration, I point out that, had interconnection been in place at the time of the fire at the Torrens Island Power Station in 1985, the maintenance of supply, at a time which would ordinarily and, in fact did, lead to load-shedding, would have been greatly assisted. The load-shedding of 3 September and last Sunday could almost certainly have been avoided under the regime of interconnection that will soon operate in this State. It must be stressed, though, that notwithstanding ETSA's excellent record of few outages in the past number of years, no absolute guarantee of uninterrupted supply can be realistically given by any electricity authority. Anyone who pretends otherwise is fooling either others or himself or herself.

It is under this Government—the Bannon Government—that interconnection will become a reality. It is as a result of this initiative that South Australians can expect greater security of supply and lower tariffs. On the other hand, all that the Opposition was able to offer South Australia during its last term in Government was record electricity tariff increases of 12.5 per cent in 1980, 19.8 per cent in 1981 and 16 per cent in 1982—a massive real increase of nearly 30 per cent.

One of the fascinating things about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is that he keeps complaining about high electricity prices when it was under his Government that they went up. One should compare the Liberal Government's performance with the Bannon Government's record

of the past four years. South Australians have enjoyed the lowest increase in electricity tariffs of any of the Australian States, with the price of electricity declining in real terms by over 15 per cent under the Bannon Government. The Opposition clearly has no credibility in this matter, has never matched its action with its rhetoric and, fortunately for all South Australians, will not get an opportunity to do so.

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Premier confirm that the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department, as well as the Department of Environment and Planning, received information in early July showing that companies owned by Mr Bill Turner, the former proponent of the Marino Rocks marina, were heading for serious financial trouble, and will he explain why this information was not fully investigated? I have been provided with documents which show that on three separate days in early July this year the Government was alerted to the impending financial collapse of Mr Turner's group of companies.

On 3 and 4 July information was telexed to the Department of Environment and Planning. On 7 July further information was telexed to the Department of Environment and Planning and also to the Special Projects Unit of the Premier's Department. This information related to the collapse of Tricontinental, the merchant banking arm of the State Bank of Victoria, and to Tricontinental's loan to Mr Turner's companies.

On 7 July, the Premier's Department was made aware that Mr Turner's companies owed almost $22 million to Tricontinental. This followed a statement on 5 July by the Chief Executive of the State Bank of Victoria, Mr Bill Moyle, that Tricontinental could be facing losses of $100 million because of bad loans it had made. The fact that, 10 weeks after the involvement of Mr Turner's companies with the Tricontinental collapse was revealed to the Government the Premier announced that the Marino Rocks project would be constructed by a company then 90 per cent owned by Mr Turner, suggests the information on Mr Turner's finances provided to the Government could not have been fully investigated.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is quoting material supplied to her by Mr David Wells, who has been actively campaigning around this issue since he was forced to relinquish his holding in the Marino development. I advise members who are not familiar with the name of Mr Wells that he was originally the landowner in the Marino area. He had interesting proposals for a marina there, including a fairly drastic one involving the dynamiting of cliffs and the establishment of a large area out into the gulf which, I believe, involved a lot of environmental problems. In any case, Mr Wells' interests were acquired by Hookers, who in turn had interests and sold to Crestwin.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I assume that the honourable member is confirming that that is the source of her information and advice. Mr Wells' material has been telexed to everybody and anything that moves in Marino over the period this has been going on.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Apparently, it is now irrelevant where it comes from. I am afraid it is relevant, because the material talked about related to, I presume, a *Financial Review* article of 4 July (one of the dates mentioned) and a *Herald* article of 6 July, both covering the activities of Crestwin and Mr Turner. Inquiries were made into both those issues. I am afraid that the material and documents, as well as all other matters circulated extremely widely by Mr Wells, cannot be totally relied on, nor should they be. I covered this question in response to the Leader of the Opposition last week. The Leader asked an almost identical question and I refer the honourable member to the answer given then.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader and the members for Coles and Mitcham to order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

CHEMICAL SPILLAGES

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. What facilities does the Metropolitan Fire Service have for obtaining information on dangerous substances which it may have to deal with as a result of transport accidents or other accidents that may occur in areas where such substances are used? In a recent Question Time, the Minister provided me with some information on how an accidental spill of the chemical TDI would be dealt with in the event that such an accident happened in the Port Adelaide or Lefevre Peninsula area, and I would be interested to know how information on chemicals is compiled and made accessible to the fire service.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his concern for both residents generally in this State and, in particular, those in his own electorate. Reliable information on dangerous substances, which is necessary to enable emergency services to safely combat incidents involving chemical spills, is a vital resource in emergency service work. The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has two databases (CIRUS and Datachem) which are updated twice yearly by the London Fire Brigade. Both provide an emergency first action code. Datachem is a computer database containing information on more than 50 000 chemicals. It provides combatant, hazard and first aid information, together with details of manufacturers and suppliers. Additional data is kept on file and obtained from such publications as 'Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road and Rail'.

With the introduction of a mobile facsimile in the fire command vehicle, hard copies of this information can be sent to the scene of an emergency. Full in-service training in all aspects of these systems is provided to firefighters. In addition, fire services throughout Australia, through State Governments, have asked the Commonwealth to establish a federally-funded national chemical databank. In the meantime, the SAMFS will continue to utilise the two systems previously described.

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier now answer the question he avoided last Wednesday and say whether, before announcing on 20 September that—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member introduces comment, he will find himself unable to proceed. The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: —a company then 90 per eent owned by Mr Bill Turner would construct the Marino Rocks marina, the Government received a written report on the financial status of Mr Turner's group of companies and, if so, will he table that report?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is no point in embarking on repetition on these matters. I have already dealt with that question. Inquiries were made through the Corporate Affairs Commission to check the status of various actions involving allegations. I also understand that certain advice and defences were received. Certain evidence indicating that the Supreme Court had settled one of those matters in Crestwin's favour was also forwarded and, to the extent that the information was available at that time, as I have said in this place, we had no reason to doubt the financial ability of the proponents to carry out any such development. It is as simple as that.

HORTICULTURAL EXPORTS

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. How has the horticultural industry reacted to a brochure recently produced by his department to promote South Australia's horticultural exports? Mrs Chris Gibson of A.C. Gibson and Sons and her assistant, Mr Gary Richardson, first raised with me this matter of promotion of horticultural exports some three years ago and sought assistance to promote South Australia's horticultural exports in the near Asian region.

Since that time Mrs Gibson has used information from travel agencies and promotional material from Tourism South Australia to help promote her products and Adelaide. Mrs Gibson has informed me that the provision of direct flights to Singapore and refrigerated storage at Adelaide Airport will be of great assistance to exporters, but she still makes the point that promotional brochures are needed. Now that the brochure has been produced, what has been the reaction of the industry?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note that the only positive comments about South Australia to come from the Opposition today are by way of interjections from the member for Mitcham who, in answer to what were the reactions of the horticultural industry to the Government's development in this area, said, first, that it was overjoyed and, now, that it is ecstatic. I am pleased to hear that feedback. However, those are the only positive comments we have had about South Australia from the Opposition today. I seldom find myself in the position of being able to agree with what the member for Mitcham says, but on this occasion he has got it right.

In fact, the horticultural industry is very pleased with this particular brochure because it puts simply the possibilities for fruit and horticultural produce from South Australia to potential overseas buyers. First, it lays out a chart of season availability to show potential overseas buyers what months of the year they can obtain particular produce from South Australia and how they can match that with their other sources of supply, especially given the fact that we are a southern hemisphere source which can have some out-of-season advantages. The brochure also gives prime reference to citrus, onions, table grapes and melons, whilst also referring to other produce that is available from the State, as well as giving information about the State from which the produce comes.

I think the brochure is very impressively produced. Being a relatively simple document, as it is meant to be, it can be quickly read and can quickly get the information across. The brochure was produced by the South Australian Horticultural Export Development Committee under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture and the horticultural industry in South Australia. It is the sort of thing that I would encourage those who are travelling overseas and who are likely to come in contact with people who purchase wholesale volumes of horticultural produce to take with them and leave so that those people can think about South Australia as a source of horticultural produce.

Mr BILL TURNER

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I direct my question to the Premier. As part of its investigation into the financial status of Mr Bill Turner's group of companies, did the Government seek information from the State Bank of Victoria or the Victorian State Government and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not as far as I am aware, because it was not relevant.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister inform the House of the benefits that have accrued to the Belair Recreation Park since entrance fees were introduced some two years ago? As the Belair Recreation Park has served the residents of South Australia for 98 years, there would seem to be a number of recent notable improvements for residents, tourists and visitors who use it for passive recreation and leisure.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in the Belair Recreation Park. I am sure that interest is shared by all members of this Parliament. As members would know, we started to charge entrance fees to the park some two years ago and there have been considerable and tangible benefits not only for local residents but also for many others in the South Australian community. The most significant and important is the creation and establishment of a new walking trail specifically prepared and designed for handicapped people. This trail, which I had the pleasure of opening a couple of weeks ago, goes around Playford Lake and was the first project to be funded through the entrance fees scheme.

Other very important innovations to the park and facilities have been a revamped entrance road, 10 new gazebos, gas barbecues, and the upgrading of two ovals. The new trail has been officially named Sanders Way in honour of the founding curator, William Sanders, who served in the park from 1891 to 1912. A number of other significant benefits are available to park users and local residents. First, as well as providing excellent facilities for park users, added benefits have been a reduction of through traffic comprising people who are not genuine visitors to the park, or genuine users, but who may like driving rapidly through it and are now of course prohibited from doing so.

Another benefit that has been noticed is a reduction in noise, litter and vandalism. Further, through the use of gas barbecues, we have promoted a reduction in the use of solid fuel fires in reserves. Of course, the two ovals to which I have referred have been transformed from dust bowls, as they were previously, to quality picnic areas, and I can say that from having examined those ovals.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

WATER RATING SYSTEM

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. In view of a statement by the Minister's spokesperson as reported in the 11 October edition of the eastern suburbs Messenger newspaper that the current water rating system is being reviewed, I ask the following questions: who is undertaking the review; when did the review begin, and when is it due for completion; and what are the terms of reference?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware of the article to which the honourable member refers. In fact, it was a very interesting article in which, I think, the Burnside council firmly put on the agenda for local government that it would be trailblazers in South Australia for moving from a valuation based local government rating system to a user-pays system. That front page article attacked the Government and, in particular, the Engineering and Water Supply Department for having in the water rating system a component tied to valuations. It seems to me that the better question for the honourable member to ask would have been whether the Burnside council will be the first council in South Australia to move to this system of user pays.

I understand that a member of my staff was approached and answered the question by saying that it was vitally important to have in the water rating system a component that has a social justice base, and that is in fact what currently exists; and that the water system is continually under review, and that is exactly what was indicated in that article and is in fact the answer that my spokesperson gave to the newspaper.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills:
Dog Fence Act Amendment,
Dentists Act Amendment,
Wheat Marketing,
Santos Limited (Regulation of Shareholdings),
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 5),
Stamp Duties Act Amendment (No. 4), and
Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act Amendment,
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

SANTOS LIMITED (REGULATION OF SHAREHOLDINGS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act was passed in 1979 to ensure the future security of energy supplies in South Australia. It was then, and still remains, a most significant piece of legislation. The company, Santos Limited, has a highly significant and strategic involvement in petroleum and natural gas assets in South Australia. Santos is the operator and major partner in the Cooper Basin. The company has taken the lead in an agreed accelerated gas exploration program within South Australia, and long-term supply and pricing arrangements have been established. One of the most effective ways of ensuring this State's future energy supplies is to ensure that ownership and control of the company cannot be dominated by those with different objectives and with no inherent interest in the industrial development of South Australia. In this respect, the maintenance of an independent Santos Board is an important consequence of this Bill.

The contribution of Cooper Basin oil and gas production to the State economy in 1987-88 for gas was $270 million and for oil, condensate and LPG $420 million, making a total value of production of almost $700 million. Total supply of gas was approximately 180 petajoules per annum and of oil and LPG was approximately 2.4 million tonnes. Direct employment in the Cooper Basin itself is estimated at around 3 000. The activities in the Cooper Basin are highly capital intensive but, to give some idea of relative size, these figures can be compared with employment in the non-metallic mineral products manufacturing industry (manufacture of glass and glass products, clay products and refractories, cement and concrete products: 3 400 employees in 1986-87. Oil and gas exploration expenditure in the Cooper Basin region was approximately $80 million in 1988, and has varied between about $50 million and $90 million in recent years.

The Cooper Basin makes a further contribution to the State's economy through interstate and overseas exports. Total interstate sales of gas, crude, condensate and LPG are approximately $300 million, while overseas exports total approximately $80 million. In other words, around 50 per cent of Cooper Basin production is sold outside of South Australia, thereby generating local employment and income. South Australian households and industry have a substantial reliance on natural gas, with about two-thirds of the State's consumption being used by ETSA for electricity generation. The other one-third is marketed and distributed by Sagasco for both industrial and domestic purposes.

With regard to electricity generation, approximately 60 per cent is based on natural gas and 40 per cent on Leigh Creek coal. Several large South Australian industries are dependent on Cooper Basin sourced natural gas. They are:

Cement Manufacturing—A $110 million plant expansion is planned at Birkenhead. An assured supply of gas at reasonable prices is required and any substantial or sudden price increase could threaten these expansion plans.

Steel Manufacturing—A spur line has recently been constructed from Port Pirie to Whyalla. This involved the construction of an 83 kilometre pipeline at a cost of more than $11 million. Delivery of gas commenced earlier this year to the steel manufacturing plant, to the Port Bonython liquids plant, and to the City of Whyalla. There is potential for considerable expansion in gas use by the steel industry.

Petroleum Refining:

Glass manufacturing:

Chemical manufacturing:

Fertiliser manufacturing.

These examples indicate that price stability and security of supply of natural gas are fundamental to the long-term growth and development of major local indutries—industries with a strong export orientation. They are vital factors in encouraging new industrial development. Price stability and security of supply are clearly also important to households. Furthermore, price stability and supply security of natural gas are fundamental to the development of the energy sector itself. They influence the timing and choice of technologies for future power stations. Uncertainty on the supply side has now been overcome at least in the short term with the recent signing of new gas contracts with the Cooper Basin Producers, which provide five years of forward cover for the State, rising to 10 years by the end of 1991.

Greater price stability has also been achieved. Negotiations on the price of gas with the Producers have resulted in an agreement that the price of $1.73/GJ would apply from 1 July 1988, and that the price will be escalated annually at 95 per cent of the CPI. To put this in context, it is important to realise that the price of $1.73 is more than 15 per cent lower in real terms than the price which prevailed in 1985.

Santos Limited is the major partner in the consortium of 11 Cooper Basin partners. It has a special function, having the role of operator, with day-to-day control over the world-scale Cooper Basin operation, in accordance with the Unit Agreement between all partners. Santos Limited's percentage ownership in the major unit block, where all gas has so far been produced, is over 50 per cent (including holdings by subsidiary companies). In the Murta Block, the total Santos interest is also over 50 per cent, and just under 50 per cent in the Patchawarra South West Block. These three blocks are the ones from which gas production is already undertaken or is currently planned.

The Port Bonython hydrocarbon liquids project, which was proposed by Santos Limited, on behalf of the Cooper Basin Producers, made its first overseas exports of liquids in February 1983. This project was one of the largest resource development projects ever undertaken in this State. The 659 km pipeline for the transport of the liquids from Moomba to Port Bonython cost about $100 million. The construction of facilities at Moomba and the fractionation plant at Stony Point cost over $600 million. The wharf and associated facilities cost about $50 million. In addition, Santos Limited makes a significant contribution to other aspects of South Australian community life. The company makes extensive contributions to community activities particularly in the tertiary education, arts and charities areas. Notable amongst these contributions are grants to the Art Gallery of South Australia, the State Theatre Company and the Australian Dance Theatre. Support has also been given to the Flinders Medical Centre Research Foundation and to the National Centre of Petroleum Geology and Geophysics at Adelaide University. A wide range of charities is supported.

The 1979 legislation has been particularly effective in providing for the security of energy supplies for South Australia. Furthermore, it is clear that in the time in which the Santos Act has applied, the company has strengthened and consolidated its activities in this State. The company has taken the lead within the Cooper Basin in further developing a major resource, successfully establishing the liquids project and developing substantial markets both domestically and overseas. It has also undertaken a substantial company acquisition program which has given it a dominant or very influential position in the South Australian and South West Queensland sectors of the Cooper Basin, in the Amadeus Basin and offshore areas of the Northern Territory and in the Timor Sea.

There has been criticism from time to time that the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act has shielded the company, its management and its board from the normal competitive pressures of the market. However, a high proportion of major Australian ccmpanies have worked to achieve protection from takeover by various means. It could be argued that many of these companies are more immune to outside pressures than Santos Limited. Overall, the 1979 Act has been successful in retaining the independence of Santos Limited to operate, develop and expand, without being diverted into unproductive and unnecessary share battles.

Over the past few months, there has been continuing speculation in the press and approaches from many sources on the future of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act. Most approaches involved proposals to overturn the legislation to allow for take-over of the company. This has necessarily had an unsettling effect on the company and has put the company in a difficult position. The South Australian Government wants to keep Santos in this State. Our natural resources need to be protected, particularly as so much of our industry is reliant on natural gas. Consequently, a major aim of the legislation is for the State Government to declare quite clearly that it is going to confirm the legislation, rather than let the speculation continue. It needs to be clearly understood that there is no significant change in direction, nor any significant change in the State Government's policy in the Bill. In fact, the House may recall the second reading speech to the House of Assembly in 1979 made by the Deputy Premier at that time:

> This is one of the most important pieces of legislation introduced in the history of the State. It has not been introduced lightly. The Government believes that what is involved is the future security of energy supplies in South Australia and the future development potential of the State. Industry in South Australia, and therefore the employment of our people, depends on assured sources of gas and electricity which can be made available at prices comparable with the major industrial markets of Sydney and Melbourne. As honourable members will appreciate, gas from the Cooper Basin is supplied principally to Sagasco and to the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Its cost affects, therefore, the welfare of South Australian consumers and the economic position of all South Australian industry.

Having decided to confirm the legislation, it became apparent that the 1979 Act needs to be updated and tidied up and, given the current state of contention about Commonwealth legislation, it is thought advisable that the new Santos Act be expressed to apply to the company while it continues to engage in the recovery and production of petroleum in South Australia, rather than be based on its incorporation in this State.

It is considered that the definitions and provisions should be made much clearer and tighter. One of the key areas of improvement in the Bill is to bring the Santos legislation into line with the Companies (South Australia) Code by matching the definitions as far as possible with definitions applicable in the Code. As an example, an associate is now defined by reference either to the definitions in the Code, or, as under the current Act, where, in the Minister's opinion, persons are likely to act in concert with a view to taking control or acting otherwise against the public interest. The 15 per cent shareholding limit is now to be measured by reference to the number of voting shares to which a person is entitled.

An entitlement to voting shares includes those shares in which a person and an associate have a 'relevant interest', as defined by the Companies (South Australia) Code. Significantly, an interest in shares is now extended to persons

who may not be direct shareholders in the company. This is considered necessary to cover the possibility of a person, not being a direct shareholder in Santos Limited, still being able to exercise control over a parcel of shares through various formal or informal arrangements or relationships.

Under the 1979 Act, there is no specific provision for review of a Minister's declaration. One of the major features of this Bill is the addition of such a section. The Minister will be able to review a declaration, in the light of further information brought to his or her notice. The Minister's initial declaration will continue to stand during the review period. As a result of an amendment in the Legislative Council, the Bill also now provides for an appeal to the Supreme Court. To clarify the provisions, there is now specific inclusion of any unincorporated society, association or body in this Bill. Provisions concerning requests for information have been clarified and improved. The possibility of a person providing information which, in the opinion of the Minister, is false or misleading, is addressed in this Bill.

The 1979 Act gives a minimum six month period in which a shareholder may sell or dispose of shares above the 15 per cent specified maximum number. This Bill reduces that minimum period back to three months. It is considered that three months would give adequate time for a shareholder to obtain a fair and reasonable price for shares in the market. Any declaration made by the Minister requiring disposal of shares, including the time period specified for divesting, is of course also subject to appeal and review.

At the time of introduction of the 1979 Bill, there was considerable debate over the ability of the Minister to annul resolutions of a general meeting of shareholders, where such resolutions, in the opinion of the Minister, were contrary to the public interest—Section 7 (1) *(b)*. The current Bill allows the Minister the option of annulment of resolutions, only where there has been an admission of votes that should not have been admitted, as a result of a prohibited shareholding, a failure to provide requested information, or provision of false and misleading information. There is no power in this Bill for the Minister to annul a resolution of a general meeting based on an assessment of 'the public interest'. These are the more significant improvements and alterations to the 1979 Act. It is confirmed, once more, that there is no significant change in policy or approach to securing South Australia's future energy requirements in this Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure and other interpretative provisions. Attention is drawn to the definition of 'relevant interest' and subclauses (2), (3) and (4) of the clause. These provisions together extend the range of shareholding interests in Santos Limited which will be taken into account in determining whether a person exceeds the 15 per cent maximum shareholding interest in the company. Under the current Act—

(a) the shares of shareholders who constitute a group are aggregated for the purposes of determining whether the 15 per cent limit is exceeded;

(b) a person is a shareholder if the person has a legal or equitable interest in the share;

(c) shareholders constitute a group if—

(i) they are associates;

(ii) they are associates of a person who is not a shareholder;

or

(iii) they are, in the opinion of the Minister, likely to act in concert with a view to taking control of the Company or otherwise against the public interest;

(d) persons are treated as being associates according to criteria that are similar to those contained in the Companies (South Australia) Code.

By contrast, the provisions in this clause follow the approach adopted in the Companies (South Australia) Code for the purpose of determining substantial shareholding interests in a company under Division 4 of Part IV of the Code. Under the provisions of this clause—

(a) the 15 per cent limit is measured by reference to the number of voting shares to which a person is 'entitled'—significantly, such a person need not be a shareholder:

(b) under clause 3 (4), the shares to which a person is entitled include those in which the person has a 'relevant interest' and those in which an associate of the person has a 'relevant interest';

(c) 'relevant interest' has the same meaning as the expression has for the purposes of Division 4 of Part IV of the Companies Code, this being a wide concept based principally on the question whether a person has power, through formal or informal arrangements or relationships, to exercise, or control the exercise of, voting rights attaching to shares, or to dispose of, or exercise control over the disposal of, shares;

(d) a person is an associate of another if—

(i) the person is an associate of the other for the purposes of Division 4 of Part IV of the Companies Code;

or

(ii) as under the current Act, the Minister is of the opinion that the person and the other are likely to act in concert with a view to taking control of the Company or otherwise against the public interest and the Minister, by notice in writing served on the Company, declares the person to be an associate of the other.

Subclause (6) provides that regulations may be made, if necessary, to allow certain relevant interests, or classes of relevant interests, in shares in the company to be disregarded for specified purposes in specified circumstances and subject to specified conditions (if any).

Clause 4 provides that the measure applies in relation to the company only so long as the company, or a subsidiary of the company, engages in the recovery and production of petroleum within the State. Subclause (2) of the clause is designed to ensure that the measure applies whether relevant transactions, agreements, arrangements, understandings or undertakings are entered into or made within or outside the State and whether shares are registered within or outside the State.

Clause 5 provides that a person has a prohibited shareholding interest in the company if the person is entitled to voting shares in the company that together constitute more than 15 per cent of the total number of voting shares in the company. The clause excludes the possibility that the company might be taken to have a prohibited shareholding interest in itself.

Clause 6 provides that it is unlawful for a person to have a prohibited shareholding interest in the company. Clause 7 provides power for the Minister, or a director or the Secretary of the company, to require information for the purpose of determining whether a person has, or is taking action to acquire, a prohibited shareholding interest in the company. Such information may be sought from a person

who has, or is suspected of having, a relevant interest in shares in the company. A notice requiring such information may require that the information be verified by statutory declaration. The clause provides that where a person fails to provide information as required, or where information provided is, in the opinion of the Minister, false or misleading in a material particular, the Minister may, by reason only of that fact—

(a) declare that the person is an associate of another, or that another is an associate of that person;

(b) declare that the person, or such other person, has a relevant interest in specified company shares;

(c) declare that the voting rights attaching to such shares are suspended;

(d) declare that the person, or such other person, has a prohibited shareholding interest in the company.

Written notice of any such declaration by the Minister must be served on the company and any person to whom the notice relates and, in a case where voting rights attaching to shares are suspended, on the holder of the shares.

Clause 8 provides that where the Minister has declared under clause 7 that a person has a prohibited shareholding interest in the company, or, apart from clause 7, forms an opinion and makes a declaration to that effect, the Minister may declare that specified persons must dispose of such shares as are necessary to cause the person to cease to have a prohibited shareholding interest in the compnay. Written notice of such a declaration must be served on the company and the person or persons required to dispose of shares. Failure to comply with such a notice results in forfeiture of the shares to the Crown. Under the clause, any transaction with respect to shares in the company that would result in a person being entitled to more than 15 per cent of the voting shares in the company is illegal and void. Any such shares transferred as a result of the illegal transaction may be declared by the Minister to be forfeited to the Crown.

Clause 9 provides for a proportionate reduction in voting rights where a person has a prohibited shareholding interest in shares in the company. For that purpose, a declaration of the Minister that a person is an associate of another, or that a person has a prohibited shareholding interest in the company, has effect and is binding on the company in relation to any general meeting held after service of notice of the declaration on the company.

Clause 10 provides that the Minister may, by notice in writing served on the company, declare a resolution of a general meeting of the company to have been (at all times) null and void if, in the opinion of the Minister, the resolution was passed as a result of votes that should not, by virtue of a declaration of the Minister under clause 7, or by virtue of clause 9, have been admitted. Such notice must also be served on the person whose votes should not, in the Minister's opinion, have been admitted. A notice under the clause does not have effect in relation to a resolution unless served on the company within one month after the date of the resolution.

Clause 11 deals with the making, review and revocation of declarations by the Minister. The clause provides that the Minister may make a declaration under the measure on the basis of such information as he or she considers sufficient in the circumstances. The clause provides that a declaration (other than one requiring the disposal of shares or forfeiting shares to the Crown) has effect when notified to the company. The clause provides for a right to have the Minister review a declaration. Such right may be exercised by the company or any person served with notice of the declaration. The Minister may, on such a review, or in any event, of his or her own motion, vary or revoke a declaration conditionally or unconditionally and with effect from the date of the declaration or some other date. Under the clause, a declaration continues to have effect unless the Minister determines otherwise notwithstanding that application is made for the Minister to review the declaration.

Clause 12 provides for an appeal to the Supreme Court against a declaration of the Minister, other than a declaration under clause 10 annulling a resolution of the company. The clause allows 21 days from service of notice of the declaration for the appeal to be instituted. The company is to be a respondent to any appeal in addition to the Minister in any case where the company is not the appellant itself. On such an appeal, the Supreme Court may, if satisfied that proper grounds for making the declaration did not exist, quash or vary the declaration conditionally or unconditionally and with effect from the date of the declaration or some other date and may make any consequential or ancillary order. Any such appeal is not to affect a declaration pending determination of the appeal, other than a declaration requiring a person to dispose of shares in the company or a declaration that shares in the company are forfeited to the Crown. The clause provides that a declaration may not be challenged or called into question except as provided in the measure.

Clause 13 provides that shares forfeited to the Crown are to be sold by the Corporate Affairs Commission and that the proceeds (less reasonable allowance for the costs of forfeiture and sale) are to be paid to the person from whom the shares were forfeited. Where the shares forfeited were transferred as a result of an illegal transaction and the transferor has not received the full consideration agreed upon, the proceeds (less the deduction for costs of forfeiture and sale) must be applied in payment to the transferor of the amount or value of the consideration not received by the transferor and the balance (if any) must be paid to the transferee.

Clause 14 protects the Minister, the Corporate Affairs Commission and the company and its officers and auditors from liability for any act or omission in good faith in the exercise or discharge, or purported exercise or discharge, of a power or duty under the measure. Clause 15 provides for the service of notices. Clause 16 provides for the making of regulations. Clause 17 provides for the repeal of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act 1979.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE OPERA OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In 1987-88 the State Opera Company faced an accumulated deficit of $507 000. As a result of this financial overrun a plan was developed to repay this sum to Treasury over a three-year period. The plan is being efficiently imple-

mented through the reduction of overheads and an aggressive sponsorship and marketing program. For the first year of the three, the company has met its repayment target of $100 000 without curtailing the planned number of productions. The company has been able to maintain excellence in production standards. This proposed revision of the Act will assist the company to continue this forward thrust.

The principal object of this Bill is to enable the board of the State Opera of South Australia to increase its coverage of expertise. The means to achieve this are to increase the number of members from seven to eight. The need for expansion of the board without altering the size of the quorum is requested for two reasons. Firstly, there is difficulty at times in obtaining a quorum. On occasions, various members have been interstate or overseas in connection with their own professions, or have been required at short notice to attend to urgent matters. A board of eight members, rather than seven, would permit members to meet their own commitments without the board's function being curtailed.

Secondly, a larger pool of expertise is required by the board to meet its responsibilities at present and in the future. A board of eight members would provide this more readily. The other object of this Bill is to clarify the area of accountability and responsibility of the board. Provision of clauses indicating that the company be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister; that all board appointments be made by the Governor; and that proper accounting records be kept are recommended. Amendments to the regulations covering the election of subscriber representatives to the board are also recommended.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which sets out definitions of terms used in the Act. The clause removes definitions of 'appointed member' and 'elected member', which are no longer required as a result of subsequent amendments.

Clause 4 amends section 6 of the principal Act which deals with the Board of Management. The number of members of the board is increased from seven to eight, all of whom are now appointed by the Governor, including the two subscriber members, elected by the subscribers. Provision is made for a member to be the deputy of the member appointed to chair meetings of the board. The members of the board hold office for three years for a maximum of three consecutive terms. In the event of a casual vacancy, the member filling the vacancy holds office for the balance of the term of the member being replaced.

Clause 5 repeals section 11 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. This deals with chairing the meetings of the board. In the absence of the member appointed to chair, the deputy will preside over the meeting. In the absence of both, the members will elect one of their number to preside.

Clause 6 repeals section 17 which dealt with the absorption of the original opera company into the State Opera. A new provision which makes the board subject to the general control and direction of the Minister has been substituted.

Clause 7 amends section 23 of the principal Act which deals with the keeping of proper accounts. More detailed requirements relating to the collection and expenditure of money and to budget and audit procedures have been set out.

Clause 8 amends section 26 of the principal Act. This requires the Minister to be presented with the budget for the current financial year on or before 31 August each year.

Clause 9 repeals section 28 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. The Annual Report for the preceding financial year must be presented to the Minister on or before 30 September each year.

The schedule makes amendments of a statute law revision nature with a view to the publication of a reprint of the Act. The opportunity has been taken to increase penalties which have not been changed since the enactment of the Act in 1976. The maximum penalty of $500 fixed for an offence against section 16 (1) (declaration of financial interest by a member of the board) is increased to a maximum of a division 7 fine ($2 000). The maximum penalty of $200 fixed for a contravention of or failure to comply with any provision of the regulations (section 31 (2) *(d)*) has been increased to a maximum of a division 9 fine ($500).

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

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1016.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): As the Minister highlighted in her second reading explanation of this Bill, the Dog Fence Act of 1946 provides for the maintenance of the dog proof fence. When I was in the pastoral areas a few months ago I was interested to see the condition that the fence was in: the parts that I saw seemed to be in an appropriate condition. To add some weight to that, perhaps, I saw two dingoes a few kilometres north of the fence—they were on the right side of the fence, and so the fence must be doing its job satisfactorily. From speaking with a few pastoralists in the area it seems that the dog fence is doing its job, despite some repairs that were necessary some little while ago. The body responsible for the maintenance and inspection of the fence, under the Act, is the Dog Fence Board. This Bill seeks to make a couple of alterations to the legislation. The Opposition supports the two changes that are envisaged.

As members would be aware, at present one member of the board is nominated by the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority. The responsibility for that authority was taken over by the Animal and Plant Control Commission, under the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act 1986. This Bill formally recognises that change, and quite rightly. It replaces the right of nomination of the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority with that of the new commission. It seems that the second member of the board is nominated by the Minister from a panel selected by local fence boards, created under the Act. Former Minister, Roy Abbott, undertook in 1986 to give that right of nomination to an appropriate incorporated association established to represent local dog fence boards. The Far West Dog Fence Board Association Incorporated has since been incorporated for that purpose. This Bill seeks to give that body a right of nomination, in place of the existing right, to the Minister. The Opposition has no problems with the consequential amendments, and I indicate our support for this Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I will not take much time, other than to say that the dog fence, a unique part of the history of South Australia, runs 8 000 kilometres, part of which goes through my electorate. It is about 2 metres high, and the fence has played an important role in protecting the grazing industry, involving merino sheep, in particular. I sincerely hope that the Government provides the board with suffi-

cient funds to continue to satisfactorily maintain the dog fence in order to prevent dingoes coming south. I have been particularly interested in the new innovations in relation to electric fences in my electorate, particularly in the western part of South Australia. I hope that this type of activity is encouraged and continued, and that sufficient funds are made available to ensure that the fence is kept in good order.

As one goes around South Australia it is interesting that we can still see some of the original dog fences that were erected. On the western boundary of one of the properties that I have, one can see part of the old dog fence. May I say that those people who originally constructed the dog fence must have been people with big hearts, because they built them particularly well and under the most difficult and trying conditions. I believe that their workmanship was second to none.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I thank the two members opposite for their contributions. I certainly concur in the sentiments of the member for Eyre. The people who originally built the dog fence did have big hearts, and I point out also that this 8 000 kilometre structure is the longest man made structure in the world. I am told that it is much longer than the Great Wall of China. Considering the size and construction of the Great Wall of China, one cannot make comparisons, but, notwithstanding, the dog fence is the longest man made structure in the world.

It is thus appropriate to recognise the hard work, energy, and commitment of the South Australian pioneers in their building the fence. The two amendments to the legislation are minor. I can tell the member for Eyre that there is a commitment to ensure that the dog fence is maintained to a standard that will ensure that it fulfils the function for which it was designed. The levy that is paid to the Dog Fence Board will ensure that the fence continues in its present state. In relation to the new technologies referred to by the member for Eyre, I understand that the board will continue to look at new technology in terms of the most appropriate form that the dog fence should take in future years.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

Mr GUNN: There has been considerable interest and public debate through the rural media in relation to raising extra revenue in relation to the dog fence. A body of opinion suggests that the dog fence affords protection to all graziers in South Australia, and that perhaps it would be fair and equitable to extend the levy to cover other areas of South Australia—to involve people in other places besides those above or adjoining the dog fence. This matter has caused some controversy, particularly in the southern parts of South Australia. Is the Minister prepared to indicate whether the Government has considered that suggestion? Does the Government have any plans to extend the areas to which the levy relates in relation to funding for the dog fence?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Dog Fence Board has taken the whole process a step further and has implemented a levy on all landowners whose property exceeds 10 square kilometres. It is correct to say that there was a good deal of spirited debate but, in the end, through the good offices of the UF&S, an overall agreement was reached to ensure that the levy was spread throughout South Australia and borne more equitably.

Mr LEWIS: I do not want this instance to go by without making sure that the Minister also understands that dingoes in South Australia are not restricted simply to areas north of the dog fence. People living in the electorate of Murray-Mallee just 10 years ago had a significant problem developing when dog numbers rapidly increased following the declaration of the Ngarkat National Park, which embraced a number of national parks and a whole lot of unallotted Crown land outside the hundreds in County Chandos. Those people in the district councils abutting those parks now substantially carry on their own heads the burden of the control of the dogs in that area.

Because they have to own farms which, on average, exceed 2 500 acres—which is 1 000 hectares and, for the sake of the Minister's understanding of mensuration, I remind her that 1 000 hectares is 10 square kilometres—it is not fair for them to look after the northern dog fence when they get no return of funds so collected for the purposes of controlling dogs in that locality. In my judgment, the Department of Environment and Planning owns those dogs and that department, from its own budget, should control and contain the dogs within that national park. If the Government is not willing to allocate the funds from that department for that purpose, those people who have the dingoes in the Boxflat Dingo Control Committee area should not have to pay for it themselves, and it is not good enough to simply ignore their plea now and tax them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is going far beyond the proposition that is in front of us. I will allow the question.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thought this would engender a great heated debate. I am being facetious, but I know what the member is saying. He is referring to the Boxflat Dingo Control Committee. Let me say for the public record that 75 per cent of the funds provided to that committee are provided by the State Government. Let me also put on the public record—

Mr Lewis: What about the other 25 per cent?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Hang on a moment. It is important that we are talking about an overall area south of the dog fence. Let me also put on public record that a number of West Coast farmers are paying twice: they are paying to a local board and they are also paying full tote odds, if you like, to the Dog Fence Board, so instead of looking at a situation where we are saying, 'We don't want to pay because we are doing our own little thing,' the point that I understood the member for Eyre was raising was that we really have to look at a collective responsibility to ensure that there are no dingoes south of the dog fence. In accepting that collective responsibility, property holders further south are paying a small amount. We are not talking about a large commitment. We are not talking about something which will so financially impinge upon the viability of landholders that it becomes a problem.

I have met with the members of the Boxflat Dingo Control Committee and I understand their concerns but, at the end of the day, I made a decision to support the decision taken by the Dog Fence Board. I believe it was the right decision in terms of the overall objectives of the establishment of the dog fence and in the smooth running of the control and management of that fence.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Members of board.'

Mr MEIER: Does the Minister have any information on the Far West Dog Fence Board Association Incorporated, particularly in relation to the number of persons who would be on the board, and whether she has any other information on the way it is now operating?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: There are four members of the board, and the position referred to in this amendment covers one of those four people.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 136.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition supports this legislation. It is very important that, with any profession, the qualifications of those professionals within the profession are recognised. In this case, if a dental technician has obtained registration, the public should know that the professional sets himself up as a registered clinical dental technician, and that they can go to him with absolute confidence. The same applies in all fields of medicine; whether it be general practice, pharmacy, dentistry, chiropractic, or whatever. It is important that we give the public a reassurance by firming up any loopholes whereby someone is allowed to practise or the public is led to believe they are practising, a service is rendered and the customer finds out after that the person was not registered. Anyone who practises in any profession where registration is open to them should be forced into having that registration before they can practise.

I understand that this is not common in the area of clinical dental technicians, but it certainly needs tidying up. As I understand it, an unregistered person cannot claim to be registered and cannot collect a fee for performing a service. However, they are not prevented from practising as an unregistered clinical technician, provided they do not charge. In other words, a person can say, 'I am a dental technician but, provided I do not charge, I can provide a service,' as they have in the past. That is quite wrong, and this amendment will tidy it up so that, if they are not registered, they cannot perform work for no payment. That is the crux of this minor legislation, and the Opposition is happy to support it. I know that it has not happened often, but the department has obviously got on record some examples where a person purporting to be a registered dental technician performed work and a dentist had to perform corrective work at a later date at the patient's extra expense. We do not believe that that should happen in the profession, so we are happy to support this legislation.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

WHEAT MARKETING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 1130.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This is an important although brief measure. I wish to declare my interest: I am a wheat grower; my family has been in the wheat industry for four generations; and we look forward to the future of the industry with confidence. The member for Flinders would have participated in this debate, but he has a longstanding engagement to attend a function, which most members would have read about in this morning's newspaper in relation to the closing of the last manual telephone exchange in South Australia. The honourable member asked me to indicate that he wished to participate in this debate because of the effect this legislation would have on his district. The honourable member would have more wheat growers in his electorate than any other member of this House.

This legislation is enabling, or complementary and will put into place the new Commonwealth Wheat Marketing Act 1989. The wheat industry in this country has been not only one of the most significant and important industries but it has also helped to lay the foundations of economic development both in this State and across the nation. The wheat marketing arrangements that the industry has come to accept and support, and which have helped it to prosper, in spite of the vagaries of the weather and Government policy, came into effect in 1948 with the establishment of the first system of orderly marketing of grain in this country.

One of the original promoters and founding fathers of that legislation was the Hon. T.C. Stott, a former Speaker of this House and a former General Secretary of the Wheat Growers Association of South Australia. He was also involved with the UF&S and led the fight across Australia to introduce orderly marketing. I am not one of those people who believes in the new, 'in' philosophy of total de-regulation, that there is no role for Government in the market place, and that we should allow market forces to dominate the economy completely. For me, it has been proved that there are many areas in which the Government should not be involved, there are many things that private enterprise can do far better than Government, but there is a need for the Government to have some influence or role in certain areas of the economy if the welfare of citizens is to prosper and if it is to ensure that we even out the playing field, and protect the interests of certain people involved in particular industries—one of which is the wheat industry.

The operations of the Australian Wheat Board have been an outstanding success in this country. People must clearly understand that we are competing with the Treasuries of the EEC, the United States, and Canada. We have no hope of competing with those countries unless we have a system which can guarantee a reasonable return to the producers and which can ensure that we place on the market high quality produce with a guarantee of supply delivery. The Australian Wheat Board has fulfilled those functions and, to its credit, has sold wheat to many countries. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table indicating the number of countries to which the Australian Wheat Board has exported produce over the past three years. I am sure that, when members read *Hansard*, they will be amazed at the range of countries involved.

Leave granted.

EXPORTS OF WHEAT BY PRIMARY DESTINATION[1]
(Tonnes)

Year[2]	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
Primary Destination:			
Abu Dhabi	90 974	111 642	73 651
Bahrain	31 930	16 598	20 012
Bangladesh	93 406	184 938	87 406
Botswana	—	20 710	—
China	2 921 224	3 716 418	1 007 241
Columbia	55 000	82 150	—
DPR Korea	161 663	157 600	—
Dubai	81 891	91 560	73 390
Egypt	2 298 028	2 171 858	1 774 306
Ethiopia	270 162	105 233	27 775
Fiji	63 162	61 511	63 546
Hong Kong	4 198	—	—
Indonesia	696 520	588 438	897 261
Iran	1 077 092	2 210 447	1 748 733
Iraq	713 669	1 183 092	936 662
Japan	934 436	1 019 258	1 033 300

EXPORTS OF WHEAT BY PRIMARY DESTINATION[1]
(Tonnes)

Year[2]	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
Primary Destination:			
Jordan	109 752	—	—
Kenya	32 000	60 531	—
Korea, Rep. of	626 890	633 084	119 101
Kuwait	160 553	89 479	82 626
Malaysia	397 167	463 360	452 529
Mauritius	168	82	126
Mexico	—	143 527	29 100
Nepal	—	2 500	—
New Caledonia	8 799	5 736	7 593
New Zealand	41 953	66 169	127 620
Nigeria	—	26 880	—
Norway	61	20	—
Oman	123 396	120 998	96 024
Pacific Islands[3]	—	—	6
Pakistan	107 701	20 000	20 000
Papua New Guinea	53 320	74 864	69 338
Peru	—	73 500	—
PDR Yemen	165 523	138 368	166 725
Philippines	67 205	17 289	1 661
Qatar	39 558	29 526	26 115
Saudi Arabia	—	83	—
Singapore	125 710	100 373	126 689
Solomon Islands	—	—	2 950
Somalia	—	1 600	—
South Africa	96 156	—	—
Sri Lanka	189 113	42 000	5 000
Sudan	4 141	801	—
Switzerland	—	20	146
Tahiti	—	60	120
Thailand	43 634	43 897	49 058
Tonga	—	1	21
Tunisia	—	—	21 600
Turkey	53 497	45 680	—
United Kingdom	264 982	—	11
USSR	3 174 488	1 291 883	298 396
West Samoa	19	133	281
Yemen AR	554 954	347 861	387 214
Zimbabwe	28 345	20 767	25 000
Total	15 962 350	15 582 505	9 860 252

Source: Australian Wheat Board.
[1] Commercial and food aid shipments.
[2] 1 October to 30 September
[3] Not elsewhere shown.

If one reads through the debates leading up to the establishment of the Australian Wheat Board, one will clearly understand that it was instigated because of the disgraceful manner in which merchants across the country had treated the farming community. People faced bankruptcy, their income was chaotic, and there was no stability in the market place. After the Second World War, when people became accustomed to some form of regulation, it became quite clear that the situation had to be altered. It is interesting to read what the Hon. Tom Austin (Opposition spokesman in Victoria) had to say in relation to this matter. He stated:

Before the Australian Wheat Board came into operation wheatgrowers of this State had a rough time. I know that because I was one of them. I was a wheatgrower immediately after the Second World War. That was my only source of income. In those days there were no such things as chemicals for controlling weeds, and the work was arduous. Farmers sowed their crop and watched it grow. If it did not suffer from frost or from being eaten by grubs it was harvested and put into bags. To help get a weight of 186 pounds into the bag one used a pick handle. The bag was sewn up by hand and was loaded into the farm truck and carted to the nearest railway siding. One then carried the 186-pound bag on one's shoulders and loaded it into a 22-ton rail truck.

In those days one would be lucky to get 4 shillings a bushel for the product. Farmers had no money to spend; they lived on the smell of an oily rag and were lucky to survive. Of course, many did not.

He went on to say:

With the advent of the Australian Wheat Board, growers had an assured market. They were confident that the grain quality was monitored and they knew they had a single seller in the marketplace who was able to negotiate price and win new markets. Whatever the criticisms might have been at that time and since, growers certainly supported the wheat board. They felt it gave them stability and allowed them to do what they were best at: looking after the growing side of their industry.

That is an interesting contribution, because the Hon. Tom Austin was Minister for Agriculture for some time in Victoria and had personal experience of the situation. Many members on this side of the House, and many of my constituents, have indicated to me that they are concerned about the decision of the Commonwealth Government to deregulate the domestic market for wheat, because many of them believe that it is the first step towards total deregulation. Economic theory is one thing; economic practice is another. In my view, the present arrangement best suits the wheat industry and the nation.

I cannot understand why certain unions have not been more vocal in relation to this issue, because many of their members, particularly those of the AWU are employed in grain handling terminals, in the manufacture of superphosphate, chemicals and products which are absolutely essential to the industry and which the industry requires in order to provide guaranteed jobs. I sincerely hope that, as this debate continues, as unfortunately it will, those unions take a closer look at this matter because it could have an effect on their members. In the *Stock Journal* of 21 July 1988, under the heading 'Grain battle may cause depression', it is stated:

For 76-year-old Paskeville farmer Glen Lamshed, the battle over deregulation of grain handling and marketing signals a return to the depression years of the 1930s.

Mr Lamshed is 'semi-retired' farmer who has many vivid memories of the days before SA Co-operative Bulk Handling, the Australian Wheat Board, and the Australian Barley Board existed.

He started driving a team of horses at the age of 12 on his Cunliffe wheat and barley property and still displays that dogged determination and fighting spirit.

And it is those memories which have encouraged him to speak out against the recommendation of the Royal Commission into grain storage, handling and transport, that the CBH should lose sole receival rights . . .

Those comments have been echoed by many producers across South Australia and at the appropriate time I will move an amendment to endeavour to enshrine in the legislation sole receivership rights of the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. When that legislation was established in 1955, after considerable debate, clause 12 was inserted to provide:

(1) Subject to this Act the company shall have the sole right of receiving, storing and handling wheat and barley in bulk within the State, and the sole right to contract or arrange for the transport and delivery of wheat and barley in bulk within the State.

(2) Subsection (1) of this section shall not—

(a) prevent the Wheat Board or, as the case may be, the Barley Board from receiving, storing, and handling wheat or barley in bulk in the Wheat Board's or the Barley Board's bulk handling facilities, or from transporting or delivering wheat or barley to or from such facilities, or from arranging for such transport or delivery or otherwise operating such facilities;

(b) prevent the Wheat Board or, as the case may be, the Barley Board from making and carrying out arrangements for the transport of wheat or barley held by the company as a licensed receiver in any bulk handling facilities operated by the company;

That amendment has allowed the Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd to become one of the most successful grain hand ling organisations in the world. It is an organisation of which all South Australians should be proud. The Victorian Wheat Marketing Act of 1989 provides, under clause 5:

Nothing in this Act affects the operation of prescribed provisions of the Transport Act 1983 and the Grain Elevators Act 1958.

The provision in the Victorian Grain Elevators 1958 confers exclusive rights on the grain handling authority. It is my

desire to see a similar course of action in relation to the Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd in this State. One should remember that there is nothing in deregulation for the average wheatgrower; there is also nothing in it for the average South Australian. If we compare the situation with what happened in the deregulation of the banking industry, we see that we are in for a torrid time.

One should understand clearly that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd is set up under statute of this House. It is owned by the wheatgrowers and currently has a replacement value of assets of some $1.3 billion dollars in this State. Last year it handled $490 million worth of grain and had a revenue of $47 million with an operating surplus of $12 million. That operating surplus has been reinvested in the company, improving the facilities that every South Australian can see throughout the grain growing areas of this State.

If one makes a comparison with grain handling facilities overseas, one cannot be other than impressed by the way in which that organisation goes about its business. It is a democratic organisation. It holds elections to appoint the directors of the company and, when growers are not satisfied, they vote them out, as people do with members of Parliament. It holds an annual general meeting each year where members of the company can go along and express their support, concerns or comments in relation to the operation of the organisation. It is particularly important that this House understand and protect this organisation, as it would be not only unfortunate but also contrary to the best interests of the people of this State if we allowed operators to come into the State and selectively establish a grain handling facility in competition with the Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. People living in outlying and marginal areas would see their costs escalate dramatically, as private traders would not be interested in those areas and would pick the eyes out of the market. That would be most unsatisfactory.

To indicate how successful the organisation has been, I wish to incorporate in *Hansard* a record of the grain receivals of the company since its establishment in 1955 to 1987-88. Anyone interested in the debate will see how this organisation has increased its capacity and how successfully it has handled the grain. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* these statistical records.

Leave granted.

GRAIN RECEIVALS

Season	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Other	Total
	Tonnes	Tonnes	Tonnes	Tonnes	Tonnes
1955-56	154 360	—	—	—	154 360
1956-57	218 252	8 834	—	—	227 086
1957-58	151 952	48	—	—	152 000
1958-59	386 836	72 739	—	—	459 575
1959-60	154 509	—	—	—	154 509
1960-61	910 979	71 743	—	—	982 722
1961-62	691 334	71 915	—	—	763 249
1962-63	853 864	76 614	8 697	—	939 175
1963-64	1 329 362	252 008	19 137	—	1 600 507
1964-65	1 299 165	333 230	18 366	—	1 650 761
1965-66	961 050	211 519	8 865	—	1 181 434
1966-67	1 346 949	313 980	34 215	—	1 695 144
1967-68	595 408	141 738	206	—	737 352
1968-69	2 076 448	403 713	28 048	—	2 508 209
1969-70	1 516 048	463 494	9 576	—	1 989 118
1970-71	680 776	580 316	22 180	—	1 283 272
1971-72	1 307 012	850 424	19 830	—	2 177 266
1972-73	711 157	374 780	2 040	—	1 087 977
1973-74	1 671 348	676 112	30 712	—	2 378 172
1974-75	1 377 418	1 070 630	37 840	—	2 485 888
1975-76	1 042 101	1 004 810	26 663	—	2 073 574
1976-77	724 948	811 789	13 692	—	1 550 429
1977-78	416 924	484 051	1 857	—	902 832
1978-79	1 974 273	1 340 324	42 039	—	3 356 636
1979-80	2 231 215	1 456 519	46 337	—	3 734 071
1980-81	1 532 364	1 039 813	16 142	12 420	2 600 739
1981-82	1 580 780	1 120 208	11 485	11 272	2 723 745
1982-83	587 280	494 183	6 736	2 000	1 090 199
1983-84	2 712 214	1 772 010	64 695	3 908	4 552 827
1984-85	1 921 265	1 810 566	39 639	1 766	3 773 236
1985-86	1 769 996	1 634 714	16 256	24 430	3 445 396
1986-87	2 380 000	1 510 000	36 069	63 615	3 989 684
1987-88	1 822 426	1 118 293	47 077	113 818	3 101 614
Total	39 090 013	21 571 117	608 399	233 229	61 502 758

Mr GUNN: The House should also note that this organisation employs more than 1 000 South Australians and is therefore one of the largest organisations in this State. I want to see the preference preserved and enhanced. That does not mean that I and every other grower have not expressed criticisms from time to time. If we looked at the operations of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd, we would have to say that it has operated efficiently and effectively and has had a desire to operate in the best interests of all grain growers.

I am pleased to note that the legislation has excluded reference to the Australian Barley Board which operates independently, although effectively, in the interests of grain growers. If I were to suggest other improvements to the legislation, I would propose a system whereby people were elected directly to the Australian Wheat Board, giving growers greater input and making those people more reflective of the needs and desires of the industry. I do not wish to cast aspersions on present members of the board; I believe they are sincere and hardworking. However, I am always

sceptical about selection committees to appoint people to Government boards. They may decide to appoint someone who will not cause the Government a great deal of difficulty or who will toe the line for fear of not being reappointed or appointed to another position. That action is not particularly wise or helpful. When I read the media release of 16 November 1987 put out by Mr Morris on the new Australian Wheat Board selection committees, I was concerned and I hope that in future when we are dealing with this legislation suitable amendments will be made as the previous system was far better.

Those people who continually advocate the deregulation of the market should understand what happened in this State last year when a company known as Gulf Industries crashed and about 180 South Australian legume growers, who were owed some $2.4 million, unfortunately received very little. That was a stark reminder of what can happen with a deregulated market in an industry which trades on an international basis and which is subject to the vagaries of the international marketplace. Those people—many are my constituents or constituents of the Leader and the member for Goyder—have learnt a lesson that they will not forget. People involved with that organisation are staunch believers in the continuation of the orderly marketing of primary produce and are not keen on the deregulation of the domestic market.

If one looked at the Australian Wheat Board and briefly analysed its functions, one would clearly understand that the wheat industry is in its 200th year in this country. Last year the board exported in excess of $9.9 million worth of wheat. About 96 per cent of growers were paid within 21 days, and that is a record and a significant factor when one looks at the sort of treatment that my constituents and those of other members received. The objectives of the Australian Wheat Board include: efficient marketing of Australian wheat; maximisation of financial returns to growers; establishment and maintenance of a cost-effective financial facility; promotion of the development of cost-effective receival, handling, storage and transportation; and promotion of the industry. It has done that effectively, in my view.

It also has a number of other important functions, including ensuring that grain growers understand what the likely future market trends will be. Throughout its history the Australian Wheat Board has not defaulted. It has operated effectively and efficiently and has built up a particularly good name. That is one of the reasons why Australia has been able continually to sell its wheat on a sometimes depressed market against considerable competition from overseas. The Australian Wheat Board has been a creditable operator in the market place: it has been able to guarantee supply and to speak with a single voice on behalf of all Australian wheatgrowers. That has served the grain industry and the nation as a whole particularly well.

This legislation has been introduced following considerable controversy, debate, criticism and public discussion in all South Australian rural newspapers, the television and in the general media. People should understand that, when Parliaments make decisions affecting important industries of this nature, not only are the people entitled to have their views put strongly but also the Government of the day should consider those views. I will now refer to some of those headlines. The *Stock Journal* of 4 August 1988 contained a heading 'Growers lose on Kerin plan'. The *Farmers and Stockowners Journal* of 10 August 1988 contains the heading 'No joy on Gulf payouts'. That clearly indicates the point I made earlier about deregulating the market. That same journal on the same date also contained the heading 'Confusion grows in wheat debate'. In the *Weekly Times* of 30 March 1988, an article headed 'Deregulation of grain trade is 'irresponsible', David Palmer states:

> A mood running amok in Australia that the grain industry could be better run was totally irresponsible and ignored the considerable restructuring planned and already undertaken. Neil Simpson, President of the Victorian Farmers Federation grains group, told the group's annual conference at Shepparton last week 'deregulation is the only word that passes bureaucrats lips in Canberra these days.'
>
> He was referring specifically to the Industries Assistance Commission report which suggested grain marketing was out of date. 'It is nothing short of ludicrous to suggest that private traders would develop markets the way the Australian Wheat Board and Australian Barley Board have,' he said. The world's private grain traders, to be given a free go at marketing Australia's wheat under the IAC's draft report, 'don't give a stuff about you.' All they cared about were their shareholders, Mr Simpson said.
>
> To put the $4 billion to $5 billion Australian grain trade at risk, as the IAC proposes, did not make sense. Later the grains group condemned the IAC's move to deregulate wheat trading and called for the abolition of wheat permit trading on the domestic market, . . .

An article in the *Stock Journal* of 17 March written by Brenton Rehn and headed 'Hands off our wheat marketing' states:

> Grassroots wheatgrowers have shown in a *Stock Journal* survey that they are overwhelmingly in favour of retaining the present wheat marketing system. And the survey points to next week's United Farmers and Stockowners grain conference being a lively affair, with 65 per cent of growers who responded in favour of two-port loading charges . . .

The article then goes on to explain those views. Although I will not do so, I could refer at some length to the comments circulated in a brochure headed 'Right to choose: less regulation more profit', which was issued by the Wheat Marketing Fund, an organisation promoted by Mr Ian Wearing. That brochure provided a great deal of information. However, in my opinion, the views expressed in that document do not correctly explain the function of the Wheat Board or the value of that organisation to the industry and to the nation as a whole.

I believe that, if the suggestions contained in the brochure had been implemented, they would not have been in the best interests of the wheat growers because one of the great problems in this debate has been that the majority of people who advocate deregulation or the operation of market forces have never had an ounce of wheatdust on them. They have never sat on a header on a hot day or been involved in the practical side of agriculture. Those people may have degrees in economics from universities or other academic qualifications and they may be capable in their respective areas but, in my view, their knowledge is limited in the real world. It is also dubious knowledge and they certainly did not have the interests of the wheat growers at heart.

I now cite a letter which I received from the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, which was addressed to me and which states:

> Comments on complementary wheat marketing legislation.
>
> Further to your communication of Friday, we provide the following comments:
>
> 1. There is no reference in the draft Act to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act. Given—
>
> *(a)* the support for the retention of sole receivership right by the UF&S;
>
> *(b)* the overwhelming support by growers of retention of sole receivership rights, over 97 per cent of growers in South Australia;

I attended some of those meetings. The letter continues:

> *(c)* the report of the Task Force Into Grain Storage, Handling and Transport in South Australia;
>
> *(d)* the massive investment in facilities by SACBH in South Australia at today's replacement costs which is in the order of $1.3 billion.

(e) the State-wide coverage of SACBH and the virtual monopoly of grain storage in this State linked with a record of efficient service;

it would seem that the complementary wheat marketing legislation should not affect the operation of prescribed provisions in the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955-1969. It should be noted that a clause has been incorporated in the Victorian version of the complementary wheat marketing legislation to protect the operation of the GEB.

You are no doubt aware that the Bulk Handling of Grain Act will be the subject of review following the completion of the review of Barley Marketing Act, and we are anxious that any complementary wheat marketing legislation does not comprise this organisation or its operation in any way.

2. The draft complementary legislation has to date specifically excluded barley and oats from the definition of grain, presumably in view of the existence of the Australian Barley Board and its coverage of those commodities. It would seem that a clause is required in the draft wheat marketing legislation indicating that nothing in the Act affects the prescribed provisions of the Barley Marketing Act 1947-1973. Here again the Victorian legislation in clause 7 (5) incorporates a provision to such effect.

3. South Australia is currently unique in Australia in having three dominant parties servicing the industry, namely the Australian Wheat Board, the Australian Barley Board and SACBH. We currently have the most cost efficient overall grain storage, handling and transport system in Australia, which has been borne out by the royal commission. Each of the parties has as its object the maximisation of returns to growers, which must include major considerations in respect of grain transport, grain storage, port costs, pricing policies, marketing policies and the identification of the role of each of the parties.

In view of the complex and free choice of grain paths in South Australia, again a fact recognised by the royal commission, we believe it important that SACBH retains an equal input into decisions affecting transport, storage and handling of grain and as such we would like to see a clause in the wheat marketing legislation ensuring that full coordination and consultation with SACBH and the Australian Barley Board is enshrined in the legislation.

I endorse and support those comments. I sincerely hope that the Government and the Minister will pay close attention to those matters. In view of their importance, I have had what I believe to be a suitable amendment drafted that I hope will enshrine once and for all the preference to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

In most years, the South Australian wheat industry has been the single largest earner of export income for the State. It has eclipsed wool and in many years it has been the largest single industry in Australia. Currently wool is slightly ahead of grain, but that varies from time to time so, in view of those facts, I believe that the House should note my comments in relation to the effective and efficient running of the industry.

I further believe that the debate leading up to this legislation was deliberately contrived by the Federal Minister in an attempt to divert attention from the disastrous economic policies in which the Federal Government has engaged. I was amazed to think that a political Party, which should have taken the credit for establishing the Australian Wheat Board, would then, again in government some 40 years later, attempt to weaken that organisation's powers, disrupt its operation and cause great personal anguish to many people involved whose parents had memories of the way that they had been treated by the previous merchant operated buying system.

To ensure that those interested in the debate understand the size of this industry, the amount of wheat produced in Australia, the area sown, and the prices and returns to growers, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* statistical tables without my reading them.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1—AREA OF WHEAT
(000 Hectares)

Season[1]	New South[2] Wales	Victoria	South Australia	Western Australia	Queensland	Tasmania	Australia
1978-79	3 162	1 377	1 295	3 706	747	1	10 249
1979-80	3 416	1 457	1 424	4 121	733	2	11 153
1980-81	3 345	1 431	1 445	4 333	727	2	11 283
1981-82	3 600	1 322	1 427	4 593	941	1	11 885
1982-83	3 162	1 327	1 398	4 865	767	1	11 520
1983-84	3 999	1 614	1 564	4 746	1 006	2	12 931
1984-85	3 603	1 523	1 378	4 652	921	2	12 078
1985-86[1]	3 648	1 488	1 432	4 143	970	2	11 683
1986-87[2]	3 099	1 364	1 616	4 260	795	2	11 135
1987-88[3]	2 511	1 025	1 599	3 316	684	2	9 136
Ten Season Average	3 356	1 395	1 459	4 274	829	2	11 311

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

[1] Year ended 31 March.

[2] Including ACT.

[3] Excluded establishments with an estimated value of agricultural operations less than $20 000.

TABLE 2—PRODUCTION OF WHEAT
(000 Tonnes)

Season[1]	New South[2] Wales	Victoria	South Australia	Western Australia	Queensland	Tasmania	Australia
1978-79	6 640	2 998	2 086	4 400	1 962	3	18 090
1979-80	6 001	3 250	2 349	3 739	846	4	16 188
1980-81	2 865	2 538	1 650	3 315	485	3	10 856
1981-82	5 910	2 467	1 695	4 803	1 482	3	16 360
1982-83	1 500	394	692	5 534	755	1	8 876
1983-84	8 961	3 971	2 843	4 316	1 922	3	22 016
1984-85	5 805	2 666	2 031	6 580	1 579	4	18 666
1985-86[1]	5 898	2 316	1 781	4 313	1 686	4	15 999
1986-87[2]	4 855	2 795	2 255	5 377	833	5	16 119

TABLE 2—PRODUCTION OF WHEAT
(000 Tonnes)

Season[1]	New South[2] Wales	Victoria	South Australia	Western Australia	Queensland	Tasmania	Australia
1987-88[3]	4 103	1 920	1 885	3 897	758	4	12 568
Ten Season Average	5 256	2 534	1 943	4 632	1 231	3	15 600

Source: Australian bureau of Statistics.
[1]Year ended 31 March.
[2]Including ACT.
[3]Excludes establishments with an estimated value of agricultural operations less than $20 000.

AUSTRALIAN WHEAT PRICES AND RETURNS

Crop year	Gross value of production	Unit value	Guaranteed minimum price a	Human consumption price b	Average export return c
	$m	$/t	$/t	$/t	$/t
1975-76	1 249.2	104.26	76.55	99.32	110.13
1976-77	1 050.8	89.05	76.29	105.40	92.32
1977-78	934.2	99.70	80.94	111.16	103.22
1978-79	2 295.8	126.91	91.96	116.61	133.63
1979-80	2 478.0	153.08	114.71	130.78	161.97
1980-81	1 684.1	155.13	131.92	156.12	154.53
1981-82	2 559.4	156.44	141.55	187.20	157.65
1982-83	1 566.2	176.45	141.32	203.46	184.53
1983-84	3 605.6	163.77	150.00	219.41	170.56
1984-85	3 202.9	171.59	145.35	210.73	189.01
1985-86	2 719.4	168.21	149.87	213.89	179.97
1986-87	2 530.0	150.79	139.83	188.92	136.54
1987-88	2 035.0	163.56	144.29	193.46	156.70
1988-89	2 370.0	179.00	147.60	210.65	189.00

Mr GUNN: It is important that this legislation be in place before the coming harvest, and hopefully that harvest will be a bumper crop so that those who have suffered so much in the past few years because of drought can reap the benefits of their hard work, and then the State should reap its share of export income. One should clearly understand that 60 per cent of this State's export income is derived from primary industry, and a large portion of that comes from wheat and wool, which are the dominant industries in this State.

Therefore, this legislation is essential. However, I believe it can be improved. I support the orderly marketing of wheat and barley and the operation of the Australian Wool Commission. Many of those people who have been leading the thud against the continued operation of the Australian Wheat Board and those who are the loudest proponents of deregulation are the same people who, many years ago, raced around Australia stirring up further trouble against the establishment of the Australian Wool Commission. Anyone who has analysed the operation of that organisation and has calculated what the price of wool would be today without the Wool Commission would realise that these people are unrealistic and have been reading Alice in Wonderland. Commonsense should override political and commercial theory which is not based on practical reality or commonsense. Commonsense dictates that there is a need for a system of orderly marketing of primary products in Australia, and it has proved an outstanding success.

That is not to say that this cannot be improved or efficiencies cannot be implemented but, as long as those improvements and efficiencies are carried out with the consent of the industry and are not imposed on them, it will continue to operate successfully not only for the industry but also for the State and the nation. I have been proud to be associated with the wheat industry and have taken a keen interest in it for a long time. I will continue to be involved with it for the rest of my working life.

I am pleased to see this legislation come before the Parliament. I hope that the amendments I will move will be passed so that the legislation can be improved. Also, I hope that when the Wheat Marketing Act again comes up for debate we do not go through the same trauma and controversy we have been through in the past 18 months. I support the second reading.

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 S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I take this opportunity to raise one or two issues: first, the matter of pedestrian crossings. Recently, the member for Kavel raised the need for a pedestrian crossing at Nairne; the member for Fisher and I over the years have been fighting to have a pedestrian crossing built near the Bellevue Heights Primary School; and I have raised the need for a pedestrian crossing on the main street of Blackwood that lies between Gulfview Road and Chapman Street. No doubt the criteria used by the Road Traffic Board and the Highways Department are not satisfactory: it is not possible to set criteria that are absolute, that say that one needs a certain number of motor vehicles and/or pedestrians to go past a certain point before a crossing can be erected.

I know that nowadays the Nairne main street is busy, even though the main Melbourne route no longer passes through it. It is on a downhill slope, and is a dangerous section of road. At Bellevue Heights there is a four-lane road with no median strip of any significance anywhere near the primary school where pedestrians, particularly children, can take refuge. It is difficult—I would say impossible—for a young child or an elderly person to cross the road there, and it would be hard enough for those people who are in between in age to judge the time they need to cross that road taking into account the speed of the traffic which does not always abide by the rules and travel at 60 kilometres per hour, the speed set down for that section of road. Members will know that, even if 25 kilometre limit school signs are erected, traffic does not abide by them. Children cross this road to get to the Eden Hills school, and to the northern side to the Bellevue Heights school, and there is an urgent need for a pedestrian crossing at this site.

Criteria should not be absolute when it relates to the safety of pedestrians. The road outside the Coromandel Valley primary school has two lanes. Some 40 metres to the south from the beginning of the school there is a blind corner, and one travelling from the other direction does not have good sight distance. There is no room on the north-

west side of the road for cars to pull off the road; they are confined to a narrow two-lane section of road, and it is dangerous for children to cross it. Some of the children have to come from the north-western side of the school over the tributory of the Sturt Creek to get to the school. Any member of Parliament who lived in that area and who knew that their children had to cross that road would immediately see the real need for such a crossing.

However, the authorities say that not enough children cross that road compared with the number of motor vehicles that travel it. That road is now becoming one of the main links with Coromandel Parade to the south for the traffic that cannot get onto South Road because of its congested state. Also, people from Echunga and Meadows who find the freeway unsatisfactory come through Lesley Creek Road into Longwood, down Woolcock Road, into Morgan Road and along Ackland Hill Road past the Coromandel Valley school. Other traffic comes from McLaren Flat, Kangarilla, and Clarendon, and passes the school. In this day and age it is ludicrous to say that this section of road does not deserve a pedestrian crossing as enough children do not cross it. If one child died a crossing would be erected in a flash, but none of us in this Chamber or in the department would wish that.

The main street in Blackwood is very busy, and on the south-eastern side, between Main Road and the railway line, there is a significant number of home units and flats, in which many retired people live. They choose to live in that location because of the close proximity of the services that are available. Most of the shops that they want to go to are on the other side of the road. However, it is a terrible place to cross. My office is there. I am still alert enough to get across, but one cannot always get across in one attempt and there is no refuge in the middle. People have to stand on the white line and hope that they do not get hit.

The department knows that there have been some bad accidents in that area. Often an accident involves not directly a person and a motor vehicle but a motor vehicle and another vehicle, while trying to avoid a person. One has to give drivers credit for being alert enough to attempt to avoid hitting a person who is not protected to the extent of being in a car. In the present day and age, we should not allow this situation to prevail.

Further in regard to the matter of safety, the Coromandel Parade South section of road is an absolute disgrace. One of the first sections of main road from Adelaide to Strathalbyn, it was developed before the main road through Coromandel Valley was developed. It is a winding section of road, a little over a kilometre in length and very narrow. It now accommodates a huge volume of traffic coming through from the south in the mornings and going back in the evenings, because of the South Road congestion and the lack of direct routes into the city. People living on that road are virtually entrapped on their properties and put their lives at risk trying to get out.

The council has started to build a narrow footpath on a very expensive section of one part of the road reserve, to help pedestrians. However, this is a terrible section of road, and a very dangerous one, for residents who live nearby. At the moment it belongs to the council, but there is nothing council can do about the matter because there is no room for road widening, anyway. On the other side of the historic bridge in the valley, Horner's Bridge, the road becomes Murrays Hill Road, and that section of road was easy to widen because there was open space on one side and there was not such a steep embankment.

We need a bypass road around that section. It will cost big money, but there is no alternative. Some people want the road closed off. That would be unacceptable to the transport authorities, in particular the STA. Some people want humps put in the road, but the STA will not allow buses to operate over them. I ask the Government to take notice of the concerns of people who are not in marginal seats. The views of those in safe seats really should be considered. I include in that people who are in the marginal seat of Fisher around the Bellevue Heights Primary School. In relation to change and accepting that criteria need to be varied, I can assure the people in the area concerned that after the next election the Liberal Party will look at using a sensible approach to the needs of the community and the dangers that exist.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I have always believed very strongly that persistence usually pays off. In the 10 years that I have been in this place I, because of my doggedness, and together with my constituents, have been successful in the resolution of many problems in my electorate. For example, trees have now been planted along the Grange railway line from the Alma Terrace and old Clark Terrace (now West Lakes Boulevard) intersection south towards Seaton Park railway station. I applaud the Minister of Transport for his very strong support and his agreeing to planting trees along the railway line. Some seven years of my trying to convince parliamentary colleagues, and indeed ministerial colleagues, of the need to plant trees along this section of the railway line has finally paid off.

It was with a great deal of joy that local residents, together with students from the Seaton and Hendon Primary Schools, were able to plant the trees last month. Students, particularly from Seaton Primary School, have taken a very keen interest in looking after the trees and watering them on a regular basis, together with local residents who live adjacent to Clark Terrace and the Grange railway line. This was a very happy resolution to a matter that I was told I would not succeed in as long as my behind pointed to the ground. Over 150 melaleuca trees have been planted and most of them have taken very well. The first summer will determine whether they grow into large trees and not only beautify the area but considerably reduce the noise from the rail services that go past.

Colleagues would be aware of my concern about feral cats. This is a serious matter which, unfortunately, has not been properly addressed in this place over the years that I have been here. As has occurred on many occasions, the other day a constituent came to see me and expressed agitation over the large number of cats in the area. They get into gardens, urinate all over the place and mate at all hours of the day and night, with all the associated noise that goes with it. While there is sometimes an amount of levity about this, it is a real problem that I believe the Government and the Parliament must address.

I am cognisant of the fact that Victoria proposes to introduce legislation in 1990 dealing with this matter. While I do not necessarily advocate the same legislation for South Australia, I ask the Minister of Local Government and, indeed, the Minister for Environment and Planning to have a look at this issue. In Victoria, there has been strong criticism of the State Government about the huge number of feral cats in that State. The euthanasia rate of 3 200 out of 15 355 cats brought into shelters over the past 12 months gives an indication of the problem that exists in Victoria, and similarly there is a problem with the number of cats that we have in South Australia. It is estimated that in Melbourne alone there are up to 300 000 stray cats. I am not aware of the number of stray cats in South Australia, but there is a large number. We know that good hearted

people, caring people, feed these cats, throwing out rubbish to them, food scraps, and so on. As the cats multiply very quickly, considerable problems are created, not the least of which is conflict between neighbours.

So, I believe that the Government should be looking closely at the Victorian legislation, called the Companion Animals Bill, which is backed by the RSPCA. As I understand it, the objectives of the proposed Companion Animals Bill are: to promote responsible ownership of companion animals; to promote and protect the welfare of companion animals; to reduce the overbreeding of companion animals; to reduce the financial and physical pressures on animal pounds and shelter services; to encourage the development of an accessible network of animal shelters and services; to reduce situations where companion animals are causing nuisance to humans or animals and to provide effective ways to redress such situations; and to improve the standards of companion animal businesses with regard to the welfare of the animals handled.

There is a whole list of many other recommendations in this report. It worries me when I see the conflict that has been generated between neighbours over this matter. Only yesterday or last Friday a constituent from Seaton, who lives in a Housing Trust home, came to me with a friend very much concerned and annoyed about the nuisance of many stray cats that were on an adjacent property. This is not uncommon. When he went to the Woodville council, he was told that it had no power to trap those cats. He then went to the Health Department of the Woodville council, and he was told a similar story, that it was not within its powers to take these cats. I am not being critical of the council. He was encouraged by an officer of the council to go to see his local member of Parliament and ask that the legislation be amended.

Having said all this, I am much aware that, leading up to 1978-79, there was considerable agitation in the community over the Dog Control Act. I believe it would be gutless of me not to raise this matter in the Parliament despite the fact that what I say may upset some people. That is not my intention. I believe we should seriously consider the liberty of the number of cats that can be kept at a property. That is not to say that professional cat breeders should not have some exemption contained within the legislation but, nevertheless, it is important that Parliament considers this matter.

I would enjoin the Minister of Local Government and the Minister for Environment and Planning, together with my ministerial colleagues, to have a close look at this matter. Much has been said about the ways that cats can be controlled. Like many of my colleagues, I have made some strange remarks about them with a certain amount of levity, but it is a real problem in the community, and my constituents are demanding that the Government takes some action in an endeavour to try to reduce the nuisance caused by the cats. I am aware that many people, including the elderly and those who come home from hospital, rely on the companionship of such cats.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Recent publicity about the Government's attitude towards its job was cited in South Australian newspapers. In particular, a reference was made to Ministers who have shown progressively a degree of arrogance toward the electorate at large. I was concerned to read those public statements, and I am more concerned to personally experience the sort of arrogance that was alluded to. Members of Parliament have a number of ways in which they can solicit and obtain information for their constituents. Traditionally, and in the most businesslike way, I suppose, one is encouraged to write a request providing the appropriate back-up detail to the Minister from whom the information is being sought. That practice, whilst it is of a professional kind, has been treated somewhat tardily in recent times by several Ministers. In that context, I suppose 'recent times' dates back a year or two because, over that period, I have certainly noticed a reluctance by some ministerial offices to reply promptly in writing to members' correspondence.

The next avenue through which members of Parliament may seek such information is via the facility of the Notice Paper in the form of a Question on Notice, and one does not have to do much research in that respect to find that the number of Questions on Notice that drop off at the end of a session is steadily growing. Indeed, there are several ways in which Ministers have found to avoid answering questions of that kind.

The third method that members adopt each day that the Parliament is in session is via questions without notice. We all know what a politically grandstanding episode that has become in this place, and it is almost impossible for other than the frontbenchers on the Opposition side and a few marginal seat holders on the Government side to even have the opportunity to ask questions without notice in this House of Parliament. When those questions are asked, as I indicated earlier, they become somewhat of a subject of grandstanding in a Party political tone rather than for any other useful purpose.

The next method is by formal appointment with the Ministers and, on gaining such an appointment, one may have an eyeball to eyeball opportunity to seek the information required, either on behalf of their constituents or in the company of their constituents. I hasten to admit that today I sought from the Premier an appointment of some importance to me, to my constituents, and to the proponent of an alternative form of sea transport to Kangaroo Island. That appointment was requested for not later than Thursday week. Despite his position as Premier with the extremely heavy workload and responsibilities that he has, that appointment has been secured for 3.30 tomorrow afternoon. I mention that because it is fair to give some credit where it is due and where attention is being properly given to matters of community importance. However, matters of community importance have not been addressed as promptly or they have been addressed arrogantly by other Ministers, as previously described.

The last method adopted by members to obtain information for their constituents has, for many years, been via corridor discussion. In other words, members informally approach Ministers across the floor of the Chamber at convenient times of the session and/or in the corridor out the back where quiet conversations have traditionally taken place. I have found that that latter method has been useful, to say the least, and almost invariably totally reliable. In other words, in that unofficial situation when the Premier, Deputy Premier, Ministers or other members of the House have given undertakings in certain directions, invariably they have been upheld. It is a great pity that that sort of corridor discussion is not being continued as regularly and respectfully as it was when I came into this place and for a considerable time thereafter. It has not occurred so much in recent times; indeed, it is noticeably lessening.

Returning to the alleged arrogance of Ministers, as reported in the newspapers and as I, too, have noticed, I want to draw the attention of the House to a couple of examples where this has occurred. The first example is very parochial. It involves the operation of the Mosquito Creek school bus. Many members would not have heard of Mosquito Creek,

but they would have heard of Langhorne Creek and Strathalbyn. It is in that region of my electorate where a young man, Hans Levi, has been exposed publicly in the local press for his concern about the removal of a school bus service—one for which he had been the driver for a considerable time. The transfer is from the departmental services to a local contractor. One may wonder why, in the circumstances, I am not supporting the principle of engaging a contractor in preference to using the public system. In explanation, I draw the attention of the House briefly to the remarks of the local school principal following that decision. An article in the *Southern Argus* states:

> Despite appeals to keep the bus the department has gone ahead with a private contractor. This will affect the school's excursions. The departmental bus was available at any time for excursions and could be driven by suitably qualified staff members. This was charged to the school at departmental rates. Now we will be able to use Mr Taylor's bus, though we still have to negotiate costs and conditions. Alternatively, a staff member can travel to Strathalbyn to collect the departmental bus, but this will add a lot in time and distance, and therefore increase the cost. We don't have excess time for excursions so this would be a problem. Mr Taylor's [the new contractor] bus is only licensed to carry 66 passengers. We have 67 students this year plus teachers. So we cannot travel as a school like we used to on the departmental bus. The department has looked at the bus service only from the monetary point of view.

As I have said, this is a very parochial example and it would not mean very much to others. However, to the people concerned, it means a hell of a lot. The young man, Hans Levi, has tried on numerous occasions to speak with the Minister in relation to this issue but the Minister has, I believe, quite rudely, if not arrogantly, ignored him. I wrote to the Minister about this subject. I thought he would respond favourably, but, over an extended period, he has not. I wrote to him again today in that sort of unofficial manner described earlier, and to this time—in the closing minutes of the proceedings—I still have not had a response. It is a simple example, but I believe that it is a classic example of the sort of arrogance prevailing amongst certain members of the Ministry of this Parliament.

Likewise, the Minister for Environment and Planning completely refuses to meet people in relation to very sensitive matters. Not the least of which is the issue surrounding the proposed refuse dump in the Strathalbyn district. I believe that only some of the material proposed to go to that dump is recyclable. The opponents to the dump say that all of it is—on that point we part company. But those people, indeed, the Anti Dumping Committee in particular, have sought to meet with the Minister over a period of months to discuss their concerns. No less than four letters have been written to the Minister specifically asking her questions about this subject and requesting an appointment, and yet she continually refuses to concede.

Motion carried.

At 4.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 October at 2 p.m.