HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 March 1991

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

TEA TREE GULLY BY-LAWS

Notices of Motion, Other Business, Nos 5-7: Mrs Kotz to move:

That by-law No. 1 of the Corporation of Tea Tree Gully, relating to permits and penalties, made on 26 July and laid on the table of this House on 2 August 1990, be disallowed.

That by-law No. 2 of the Corporation of Tea Tree Gully, relating to streets and public places, made on 26 July and laid on the table of this House on 2 August 1990, be disallowed.

That by-law No. 3 of the Corporation of Tea Tree Gully, relating to parklands, made on 26 July and laid on the table of this House on 2 August 1990, be disallowed.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I do not wish to proceed with these motions.

Motions lapsed.

SRI LANKA

Consideration of the Legislative Council's resolution:

That this Council—

1. Condemns the persistent human rights violations by all sides including extrajudicial executions, 'disappearances' and torture in Sri Lanka which affect the population in both north and south and which are outlined in recent reports by Amnesty International;

2. Calls on the Government of Sri Lanka to:

(a) set up an independent commission of inquiry into extrajudicial executions, the result of which should be made public; and

(b) investigate impartially, through an independent commission of inquiry, the whereabouts or fate of all people reported to have 'disappeared';

3. While understanding the very real constraints placed upon the Sri Lankan Government by the conflict, urges the Government of Sri Lanka to ensure strict control, including a clear chain of command, over all officials responsible for apprehension, arrest, detention, custody and imprisonment as well as over all officials authorised by law to use force and firearms; and

4. Urges the Australian Government to seek whatever ways are appropriate to bring a halt to all human rights abuses carried out by all armed parties in Sri Lanka and urges all parties involved to exercise maximum restraint.

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

That the resolution be agreed to.

In this very important matter this House must consider matters of human rights that may or may not exist in another land. Even though it is not a matter that I have researched much, I think that we all realise that, if there is injustice in other countries, we need to speak of it and try to draw more people's attention to it. In saying that, I am conscious of the lack of recognition of human rights in many countries, even in our own.

I will not expand on that; I just remind the House that at times we need to look at what happens within our own community. We speak about Sri Lanka, South Africa or other places but, with respect to some of our traditional people, we have poisoned their wells, pushed them over cliffs and so on. I do not want to say any more about this resolution that has come from the other place, other than to ask the House to accept and support it.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Before we begin to pontificate about breaches of the rule of law in Sri Lanka, we owe the people of that country some understanding. Sri Lanka's undoubted human rights violations should be considered only after we have looked at its history and its current circumstances. Sri Lanka ought to be spared abstract pity and abstract judgments. It is not merely another Third World cause.

Sri Lanka, the resplendent island, lies off the south-east coast of India and, more importantly, off the coast of the Indian State of Tamil Nadu. Sri Lanka is 272 miles long and, at its widest point, is 140 miles across, yet it sustains a rapidly growing population of 16 million. Sri Lanka is a food importer, reliant for much of its foreign exchange on the export of tea. It comprises three major ethnic groups, and this is the foundation of the conflict in that country: 74 per cent of the population are Sinhalese Buddhists, 18 per cent are Tamil Hindus, and 7 per cent are Tamil-speaking Muslims. There is also a Christian minority.

Sinhalese, Tamil and English are the main languages. Five different systems of law cater to the various communal groups. Much of Sri Lanka's politics is fought along ethnic lines. Pseudo-historical race myths are employed by those who fight for power for the purpose of exalting one group and denigrating another. Known as Ceylon before 1972, Sri Lanka was a Portuguese and Dutch colony for centuries and, from 1804 until 1948, it was part of the British Empire. It became a republic in 1972, but remains part of the Commonwealth.

It has a directly elected President (currently Mr Premadasa) and a unicameral Parliament in which the majority party is the United National Party (UNP). The UNP is opposed among the Sinhalese by the JVP, a Marxist and integral nationalist Party based in the south and accustomed to using terrorism in its struggle against the Government. In the north and east of the island, especially on the Jaffna Peninsula, there is a seven-year old separatist insurrection by the Tamil Tigers.

Since 1984 the Sri Lankan army has grown from 12 000 to 60 000. As in any country with a civil war, the army is influential in the Government and most elements of the rule of law are suspended, including the law's effective application to the army. The war between the Government and the Tamil Tigers is a straightforward separatist war. The Tamil Tigers still have some support from the people in the northern and eastern regions of the island, although non-Tamils and Muslims comprise half the population of those regions.

Arms and fuel are supplied to the Tamil Tigers across the strait separating them from their Tamil brethren in southern India. The war between the Government and the JVP, which the Government appears to have won for now, resembles the so-called dirty war of the 1970s waged by the Tupamaros guerillas against South American Governments.

On 11 January last, the civil war between the Government in Colombo and the Tamil Tigers resumed. In the previous six months, during the truce, 4 000 people were killed in communal clashes. In these circumstances it should surprise no-one in this House that 40 000 people have disappeared during the civil war, that the Defence Minister was blown up earlier this month by a bus bomb (along with 33 bystanders), that the air force is bombing the Jaffna peninsula, that the Government advises people to flee the Jaffna region and that hundreds of thousands of Sri Lankans are refugees in their own country, unable to return to their home because of a well-founded fear of persecution.

Torture, extra-judicial execution and massacres are common and practised by all sides in the civil war. As in Argentina, a mothers' front has been formed to demand information about the 40 000 people who have disappeared

during the civil war. We know these things because of the tenacity and courage of Amnesty International, which has reported on Sri Lanka. The only party in the civil war that can be influenced by western public opinion is the Premadasa Government. Therefore, this motion, while condemning the outrages by all sides, is addressed principally to the Premadasa Government, as the only party with the means and the will to restore the rule of law. To its credit, the Government is holding 49 of its own soldiers on indictments for excesses in the fighting, but this problem is much bigger than that.

I support the motion to have the responsibility for murder and kidnapping ascertained. I support the call for the Colombo Government to restore a clear chain of command in the armed forces and for all parties to exercise restraint. I look forward to the restoration of peace and the rule of law in Sri Lanka, and I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I am very pleased indeed to support the motion and, as a member of the parliamentary group of Amnesty International, to recognise the bipartisan support that this House and the other place have invariably given to motions relating to civil rights as they apply universally. Briefly, in support of the remarks made by the member for Spence, I want to convey my own belief and that of many of my colleagues that there have been clear instances of human rights violations in Sri Lanka by both Government forces and the Tamil Tigers in the ongoing seven year war.

I am concerned that the Hawke Government continues to export arms to Sri Lanka, despite the continuing human rights situation there. My Federal colleague, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, Senator Robert Hill, has proposed that a Commonwealth working party should be established to help negotiate a cease fire in that country. The Australian Government, through Senator Gareth Evans, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, has taken up the proposal, and the Australian Council for Overseas Aid has endorsed the plan as being a constructive one.

Recent reports from fierce battles in Sri Lanka indicate that there has been an estimated death toll in fighting since June last year of no less than 4 800 citizens and that the death toll includes many hundreds of civilians. The Federal coalition has called on the Sri Lankan Government to institute a full investigation of abuses of human rights and urged it to take appropriate action to prevent further violation of the rights of the people. There have been enormous losses to property and to Government infrastructure, as well as loss of life. There has been enormous loss of export trade and damage to the export trade, notably to the tea industry and the agricultural and mining sectors, and of course to the important tourism sector, which has been—I hope not irreparably—severely damaged as a result of the fighting.

The motion as it is presented to the House condemns the persistent human rights violations. It calls on the Government of Sri Lanka to set up an independent commission of inquiry, and to investigate through that independent commission the whereabouts or fate of all people who are reported to have disappeared. This may seem—and indeed it is—a situation far from a State Parliament; nevertheless, as my colleague the member for Davenport said, 'When human rights are violated anywhere, they are violated everywhere'. It behoves those of us who live in a parliamentary democracy to note and condemn these violations and to urge that they be investigated and stopped. I conclude by urging the House to support the motion, which urges the Australian Government to seek whatever ways are appropriate to bring a halt to all human rights abuses carried out by all armed parties in Sri Lanka, and it urge all parties involved to exercise maximum restraint.

Resolution agreed to.

ENERGY SECTOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House notes the Green Paper on the Future Directions for the Energy Sector in South Australia and condemns the Government for—

(a) failing to recognise its responsibility to identify options which enable reductions of atmospheric carbon emissions in compliance with the Commonwealth Government commitment to the international community;

(b) failing to address the future energy needs of the multifunction polis;

(c) failing to supply factual information about the environmental, social and economic benefits of demand management techniques;

(d) the lack of factual information about the part which alternative and renewable energy forms can play in future energy supply;

(e) the lack of direction and initiatives relevant to energy conservation and fuel substitution;

(f) the lack of factual historical information about the recent attempts which have been made by the Government and its agencies in demand forecasting; and

(g) failing to outline the basic optional strategies for funding research and development needed to support the discovery of technologies for viable alternative energy sources.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3129.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): When I concluded my remarks in this debate on 21 February I had addressed the first three points contained in my motion. First, the Government's failure to recognise the necessity to reduce atmospheric carbon emissions (greenhouse gases) and, of course, that means a failure to comply with what our Federal Government has said to the international community about our determination to reduce such emissions by the year 2005. Secondly, I addressed the failure of the green paper to address the future energy needs of the multifunction polis. I point out to the House that no comment whatever is to be found anywhere in the green paper about the impact of the multifunction polis on future energy requirements for South Australia. Either the Government is fair dinkum about this development, or it is not. We will either have the multifunction polis or we will not.

The most basic commodity required for any such development is the energy to put together the components of the infrastructure. Of course, concrete will be necessary to make kerbing, culverts, and roads, and enormous amounts will be required in the raft footings—pier and beam will be no good whatever. Those soils are so saline and otherwise contaminated that they are very corrosive and, for a building erected on the site to have anything like a reasonable life, they will have to be of heavy raft construction so that they literally float on a sea of wet sand and provide some means by which we can secure against the risk of liquefacation when the earthquake comes—it is not a matter of if: it is a matter of when. That is some of the problem at West Lakes, but that is another matter altogether.

The energy required to make the infrastructure components will be substantially greater *per capita* for the number of people who can live and work there than for any other part of the metropolitan area, and most certainly well in excess of the *per capita* average. Thirdly, I addressed the point that there is not enough factual information about the demand management techniques that are available to us and their consequences for the enhancement of our environment, and the enhancement of social and economic

benefits that can be derived by using demand management techniques.

There is no list of those demand management techniques; there is no indication of which ought to be the highest priority in all the techniques that are available; and there is no statement of the necessity for public education so that members of the general public can effectively involve themselves in demand management. From time to time we hear a piecemeal dissertation of ideas, like the announcement of energy efficient appliances from zero to five stars in rating. That is a demand management technique that the Opposition has always not only supported but stated was necessary from the outset.

However, it is not good enough to do things in this piecemeal fashion. If we are to achieve a reduction in the growth that there has been in total demand in the domestic sector previously, we need a strategy for that and we need to know the options that are available to us. We also need to know which one we will introduce first and spend our dollars on. We need to know where the greatest gain can be achieved in reducing overall demand, not just demand for electricity or for gas but for all energy whether used for domestic, industrial or transportation purposes. We need a statement of that kind. The energy green paper was intended to address that matter, but it does not.

The fourth point upon which I wish to elaborate in greater detail is the lack of factual information about the part that alternative and renewable energy forms can play in future energy supply. In the green paper, at page 57, the Government proposes to:

Provide State funding as appropriate via the State Energy Research Advisory Committee (SENRAC)—

for those who would like to know what that word means—

and seek to attract State and Federal grants to undertake research, development and demonstration programs into renewable energy technologies.

Turning to page 65, under the subheading 'Choices for the Future', we find:

What level of research and development funding should the Government support in the development of alternative energy forms?

That is a question. It does not provide the options available, and that is what a green paper should do. Any fool can ask a question. We need some answers so that we can debate the issues. We need some factual information. We need some statements of the processes in decision-making which are to be involved. If you like, we need set out before us a decision tree which indicates the basic options available and what effect the choice of any one or more of those basic options will have on future options—the way it narrows down, as it were, in the elimination process to determine the course to be followed or the strategy to be adopted. The green paper states:

There are many alternative energy forms which could play a major role in the State's energy future.

What are they? The green paper continues:

Much national and international research is being undertaken on these alternatives. Is it reasonable to expect—

and this is a rhetorical question that we find recurring throughout the green paper—

that SA, with a small research infrastructure and only limited Government funds to spend on research of this type, could have a significant impact on the development of these alternatives?

That is in direct contravention of the statement on page 57 which said that we would. The question is posed:

Would it be better to utilise technological innovations developed elsewhere?

In other words, would it be better to sweat off and let somebody else pick up the tab? Further, the green paper states:

If SA is to support research in this area, which technologies and alternative energy forms should be supported.

Well, the Government in the green paper should list the alternative energy forms and the consequences of supporting each of them, so that we, as a community, can then debate which of those we would choose, not pose the rhetorical question without providing the backup information. It continues:

If SA is to support research in this area, which technologies and alternative energy forms should be supported? By what means should such support be given?

Clearly, the Government does not know what it wants to do; it does not know what the public would want it to do, and in this debate it is not providing the public with any background information that is at all relevant to the determination of the course of action we ought to follow. It is not helping to develop the consensus that will be necessary, yet it could have done so much.

The Government's green paper should have set out several decision tree models showing what options are available to choose from, and it should have shown the range of basic options from which we can begin to make that choice process. The paper outlines several research projects that have been undertaken by SENRAC, but nowhere does it provide any factual data nor any results of those experiments which provide alternative and renewable energy forms. It is just not there. What is more, nuclear and solid fuel cell are but two energy technologies that are not even an option due to current Government policies, that is, the ALP Left and Centre Left 'flat earth' type attitudes, based on emotion, not fact. They are more a statement of prejudice than of principle, more a statement of feeling and fiction than of fact.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The Left and the Centre Left, for the benefit of the member for Henley Beach and the member for Spence. It is a pity that even though significant breakthroughs have occurred in the development of these technologies, nowhere are those breakthroughs listed relevant to any of those technologies that could have been considered as future options. There is not even a recognition of the major change from fuel rod in the nuclear cycle to fuel B, so that no longer is it ever likely or indeed possible for a meltdown to occur. Fuel B technology makes the meltdown the really fearsome aspect of, albeit inadequate, powerhouse design technology, a subject of aversion in the public mind.

That could no longer happen if we were to adopt fuel B technology; meltdowns do not occur in the use of that technology. This is again an example of the shallowness and lack of depth the paper portrays. It is a pity, too, that the solid fuel cell is not given any reasoned consideration. Let us look at the next factor to which I have drawn attention in the context of this motion, that is, why we should condemn the Government in terms of the green paper for the lack of direction and initiatives relevant to energy conservation and fuel substitution.

The paper states that major efforts in conservation should be oriented or directed toward uses of transport fuels and electricity. These areas account for about three-quarters of consumer expenditure on energy in South Australia and, more importantly, about two-thirds of the carbon dioxide emissions from the entire energy sector. However, the paper does not give any direction or initiatives—again a big deficiency. By way of example, under 'Transport Sector', the opening sentence states:

Transport has a key role to play in planning for the future development of the energy sector.

The closing sentence is as follows:

If substantial gains are to be made in the transport sector then the community will need to fundamentally re-assess the manner in which it uses transport fuel.

But, it does not say how the community ought to do that—what the options are. How we can come to any conclusion in consequence of the stimulus of debate that should be provided by the green paper is beyond me. The Government's green paper fails yet again on that point.

The next point to which I draw the attention of the House is the lack of factual historical information about the recent attempts that have been made by the Government and its agencies in demand forecasting. It is a mess. The demand forecasting process is based largely upon an examination of the past relationship between energy demand and other factors, including possible economic fluctuations, industrial developments, population growth (or the lack of it), consumer preferences, energy prices, technological innovations, environmental constraints and climatic variations, that is, how bad the weather was or how hot or cold it was. The report states:

Forecast growth rates are greatest for electricity and petroleum products.

Keeping in mind that ETSA sales in 1989-90 grew at 5.6 per cent, the demand for total delivered energy in this green paper is predicted to be an average rate of 2.3 per cent until 1992-93 and then 1.6 per cent until 1998-99. It does not detail for us why that will or is likely to be so. It does not set out the formula by which such forecasts are determined; it ignores not only the 5.6 per cent last year but also the 4.8 per cent from the previous year. In both years the forecast was for something just over 2 per cent. If the forecasters within the Government's forecasting bureau can be so wrong, there is something wrong with their formula.

Why is the formula not provided and some discussion of the emphasis given to the factors in the formula so that the public can better understand why the difference exists between the forecast and the reality and then make decisions themselves about how to improve that formula and, more importantly, what the likely expansion of demand will be? I suggest to the House that, if we have the same kind of inaccuracy in demand forecasting over the next three years as we have had over the past two years, we will not have sufficient infrastructure, power generation capacity or gas supply capacity in South Australia to meet the need. There will be brown-outs like there have been whenever there have been extremes of weather in the past. The brown-outs were not occurring here in metropolitan area: they were occurring out in the area that I represent—the Murray-Mallee. That is not fair, because what we were told about why the power was shut down bore no resemblance whatever to the truth of the situation.

What is more, just because it is not electorally sensitive and the lines of communication out there are a bit longer, it is no reason for the Government to suppose that it is in any way likely to get away with it—not while I represent that area, anyway. More importantly, there is no social justice, no equity and no equal opportunity to those people who suffer the consequences of the incompetence of the Government when it fails itself and through its instrumentalities to meet its reasonable commitments to those three basic principles about which we have heard so much, increasingly more in recent times over this past decade.

If those words do mean anything at all, they ought to mean something for everyone, and they mean something for this Government when it seeks to gain support in the marginal seats in the metropolitan area. However, they ring very hollow indeed for the people of the kind whom I represent.

Let us then look at some of the things that currently occur. I will put on the record (because the paper does not) that at present South Australia's gas consumption pattern is a bit different from that of the other States. The reason therefore is not even discussed, and it ought to have been. This information ought to be contained in the report. South Australia uses about 30 gigajoules per capita, whereas Victoria uses 50 and New South Wales 20. Why is that so? That information should have been provided and a discussion about why it is so ought to have been provided so that we can know why things are different between ourselves and the other markets for that commodity and the way in which in consequence we can use or ignore their demand forecasting emphases.

My final point relates to the failure to outline the basic optional strategies for funding research and development needed to support the discovery of technologies for viable alternative energy sources. The report states:

In 1987, the Government completed an extensive review of [the State's Energy Research Advisory Committee's] objectives resulting in the identification of five areas of particular relevance for assistance: social and environmental aspects of energy use; small scale energy supply technologies; air-conditioning; low grade coals; [and] seismic exploration technologies. Together with a need for funding of projects dealing with renewable energy and energy efficient technologies, the above five areas remain the priority areas for directing energy research funds.

Again, that contradicts what we read back on page 65. It goes on to outline significant projects undertaken, but it does not give us any results. It says, 'This is what we are doing and this is what we have done,' but it does not say anything about cost; it does not provide us with any data; and it does not make any analysis of any data or put forward any recommendations.

Why on earth are we spending this money if we cannot get that information to assist us in our public discussion of our energy future? So, the green paper fails to give the public any issues to debate with respect to alternative energy sources. Let me give an example under the South Australian wind energy program. In a joint venture between the Office of Energy Planning and ETSA, the Government has undertaken a comprehensive wind monitoring project at a cost of about $200 000 at 30 sites around the State, 16 of the sites being within the ETSA grid and the remainder being in the remote communities, but no results of the survey are provided.

Cost estimates for wind generated electricity for both grid and remote area sites are not given. Why have we spent the money? Where are the data? Why can we not have them? If they are not relevant, the Government should say so and not go on kidding us that an option is available to us and, if it is relevant, it should provide us with the information so that we can fit it in with all the other information that ought to be provided to the public to enable that kind of debate to proceed.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes; where are the data? Why can we not have them? Is wind energy viable? We do not know. Are any more research funds and projects envisaged? We do not know, and the paper has said nothing about that, and neither has the Minister. It is an example, as I said at the outset, of this Clayton's green paper—it is the kind of green paper you have when you are not having a green paper. It contains a lot of words and it has cost a lot of money; it has been long in coming with a gestation period of more than 10 times that which was originally suggested; and it is distressing to me and all the people with whom I have discussions in what it fails to provide as much as what it

does provide, namely, inaccurate information. On the basis of both those aspects, the Government deserves the condemnation that in this motion I propose to visit upon it. The Minister deserves this most especially because it is the Minister who clearly must cop the buck when we finally leave it to rest.

I know that, upon assuming responsibilities as Minister of Mines and Energy, when we come to office, among other things I will still have many questions to which I will need to find answers and then to provide those answers to the public of South Australia so that we can have—albeit late in the day at that time—some reasoned discussion about our future, rather than to go on, like Topsy, just growing and not committing ourselves to an efficient, sensitive and realistic future, such as South Australians deserve and have provided for themselves in so many other areas of public policy in the past.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): We have just heard an exercise in nit-picking from the member for Murray-Mallee against the Government's green paper.

Mr Quirke: Did he find any nits?

Mr HOLLOWAY: No, not very successfully. He said a lot but I do not think he discovered very much. I oppose the motion moved by the member for Murray-Mallee. Apart from nit-picking, if the energy green paper had followed the lines outlined by the member for Murray-Mallee, it would have run into so many volumes that would not fit into this building.

Basically what he said was that we should put in the paper everything that has ever been known about every type of energy source and the methods for collecting the data, the analyses and everything else. It really is ridiculous that he is suggesting that any green paper should follow that line. A green paper is intended to be a discussion paper and to seek comment and community involvement. Green papers are never intended to put forward predetermined positions on a range of issues. Their purpose is to invite comments.

In relation to energy, the issues involved are very complex and extremely broad. The activities within the South Australian energy sector have a close relationship to other areas of government, such as planning, the environment, economic development, social justice, transport, housing and so on, and they are highly interdependent areas. They depend on events that occur at the national and international levels. This energy green paper raises a number of broad issues: the sources of energy to meet the State's future energy needs; ensuring that the energy sector contributes to the competitiveness of the State's industry; restricting the environmental impact associated with the production and use of energy; and restructuring the electricity and gas industries to optimise their efficiency. I will read from part of the forward to the green paper, because it sets out the context for this energy green paper. It states:

> Future energy planning must be flexible and will call for more imaginative approaches to both supply and consumption activities than have been considered necessary in the past. A main role of Government is to ensure that the conditions which prevail in the energy sector encourage its appropriate development. Explorers, suppliers, distributors and users all have a responsibility, within the often conflicting constraints imposed by the various interested parties, to ensure that the State's energy requirements are satisfied. Increased community awareness and commitment are essential to make a significant impact on patterns of energy use and thus on emission levels. Accordingly, greater public involvement in the planning process will be sought. To facilitate the consultation process, the Government has prepared this green paper.

With many of the issues that need to be considered for the State's future energy needs and the sources to meet those needs, and all the other related questions, we need to have the community involved in that process. The Government can implement policies to influence the activity of the public, but ultimately the energy levels consumed are those determined by the public's use. Therefore, if we are to change the direction in which we are going, we need to have the public involved in that process. The public needs to be involved in any changes that are made, and that is why it is important, particularly at this time with the greenhouse effect being discussed, to have an energy green paper that brings these matters out into the public arena for discussion and response, thus enabling the Government to come back later with its policies.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Since the member for Murray-Mallee talks about data, one question he raised in his contribution concerned the methodology used in collecting data. He would like this discussion on future directions for energy (which is to go out and create public awareness) to be bogged down in all sorts of details about the methods used by ETSA and the other energy authorities in collecting the data on energy demand. I point out that much of this detailed information sought by the member for Murray-Mallee is available through the Energy Information Centre and other bodies. That is where he should be going. The green paper, the discussion paper, should not be bogged down with all this extra information.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Energy forecasting is necessarily an imprecise science. I am sure that, if the member for Murray-Mallee has any suggestions, and believes that there are things that are being done wrong, or things that could be done better in terms of demand forecasting, he should speak to the people involved. I would like to point out that a report detailing the latest demand forecast for 1988-89 to 1998-99 was released by the Minister of Mines and Energy in 1990. So that information exists and, indeed, it is referred to in the bibliography of the green paper. So the information is there, yet the member for Murray-Mallee is suggesting that the green paper should be bogged down in discussing all of this sort of information about the details of how we should measure energy demand.

The member for Murray-Mallee made a number of specific points in his very long addresses over two weeks. I would like the opportunity at a later stage to answer in more detail those points, so I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 December. Page 2744.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is with a great deal of interest that I note the amendment Bill moved by the member for Hanson. It is unfortunate that he is not here so that I could take him to task but I understand that he is away on probably equally important business.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, an inference against an honourable member is not allowed under the Standing Orders, and when the honourable member being complained about is on parliamentary duties overseas—

Mr Hamilton: I just said that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Why start to pull him about in the first place?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I take the point of order as made in that the honourable member concerned is away on parliamentary business. In the first place, I wish that the references were not made but, if they are made, that they be qualified by an explanation.

Mr HAMILTON: I accept your guidance, Sir. I must say that I was trying to be charitable to the member for Hanson and placed it on the record that he was away on parliamentary duties. I was going to go on to say—and I think *Hansard* will record—'a matter of equal importance' to this State. Whilst I understand his loyalty to his colleague, I think the member for Light was over-zealous in trying to jump down my throat but Here's Humphrey is not dead yet.

Having said all that, I would like to say that I believe that this amendment has been a political stunt because, quite frankly, within the Act there are those penalties available. The penalties are there and anyone who looks through the appropriate Act will understand that those penalties have been provided. We will not substantially change the law in any way by these amendments.

Let us have a look at the amendments that the honourable member wants to introduce in this particular Bill. I believe that what the honourable member is trying to do is to tell judges not once, but twice, what they should be doing in terms of these particular Acts. I think that, perhaps, the judges could take offence to that.

In terms of clause 3 (3) what the honourable member is proposing is a penalty that already exists. It is an option that he is putting forward.

When looking at penalties, I suggest that we look at the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. Under 'Sentencing powers of Children's Court', section 51 (1) *(ab)* provides:

> upon convicting the child—
> (i) impose a sentence of a specified number of hours of community service to be performed by the child;
> (ii) direct that the child be under the supervision of an officer of the department for the duration of that sentence:

I was appalled, as were many others, when last year three juveniles were accosted on the Outer Harbor line. I not only expressed my dismay to the Attorney-General but wrote to him requesting that that section of the Act be deleted not so that a child could be convicted but so that the Children's Court, where a child is found to have committed an offence could, without imposing a fine, require the offender to do community service—and quite properly so. On page 2744 of *Hansard* of 13 December 1990, the honourable member stated:

> I have always believed that the parents of children who damage people's property should be liable for that damage.

The hypocrisy of the honourable member! We all know that last year in this Parliament that belief was not supported by members of the Opposition. Now we have this complete somersault. Members opposite with such gyrations could get a job in the circus any time, in more ways than one. It is just a clown act, that is all it is. It is beat-up publicity to try to suggest that the Government is not doing enough.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Light made a point earlier and it was said that it was a little premature. However, I point out to the House that the honourable member is absent: he is not here to defend himself, and I believe that the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order. There is no point of order. It is not unparliamentary to use that term although it is perhaps distasteful to some members. I am not quite sure whether the reference was directed toward the honourable member, but I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr HAMILTON: I wonder sometimes whether this is a kindergarten or whether it is a place where members are allowed to stand up and have their say.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, and to clarify my mind for future reference, is it legitimate for another member to impugn a member who is absent from the Chamber on parliamentary business by calling him such things as a 'clown'?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat. I have just explained that I heard that part of the debate and in my opinion the words used were 'it is a clown act'. I do not think that that comment was directed specifically at the honourable member but at the action of attempting to change the legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Obviously this is distasteful to members of the House, so I ask the honourable member to be careful with the words he uses. If offence is taken, the Chair will have to take notice of that fact.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Sir. I take notice of the sensitivity of members opposite to this particular issue because, quite clearly, they are not prepared to allow someone such as myself, who has stood up in this place over a period of 11 years, to direct my attention to the issue of law and order. I remember the filthy and disgusting advertisements when I stood for preselection as a member of this place in 1979. I do not forget; I have a long memory. Of course, as in the case of Paddy's dog, they can dish it out but cannot take it.

However, I do not want to be distracted from the issue we are debating, which is what the Government is doing in this State in terms of law and order. May I remind the House, for those members who are not capable, are thick and do not read the papers, that at a crime prevention meeting in the northern suburbs on Thursday 28 February of this year the Attorney-General said:

> The other area of sentencing where I do have concern, and it's not an easy one to resolve, is in the area of the juveniles, that is those who continue to come back before the courts time and time again. The juvenile justice system in South Australia has worked well in one respect. We have reduced the incarceration rate for juveniles, and the reason for that is that if you put the young people into a prison environment they are not going to come out of it anything other than criminals. If they mix with other criminals, then they get worse. Prison doesn't generally rehabilitate. Some 87 per cent of juveniles who come into touch, in contact, with the criminal juvenile system through juvenile aid panels don't return to the court. So, for the great majority the system works.
>
> They don't reoffend, but I'm happy to concede that the real problem area is that other 10 per cent or so where they continue to reoffend, they continue to get back before the court, and that's the area where I don't think the system at the present time is coping. I don't have an instant solution of how to overcome that particular problem but I'm prepared to acknowledge it, that sentencing policies dealing in particular with those recidivist juveniles; that is, those maybe under 16, but probably generally over 16, who have offended, come back, come back and come back again, and at no point in time does it appear that they are actually having a penalty imposed on them or having it brought home to them that they ought to be taking greater responsibility.
>
> We have increased the penalties for juveniles in legislation recently in Parliament. We did include provision for community service orders, which was designed to provide, and there are funds to back this up, for juveniles to be given discrete community service orders to clean up graffiti, repair vandalism, etc., but what we've found, and we are going to correct it in the next session, is that it requires a conviction to be recorded before that com-

munity service order will operate. And, of course, in a juvenile court, convictions are often not recorded, at least not for very young children, and they can return and return again without having a conviction recorded. So, we will change the legislation to ensure that community service orders can be imposed even though no conviction is recorded. So that is one step to address the problem of sentencing of juveniles.

I thank the House for allowing me to read that into the record, because it is very important. Another area I think is very important is this: you can come down with a big stick on some of these kids, but it is like belting your head against the wall. No-one in this place can accuse me of not having addressed the law and order issue since I have been in Parliament.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, we all know who introduced Neighbourhood Watch and many other issues into South Australia. Let us look at the real reasons why we have these particular problems. The silvertails opposite, who have been brought up without really knowing what it is like to battle, do not really understand the problems in the real community. They stand up here and pontificate about what they would do, yet their record between 1979 and 1982 was dismal. In terms of law and order, it was appalling. One has only to look back at the record to see how pathetic their contribution to law and order in this State really was.

Let us come back to the real issue. You can come down on these kids with a big stick if you like. Along with the member for Henley Beach, I have been involved in organising meetings in the western suburbs. We have had police inspectors down there, we have had the Attorney-General down there as well, we have been out on patrols with police officers and we have had meetings with different groups in the community to try to address these problems.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I wish that noise would go away, because it is distracting.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, I will not say that he is a clown. The real issue is to address those areas and try to find those kids who are genuinely interested in urban art. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr M.J. Evans:

That the regulations under the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 relating to exemptions from expiration, made on 20 December 1990 and laid on the table of this House on 12 February 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 7 March. Page 3379.)

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): In seeking to conclude my remarks on this matter today, it has come to my attention since I moved this motion on 7 March that the Government is considering reviewing the Subordinate Legislation Act to ensure that the difficulties, which have been created by the impossibility of extending regulations for a limited period of time under that Act are eliminated, so that regulations can be extended for a short period—say, 12 months—while a review takes place. Unfortunately, as it stands, the Act only allows regulations to be exempted indefinitely from the automatic expiration which the Subordinate Legislation Act normally provides. This is clearly a much more desirable process, and I think that, if we are able to bring that to a conclusion, the processes envisaged by the Subordinate Legislation Act, where there would be a regular review of regulations, can be properly put into effect.

With respect to the Lottery and Gaming Act regulations, which are of principal concern to me in this matter, I commend to the Government the option, which was adopted by the Subordinate Legislation Committee yesterday, of a brief amendment to the principal regulations, providing that they would expire on some specified date later this year—perhaps 1 September or 1 October—which would ensure that a sunset provision in those regulations was able to take the place of what the Subordinate Legislation Act itself should have been able to do. That would cure the difficulties with those regulations, and would then, of course, allow this matter to be discharged, if that were the will of the House, since the matter would have been adequately dealt with. I commend the proposal to the House on that understanding and on that basis.

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

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That the regulations under the Planning Act 1982 relating to coastal development and commission powers, made on 14 February and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3129.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): We support the proposition that the regulation should stay as it is; therefore, we oppose the motion moved by the member for Heysen. The member for Heysen, in moving the disallowance of regulations made on 14 February 1991 under the Planning Act, stated that he was concerned that no opportunity was provided for the House to debate, disallow or amend the regulations. The honourable member did indeed debate the regulations. He has tried to disallow them and, during the course of his debate he did not indicate in any way his wish for amendments to the regulations.

His only contribution was to seek outright rejection of the proposals and, in doing so, he cast reflections on local government. He suggested that local government would make inappropriate decisions and that parochial considerations were likely to take precedence over State problems. I am surprised that the member for Heysen would be so critical of local government. The honourable member and his colleagues must get used to the fact that the Local Government Association is the negotiating body for councils, and full consultation took place with that organisation before the measure that is before us was introduced.

The changes are welcomed by local government and are totally consistent with the Local Government Association's 1990 policy manual. They are also supported by the Royal Australian Planning Institute (South Australian Branch). The changes arise from a working party comprising the then President and current Secretary of the Local Government Association, the Chairman of the South Australian Planning Commission and the Director of the Planning Division of the Department of Environment and Planning. The amendments were endorsed by the Planning Commission as appropriate changes to its role, and supported by the Minister's Advisory Committee of Planning.

The charge laid by the member for Heysen that no consultation took place is a nonsense. The difference between this side of politics and the other side is that we are at least able to make decisions. The matter before the House is an example of this. All the shadow Minister is concerned with is maintaining the *status quo*.

The other point the member for Heysen made concerned the alleged strain on council resources. It is crystal clear that under the old system there was duplication with a council considering applications and advising the commission of its position. Now that councils are the controlling authorities, they can simply decide on applications instead of advising. The double handling is eliminated without councils having to consider proposals not previously before them. I believe this is another instance of microeconomic reform, where we save money in both the State Government and local government sectors. Because of these reforms, I cannot understand why these proposals are not accepted by the shadow Minister.

Members can be assured that councils cannot approve a range of developments contrary to the rules in the development plan. Inappropriate development is prohibited throughout the affected sensitive areas. Should a council wish to approve a prohibited development, in the light of local knowledge, it must seek the Planning Commission's concurrence. Thus, while the administration has passed to local government, the commission maintains effective control. The Opposition can make wildly extravagant suggestions, but the Government is conscious of the need continually to improve the efficiency of the development control system and remove duplication and waste. The previous system involved both duplication and waste.

The criticism of the timing of the release of the detail of the regulation by the member for Heysen is churlish and unnecessary. The honourable member has had the opportunity to debate the matter—witness the present debate. The Minister cannot win. If she holds up the regulation, she is accused of delay; and, if she puts it forward, she is accused of putting it forward at the wrong time in order to stifle debate. I believe that the shadow Minister is really in favour of this regulation, but he has put up an argument for the sake of his yuppie colleagues in another place. Much of the noise has been put up by the Hon. J.C. Irwin and the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner in another place, and most of their argument is illogical.

It is time that the shadow Minister explained to his colleagues that he is in charge in this area and that they should step back and allow him to take control. The shadow Minister should explain to them that he is the expert in this area and he is the one who should be making the decisions. This regulation should be supported by the Parliament. It reduces the cost by saving on duplication. It strengthens the decision-making power of local government and signals to it that Parliament is prepared to allow it to make significant decisions in the planning area. It maintains all the significant protections for sensitive areas.

The Premier's planning review also supports the change as being consistent with the emerging vision for the most appropriate development control system for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: It is extremely pleasant to see the shadow Minister in the House at last. The fundamental principles for this vision were initially canvassed in the July 1990 'Issues Statement' entitled '20:20 Vision'. Public comment on that document has been assessed and has been published for community debate. The new regulation should be supported by everybody in this Chamber.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

COASTAL SAND-DUNES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

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

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1187.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I note the motion of the member for Hayward in relation to the preservation of the coastal sand-dunes at Somerton Park. I can appreciate some of his concerns because of the problems that we have in some parts of the western suburbs of Adelaide. As environmentalists—as most of us in this place are—we are very concerned about the need to preserve our sand-dunes. I recall many years ago, long before coming into this place, the furore that erupted in the western suburbs by a group called SOS—Save Our Sand-dunes. I believe they were correct at the time, considering the problems that are now being experienced in some parts of my electorate, which have resulted from building on sand-dunes not only in the 1970s, but prior to that. To use a biblical saying: 'As you sow, so shall you reap.'

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I acknowledge the support of the member for Custance; I am pleased that he is giving support to what I am saying. Many of the world's sandy beaches are eroding. There are areas along Adelaide's coastline where the sand-dunes are being eroded. This is not unusual—it has been an ongoing feature of Adelaide beaches for, I am informed, the past 3 000 years.

The strategy of the Coast Protection Board, for the protection of the coastline and the preservation of Adelaide beaches over the past 18 years, has been sand replenishment with rock protection as the last line of defence. This has been successful, as can be judged by the massive damage that occurred prior to the board's work. It is sad that our predecessors allowed properties to be built on sand-dunes. We are certainly paying one hell of a price for it, and the taxpayers of this State will, in the future, increasingly pay more and more for it. Some years ago a resident decided, with the support of the local council—and I opposed it very strongly as did many of my constituents—to build a residence right out almost on to the beach itself.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: As the member for Henley Beach points out, almost out to the high water mark. It will not be long—it will be in my lifetime—before that resident comes to me and says, 'We want Government help. We want protection. My house will be washed into the sea.' It is sad that I was unable to do anything, try as I may, to support the views of my local constituents. I think it is an indictment of the bad planning of the past and of our predecessors, although I know it is easy to be wise in hindsight.

Apart from holding the beaches in many areas, dunes have actually been re-formed in the Brighton-Seacliff area. Certainly more work is to be done in stemming erosion in certain areas, but this must be done in the reality of the economic conditions that prevail. This is where I have a lot of sympathy for the member for Hayward—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Not personally for him—I do not mean anything untoward—but in terms of the issue he has raised. I understand what the member for Hayward is trying to do. I know that he understands the economic conditions that presently apply, and I can appreciate the reasons for his bringing this matter before the House. Sand replenishment from dredging of offshore sources is a very popular initiative for coastal residents and councils alike, but it has

not been without additional cost, and more funds have been allocated to the board over the past three years to implement this work.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I concur with my very knowledgeable colleague the member for Henley Beach about the need to have the barge. The board's strategy is to work with nature and not against it. In the past rocks that, as a last resort, have been placed along the beachfront to reduce erosion have compounded that problem. I know from bitter experience in my electorate that some sand-dunes that were eight, nine or 10 feet high when I came into this Parliament in 1979 have now disappeared; and, as I have said before, that is sad.

As I said, we are paying a heavy price. Taxpayers and future generations are paying a heavy price for the lack of vision by our forebears. Returning to the board's strategy of working with nature and not against it, there are no easy one-off solutions to coastal protection. As we all know, the sea moves the sand relentlessly and one does not have to go as far as Britain to see the effects of groynes, as Mr Maxton indicated in his letter on the disappearing dunes in the Messenger Press *Portside* of 14 November last year.

There are examples in Australia, for instance the Gold Coast, where groynes have been shown to be expensive protection measures with evident shortcomings, and sand replenishment is the strategy now adopted. Many years ago when I was in Opposition I initially supported the erection of groynes in parts of my electorate, but I was quickly disabused of that by the then Minister for Environment and Planning. That was the only good thing he ever did, and his staff advised me that groynes were not the way to go.

As I indicated previously, there are many examples of the inadequacy of groynes. Groynes have their place, but they are not applicable in this situation. The board has assisted councils with the construction of groynes at Robe and Beachport where they have been successful, but even in these locations periodic replenishment of sand is necessary.

Finally, the board and the Government are confident that the current strategy of sand replenishment with some rock protection is the most cost-effective way of working with nature to preserve our magnificent beaches and coastal properties. It is, nevertheless, a strategy that is sensitive to the moving sand and changed circumstances, such as rising sea levels, and therefore is subject to continuous investigation.

In common with many members of this House I have sought information from my colleagues on this issue because it is a serious one, a matter that impacts not only on those people living near beaches but on all South Australians because of the decisions that this and any other Government will make concerning the protection of our coast and our beaches.

I have had much experience in working with the board over many years and I must say that I have not found it wanting. The board knows what it is doing. Its work is well researched and I place on record my appreciation of the wonderful work of Mr Rob Tucker and his staff throughout my involvement with the board. I understand what the member for Hayward is on about, but at this time the Government is doing as much as it can. Therefore, I regret that I am unable to support his motion.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In closing the debate I thank members on both sides of the House for their contribution. I acknowledge that many members on the Government benches supported the spirit, at least, of the motion. However, I must record my disappointment that the Government is unable to support it. I say that, presuming that those members opposite who contributed spoke for the Government, because I note that the Minister did not enter the debate. I express my disappointment, because the motion was carefully worded so as not to impose a financial encumbrance that the Government could not bear. The position of the State's finances is the province of the Government of the day. It is its job to allocate money as it sees fit.

The purpose of this motion is not to tell the Government how much, when and where to allocate money: it quite clearly provides that this House urges the Government to ensure the restoration and preservation of the sandhills at Somerton Park. The matters of cost and timing are quite rightly left to the Coast Protection Board, to the Government and, I suspect, also to local government which, in this case, is the Brighton council. I acknowledge the work that has been done already by Minda Home, which is the freehold owner of part of the land to the high water mark, by the Brighton council and by the Coast Protection Board. However, it is worth recording that the director of Minda told me that, in the past 20 years, 38 metres of that beach has been lost. There are two or three severe blow-throughs from Minda Home and I suspect, along with my colleague the member for Albert Park, who has just resumed his seat, that, within not too many years, some of the buildings of Minda Home may well be endangered because of the continued erosion of those sandhills.

I believe, as members oppposite believe, that the sandhills are very important to the heritage and history of the South Australian coastline. I believe that they should be preserved. This motion does not seek to prescribe a time limit for the Government; it does not seek to bind the Government in terms of cost; it seeks only to record the opinion of this House and especially of those members opposite who represent as I do electorates that have a seaboard component.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I did not realise that the District of Briggs has a seaboard component, as the Minister points out. I would hope that I have his support as well as that of all members who have spoken and who have a seaboard component in their electorate. I repeat: this motion is not to bind the Government or to denigrate the work that it has done; it is merely to see that the will of this House is expressed and that the Government knows that this House thinks that the preservation of the few remaining sandhills along our coastal seaboard is a matter of significance and importance. Even were this motion passed, there would be a long way to go. The board of Minda owns the freehold to the high water mark, which in itself must be a most unusual position in metropolitan Adelaide. Part of the remaining areas is a road reserve, leased by Minda from the Brighton council. So, this motion would not be an ending; it would not even be an answer; but it would be a beginning. Therefore, I ask the Government to reconsider its position and support the motion.

Motion negatived.

VIDEO MACHINES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.G. Evans:

That in the opinion of this House the State Lotteries Act 1966 must be amended to allow for hotels and clubs to operate video machines as described in the regulations under the Casino Act 1983 as from 1 July 1991.

(Continued from 7 March. Page 3388.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I take the opportunity this morning to talk about the Casino regulations as they relate to video gaming machines and to put my point of view as to what ought to be happening in this case and, more importantly, what ought to be happening in relation to the whole video gaming machines argument right across the State. I find it quite incredible that we have seen in the newspapers of this State over the past few days comments made by the Casino authority that video poker machines—or gaming machines, as they are called—will be introduced into the Casino without this Parliament's finally deciding whether or not it should support these regulations.

That is a contempt of this Parliament. It is something about which every member of this place should stand up and protest. I am not at all concerned whether or not this Parliament decides to pass these regulations but, as stated by the member for Alexandra the other evening, when individuals representing the casino invite people to special occasions for the release of these machines, it is abhorrent and we, as a Parliament and not as individuals, should not accept that situation.

Having made that comment, I believe that, if video gaming machines are to be introduced into the State, they should be available to all licensed premises. The casino, licensed clubs and hotels should have the opportunity to have these machines. In the short time that I was shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport, I saw a significant move away from entertainment in clubs and their facilities because of the introduction of the casino to this State. When the casino was set up, the Premier promised that some of its income would go back to the clubs and their facilities. That has not occurred, and I am concerned that we will see a further drift away from community clubs and facilities with the introduction of these video gaming machines into the casino. That is not acceptable. I believe we ought to consider a total involvement of these machines in the community or not at all.

Personally, I am in favour of seeing them introduced into all facilities because, if people wish to avail themselves of any gambling opportunity, it ought to be legal and available in the widest possible way for all the community to benefit from or be part of the operation of any gaming machines. I find it unacceptable that again we will give the casino, which I support and believe is a marvellous institution in this State, a privileged position when, if this Parliament decides to do so, video gaming machines are introduced into this State.

I hope the Government will consider my major thrust, which is to recognise that all sporting, social and community clubs have a significant benefit to each individual community, whether they are in the northern, southern, eastern or western suburbs, and these machines should be introduced into them at the same time. I recognise the fact that the casino is now significantly advanced in the introduction of these machines and, within 12 months, we should allow all clubs to include them in their facilities. Although I intend to support these regulations, I call on the Government to make sure that the same facilities are available to all licensed premises in the community.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I add my support to the comments of my friend and colleague the member for Bragg and place on the public record my attitude to this question of video poker machines being introduced into clubs and hotels. Initially, I opposed the introduction of poker machines into the casino but, now that it is a fact of life that they are being introduced into the casino, it is my considered view that their introduction should be extended into clubs and hotels. I think it is grossly unfair to clubs and hotels that only one organisation in this State is operating the machines.

Mr S.G. Evans: It is an absolute monopoly.

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Davenport says, it is an absolute monopoly. It is a grossly unfair monopoly, which we should not tolerate. The impact of these machines will be enormous. The latest estimate from just some 800 of them shows that there will be a turnover of $250 million going through the machines. That will be $250 million less that will be spent in clubs and hotels and that much less spent in the three racing codes; also it will mean that less money will go to charities. It can be argued, I suppose, that there will be some new money in that $250 million, but the reality is that $250 million will be circulating through those machines.

Clubs and hotels are having a hard time at the moment in business. The number of patrons coming through the doors has been diminishing and, most certainly, when we see the facility available at the casino, we realise that thousands of people will flock through the casino's door to play on the machines, and that means that thousands fewer people will be fronting at the bars of sporting clubs and hotels. Sporting clubs have contacted me and made very clear that they would like to see the machines in their premises.

Some members may have already been told (because they would have contacts in the clubs) that I wrote to 1 200 sporting clubs recently asking them to express an opinion, and I will make that information available to the House when it has been collated so that it will assist members in making their decision. But, already every club that has responded to me has said it would like to see these machines introduced in their club.

I suggest that, if the Government has any sense at all, it will move, now that it has put those machines into the casino, to open it up for clubs and hotels immediately. It is the most logical way to go. As the member for Davenport has been saying consistently throughout this whole debate for many, many months, there is no way that we can tolerate a monopoly which, indeed, we will see at the casino. Indeed, nor can we tolerate the certain profits from the machines going outside Australia. That should strike at the heart of every member in this Chamber so that the profits from these machines will be retained within South Australia and start producing facilities for the people who use these sporting clubs. I am very comfortable with the course of action that the member for Davenport has taken since he moved this motion last year. It has brought into the arena a public debate on the subject, which has been necessary.

In conclusion, I would say that, from the overwhelming correspondence that I have received, there is no doubt in my mind that the clubs and hotels want this to happen, and they do not want to be left like shags on a rock with all the turnover going through the Casino and nothing going through for their own benefit and income; nor do they want to see a reduction in the number of patrons coming through their front doors. I will support the passage of the regulation allowing the machines to go into the casino, because I believe that the battle in relation to putting machines in the casino has been lost. But, I am doing it knowing that, once the machines are in the Casino, I will be a public advocate for the admission of the machines into clubs and hotels.

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

SEACLIFF HOCKEY AND TENNIS COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to commit itself to a hockey and tennis complex at Seacliff and calls on the Government to intervene immediately to prevent the loss of $230 000 Federal funding and $30 000 local government funding together with land and buildings, all of which have already been committed towards the complex.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3127.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

Leave out all words after 'House' and insert 'urges the State Government to intervene to ensure that the $230 000 in Federal funding to the Seacliff Tennis Club and the Happy Valley Hockey Club is used for a Southern Region hockey/tennis sports complex.'

As the member for Bright has said, Federal funds amounting to $180 000 have been allocated to the Happy Valley Hockey Club for the establishment of a synthetic pitch and Federal funds of $50 000 have been allocated to the Seacliff Tennis Club. Owing to financial and planning activities at the Byards Road complex, the Happy Valley club is now pursuing the development of a combined hockey/tennis club at Brighton using the Federal moneys totalling $230 000 that have been made available to both of these clubs.

During 1990, the Brighton council advised the Department of Recreation and Sport that there was still a shortfall of funds for this project and it requested a contribution from the State Government. The Department of Recreation and Sport's policy of funding State associations and not individual clubs or organisations is one that precludes it from assisting in this regard. The Minister of Recreation and Sport and other members on this side of the House are keen to support the establishment of a sporting facility in the southern region and to ensure that these Federal funds are used for that purpose. This will be achieved only after consultation with and the support of the State associations involved.

The Minister established last year the southern regional recreation facilities task force, which reported to him in June last year. The report identified and established the need for a league football oval, turf cricket oval, synthetic hockey pitch and a synthetic tennis surface in this area. The task force reported to the Minister as follows:

It would seem logical that league football and cricket share facilities, and that hockey and tennis facilities be linked. It is considered vital to the viability of the complex that the SANFL give a firm commitment to schedule league fixtures there on an on-going basis. However, if there is no such commitment, this will need to be taken into account in determining whether provision should be made for a league football oval, as South Adelaide Football Club's request for inclusion could then be deemed as being at local/club level.

The task force supports the Happy Valley Hockey Club's establishment of an artificial hockey pitch. However, since the Hockey Association regulates that all A grade matches must be played on artificial surface pitches, the task force believes that southern clubs are severely disadvantaged by the lack of synthetic pitches. A facility at Brighton would be situated on the northern boundary on the southern region of council's area and access from other parts of the region are difficult when using public transport. Also, a pitch at Brighton would meet immediate needs, but further facilities are required in the southern area of the region. This is logical, especially when compared to the fact that there are five synthetic pitches located in the northern metropolitan area. The facility proposed at Brighton is also dedicated to a club, and not an association.

The South Australian National Football League has not given and will not give a firm commitment to schedule league football matches in the south. It is not true that the Government is not committed to the establishment of sporting facilities in the southern area; in fact, the Department of Recreation and Sport is working on this project as a matter of urgency to ensure that the Federal funds are used in the south.

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

RURAL YOUTH

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House recognises the importance of the South Australian Rural Youth organisation, deplores the reduction of resources to the organisation by successive Governments and urges the Government to recognise the cost effectiveness of the training function of Rural Youth by providing incentive based grants designed to attract private sector funding to assist worthwhile projects for the benefit of rural youth in South Australia.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3130.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

To strike out 'deplores the reduction of resources to the organisation by successive Governments and urges the Government to recognise the cost effectiveness of the training function of Rural Youth by providing incentive-based grants designed to' and insert in lieu thereof 'and urges Governments to recognise the training function of Rural Youth by continuing to provide support which can.'

The Rural Youth Movement of South Australia, since its formation as far back as 1952, has been supported by the Government of South Australia. The support has been in the form of administrative, advisory and training support provided by officers of the Department of Agriculture, and details of that are given in Mr P.N. Gray's report 'A History of the Agricultural Bureau, Women's Agricultural Bureau and Rural Youth Movement in South Australia 1888 to 1985.' The recognition that this Government places on the Rural Youth Movement is indicated by the level of funding currently allocated to the organisation—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: —and that is over $50 000 per annum, for the benefit of the honourable member opposite who interjected. The training provided for rural young people has diversified to meet their changing needs. Obviously, there is a real need for that. Some of these needs, particularly in the larger regional centres (for example, in my own electorate), are met by programs conducted by the Youth Affairs Division of the Department of Employment, Technical and Further Education, and I have firsthand knowledge of that, being a Past President of the council of DETAFE in Port Augusta.

The agricultural training function previously conducted by Rural Youth has now largely been assumed by DETAFE through courses such as the on-the-farm training scheme.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: That has been very successful, again answering the interjection of the honourable member opposite. As well, DETAFE provides a range of vocational and other courses to meet the very varied needs of rural young people. However, it is beyond the scope of a small organisation such as Rural Youth, with its very limited curriculum development resources, to provide such training, and that is why DETAFE does that.

I believe it to be appropriate that such courses be provided by DETAFE, as it gives all young people access to courses, rather than restricting the training to members of one organisation. At a later stage I will give more details of the actual courses that are provided, and the funding. The Rural Youth Movement currently has private sector sponsorship for a range of programs, competitions and exchange awards. In recent years and in the current economic climate,

of course, private sponsorship has, for obvious reasons, become increasingly difficult to obtain.

In order to ensure the long-term viability of the exchange programs, in 1989 the Rural Youth Exchange Foundation was formed. Private individuals—and this includes some of my parliamentary colleagues—groups and corporate bodies can and do contribute through membership of the foundation. Each year Rural Youth receives a significant contribution towards its training programs from grants from a range of trust funds and granting bodies. In 1990-91 this came to $13 500, and it should be recognised that this funding is in addition to the Government's allocation of $50 000.

The cost effectiveness of this external funding is increased by the support given by the Department of Agriculture, that is, the salary of the Training Coordinator and the actual administrative support that has been offered to the organisation. As well as that, the opportunity now exists for private organisations to fund training programs either wholly or partly, and the effectiveness of such funding would be enhanced by the work of the Training Coordinator, which is funded elsewhere. However, notwithstanding that, it should be borne in mind that private organisations involved with programs for rural youth, and hence the Department of Agriculture, should really not be able to use that just for commercial advantage.

I mentioned some of the funding that can be obtained through the Minister of Youth Affairs, and I will refer to some of it now. State Youth Affairs has provided the following resources to rural young people. The first of those is the youth leadership training scheme, which aims to increase the participation of young people in decision-making processes. A sum of $1 350 was provided to the Rural Youth Movement in South Australia for funding to support a youth leadership skills workshop in December 1990. The State Youth Strategy has established regional offices in Whyalla—and for the benefit of the member for Custance, also in Port Pirie—and I have already spoken with the person in charge of that enterprise. In each region, coordinating committees are meeting to determine regional youth strategies, and I am sure that if the member for Custance would like to see me afterwards we could have a chat with the regional coordinator in Port Pirie regarding some of his problems.

Youth assistance grants are being provided to disadvantaged young people between the ages of 15 and 18 years. Youth strategy grants are being provided for projects to assist groups or communities. A senior project officer is assigned to each region. Referring specifically to Port Pirie, which is a common interest area for both myself and the member for Custance, currently a considerable degree of research is being undertaken on issues facing young people who are in at risk situations, and cooperative ventures between agencies and workers are currently being undertaken to focus on such issues as income support and finding effective ways of working with various groups of people, for example, Aboriginal young people, who are leaving school at an early age, teenage mothers, young offenders and young people in need of supportive accommodation.

In Whyalla an Aboriginal support committee has been formed to ensure that effective advice is provided on Aboriginal youth issues and various programs are under way, including participation in an expo at Ceduna, an independent living support scheme that assists young people on low incomes to budget for and purchase basic items, planning for a youth radio training scheme, and a resource centre mural. That strategy office is actually collocated with the local Skillshare program. Funds are available for similar sorts of projects in areas outside the designated region through the State senior project officer.

There is also the youth conservation corps project, which provides young people with opportunities to develop vocational, personal and enterprise skills through participation in conservation projects, and I am sure all members would have heard of that. Off-the-job training is conducted in TAFE colleges and projects last for a total of 20 weeks. The eligible trainees on that course receive the job training allowance. Currently there is a project at Canunda—the Canunda National Park (at Millicent)—and I believe approximately 50 per cent of the youth conservation corps projects will be undertaken in rural areas. There are six projects which will be undertaken in rural areas by June 1992. There will be up to 15 young people in each project, and a total of 90 young people will participate.

In relation to the enterprise skills development funding, the programs branch of State Youth Affairs is implementing a skills development program with a focus on the following areas: environmental and conservation projects, camps, outdoor education, music and art. Three projects will be implemented in rural areas before the end of this current financial year, and they are the ones I have just mentioned. Resources are currently available for rural workers who are looking at innovative responses to the needs of disadvantaged young people. In Port Augusta $1 000 was provided to assist the local community to pilot a street-work program there, and that has a great deal of relevance to me, of course, because it is part of my electorate and I was actually able to participate in that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: The program is being implemented by the Inter-Agency Committee on Juvenile Crime—and I am surprised the honourable member would say 'Wow!' because law and order is one of the issues that we should all be addressing. Support is being provided to a group of six Aboriginal young people who have completed a recreational needs survey for the young people living in Port Augusta.

Last but not least, there is a seminar series, and rural seminars will be held in the South-East on 2 May and in the northern country on 5 July. These seminars aim to give rural communities the opportunity to explore issues relevant to their young people. I know that State Youth Affairs has an ongoing commitment to ensuring that young people in rural and isolated areas, such as those which the member for Custance and I both serve, have access to quality programs and assistance. I support the motion as amended.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I oppose the amendment and support the motion moved by the member for Custance. In so doing, I declare my interest and support for the Rural Youth Movement of South Australia. I think I could claim to be the first Rural Youth office-bearer of any branch or of any part of the State to be elected to State Parliament, and I hold that position with some pride. Furthermore, I may be the only recipient of the P.C. Angove Memorial Award in this Chamber, and to that end I reaffirm my interest and support for the movement and certainly will do everything I can to ensure its success.

I commend the member for Custance for moving the motion. Having moved similar motions in the House some years ago, I think it is fitting that the honourable member's moving this motion should be one of the measures with which he is involved in his first year in Parliament. For those persons who have observed it, the Rural Youth Movement has diminished over the years; it has diminished because of a lack of commitment by the Government of

the day to recognise its value for persons particularly outside the metropolitan area. My recollection of the Rural Youth Movement is that it was an organisation that demanded the utmost of respect from all sections of the community. It was supported by Governments of the day during the Playford Administration and, with senior advisers, the movement had absolute access to every available branch of the Department of Agriculture, which gave the Rural Youth Movement support in the way of field days and guest speakers and virtually in any way it was requested.

Through the esteem and status of the Department of Agriculture and through the late Mr P.C. Angove, the organisation was established, and Mr A.T. Hooper was the Senior Adviser of the movement at that time. I can recall of at least five zone advisers who were each responsible for a number of zones throughout the State. They, in turn, provided training background and advice to each of the branches and zones throughout the State. Through those branches and zones, there was a series of competitions, a series of activities, and, for those members present, the three links in the chain of the Rural Youth Movement basically involved cultural, social and agricultural activities. Those three components made up the general concept of the Rural Youth Movement, and in the program planning, which each branch undertook every year, those social, cultural and agricultural activities would have been discussed on an equal basis. Many of the activities of the zones culminated in a Rural Youth zone rally, which led to State and sometimes interstate competition.

Members of the Rural Youth Movement were encouraged to do public speaking, debating, stock judging and be involved in all sorts of activities, males and females alike. Having given that resume of the movement as I understood it, I compare it with what is happening at present, with a number of diligent and able young members desperately trying to maintain the movement as it was known in the past.

Debate adjourned.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POTATO CYST NEMATODE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wish to report further to the House on the major outbreak of the serious potato disease, potato cyst nematode (PCN), in Wandin, Victoria, that I referred to last week. I am able to report that the Department of Agriculture has acted quickly to address any possible impact on South Australia's potato growing industry. As a consequence, we are confident that this devastating disease will have little effect on the health of our potato crops.

As I advised on 6 March, amendments to the plant standard under the Fruit and Plant Protection Act now prohibit the entry of potatoes grown within a 20 km radius of the Wandin property where the PCN outbreak has been declared. After extensive consultation with potato growers and industry groups the industry has recommended these new restrictions as an essential safeguard for the South Australian industry at this time. Essentially, these restrictions were ratified on 1 March and also apply to potato seed, bulbs and field plant nursery stock. As one of South Australia's major horticultural crops, it is vital that we protect the potato industry from the threat of PCN.

South Australian potato growers have relied on Victoria for seed potatoes to establish plantings and it is essential that this supply be monitored to prevent the spread of PCN. These restrictions will help to protect the South Australian potato industry from the disease and at the same time ensure the preservation of our status with important export markets such as Western Australia.

Following further consideration of this issue, in light of the action taken by Western Australia and after consultation with industry, we will be introducing major 'fork' testing and soil testing services in South Australia so that the Western Australian Government can be reassured that PCN is not being transported to their State from South Australian potatoes. This will be an expensive process, and the Department of Agriculture will have to charge a fee for service to cover the costs of employing field survey staff to carry out the testing. However, the investment made here will go a long way to protecting South Australia's $13 million potato trade to Western Australia.

It is essential, for their own protection, that all South Australian potato growers observe the new restrictions. This is especially important because the extent of the PCN outbreak in Victoria is unknown and will remain so until a total survey is completed. I wish to assure the House of the Government's commitment to maintaining a healthy and viable potato industry in this State.

QUESTION TIME

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Labour advise whether, following today's special Caucus meeting, the Government will proceed with legislation to extend so-called preference to unionists?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government will proceed with that legislation when the time is right.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Treasurer satisfied himself that there is no conflict of interest between Mr Gerschwitz's role as a Director with Barclays Bank and SGIC's own financial activities, including its large shareholding in Standard Chartered Bank, of which Mr Kean is a Director and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am awaiting a report from Mr Gerschwitz on the question asked yesterday. Some preliminary information was provided and the honourable member would have noticed that it was the subject of a release reported in the press. I speculated at the time that a number of those directorships mentioned by the honourable member would have been as a result of SGIC operations, subsidiaries of SGIC, and so it proved. There were one or two exceptions, one being Barclays Bank. I am yet to receive advice from Mr Gerschwitz.

HOMESTART LOANS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister representing the Minister of Housing and Construction advise whether it is true that HomeStart interest rates have increased by 73 per cent, as we are told in a headline in this morning's *Advertiser*?

The SPEAKER: Order! That question is out of order. Under Standing Orders a member cannot ask a question about the truth or otherwise of a report in a newspaper.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House on South Australia's employment figures for February as released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics? I understand that today's Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show a deterioration in Australia's employment position with a .4 per cent fall in employment representing a loss of 30 700 jobs in the nation, which has resulted in a rise in unemployment to 8.7 per cent from January's figure of 8.3 per cent. I also believe that the national youth unemployment rate is now 25.5 per cent.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area. She is correct in saying that there has been a deterioration in the national figures. I am sure that members opposite and those on this side of the House will be pleased to note that South Australia's unemployment rate actually fell by .4 per cent in February to 8.9 per cent. This means that there are now 3 300 fewer unemployed people in this State compared with the previous month.

Moreover, our State's total employment grew by 2 200 during the same period, despite a fall nationally. Indeed, our average total employment—that means jobs—is 1.2 per cent higher than at the same time a year ago, which represents 7 700 more jobs in South Australia than at this time last year. Members will be interested to know that there are three States with unemployment rates higher than South Australia's—Western Australia with 9.8 per cent, and Tasmania and Queensland with 9.6 per cent. Previously youth unemployment in South Australia has been amongst the highest in the nation. However, in February our youth full-time unemployment rate fell 2.8 per cent and is now the lowest of all the States. Past experience—and I stress this—has shown that statistics do and will fluctuate from month to month, and quarterly data are more reliable indicators—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting to hear Jed and Jethro over there. They are only interested in the bad news. They applaud the bad news because they want to run up the white flag on South Australia's future. And the member for Coles—Elly-Mae—wants to join the front porch. This is a very serious matter about employment and unemployment in this State. The single simple fact is that people like the Leader of the Opposition persistently ran to the media last year predicting 10 per cent, 11 per cent and 12 per cent unemployment, but they do not actually know the facts because they are interested in the headline. They do not want our State to proceed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am interested in the interjections of the Leader of the Opposition. They are calling him Mr 4 per cent in the Liberal Party. Perhaps he can tell us about his own non-performing loan. The Federal Government's March industry statement has signalled difficult times ahead for South Australian manufacturing as a consequence of tariff reductions; and, of course, South Australia's labour market is unlikely to improve for some months.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am interested in the interjections of members opposite. They will be interested to know that since November 1982, when the Bannon Government was elected, 104 100 jobs have been created in South Australia, an increase of 18.6 per cent. This is not good news today; these figures are not good news. But, we have to deal with the facts rather than the doomwatch that is peddled by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Does SGIC own and operate a laundry and have a stake in an angora and Boer goat breeding business; did the Treasurer approve these and other similar non-core business activities; and are they consistent with SGIC's formal investment guidelines, which the Premier has still not revealed to the House? I have been informed that, in addition to owning and running a laundry at Somerton, SGIC has commenced breeding angora and Boer goats from Zimbabwe and South Africa which were recently transported to Australia via New Zealand.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The SGIC, appropriately, has a number of investments in South Australian businesses. It has always done so. I am not aware of any particular project involving a laundry, but I am aware of the goat breeding project, which has been promoted by a South Australian consortium in an attempt to improve the value of our rural agricultural production. SGIC, as I understand it, has been involved in an investment in this enterprise. So, all I can say is that I do not believe that there is anything untoward in SGIC's being an investor in or supporter of particular projects like that. It is very different indeed from its running the project. I do not think SGIC would say it was a brewer, for instance, yet it has held a very substantial number of shares in our brewing company. One could go through the whole list of securities in which SGIC has invested; it is not involved in actually running those enterprises but, to the extent that it will support these things, I believe that is in the interests of the State.

HOMESTART

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister representing the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House of the increase in HomeStart interest rates owing to the latest quarterly consumer price index?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes; I answer this question on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction. It is probably relevant to point out the background to the setting of loans with HomeStart. Indeed, HomeStart loans have been tied to the quarterly increase in the CPI and, in past years, that has meant that, for example, in the period—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have not even had a chance to explain the background, let alone give the answer, and the member for Bragg obviously does not care about the many people in South Australia for whom this is a vitally important issue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, it is not a massive increase, and I would be very pleased to have the opportunity to explain that to the House. In the January to March

quarter of this year, the September CPI figure of .72 per cent produced a HomeStart interest charge of 10.404 per cent, and this rate was well below the banks and building societies fixed or variable home lending rates. However, with the recently announced December CPI figure of 2.68 per cent, the HomeStart interest charge for the April to June 1991 quarter would theoretically rise by 18.194 per cent. Obviously, this prediction, if we were to follow it, has caused great disturbance to borrowers, even though their monthly repayments are not being altered.

Therefore, I can announce today that HomeStart will now introduce a new six-monthly averaged CPI for all new borrowers from 1 April and, as well as that, all existing borrowers should not be alarmed, because they are not missing out: they will receive a letter in the very near future offering them the opportunity to move to this new six-monthly formula. The result of using a six-monthly average figure will be that for the April to June quarter the interest charge will be reduced to approximately 14.3 per cent. Of course, again that is below the 15 per cent that was the Government's initial commitment, and I remind the honourable member of that.

The important feature of HomeStart's interest rate charge was the past annual rate, not the quarterly variation. In the past 12 months that rate averaged 13.4 per cent and, even with the new CPI figure, the annual average was still only 14.2 per cent. Therefore, the rate has been very competitive with other lending institutions. I would like to make very clear and to place on the public record that those members of the community who are involved in part of the HomeStart loan system will not be disadvantaged and most certainly they will not pay a quarterly interest of 18 per cent; indeed, they will pay a quarterly interest rate of 14.3 per cent.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Did SGIC continue to operate the company SGIC Risk Management Services in the face of a legal opinion that its scope was outside the SGIC Act, who authorised the company's continued operation, and does the current business have a relevant licence under the Commercial and Private Agents Act?

I have been informed that on 3 May 1988 SGIC Risk Management Services was operating outside the SGIC Act, yet the consultancy business continued to operate under that name until the middle of 1990 when a cosmetic change was made by naming the business Monash Consulting, which now operates from premises at 5 Greenhill road, Wayville.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to SGIC and provide a response.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER SUPPLIES

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House of progress made by the Government to provide filtered water to the people of South Australia in both metropolitan and country areas?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to provide—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I know that members on this side of the House are very interested in the Government's commitment to the provision of safe, clean water—our filtration program is an integral part of that commitment—and I intend to provide an answer for the honourable member. In the past 15 years, the State Government—and that includes Governments of both political persuasions, but most of the funding has been spent under the Bannon Government—has spent approximately $200 million on the provision of filtered water to the people of South Australia, and this program is continuing.

Four metropolitan plants (Hope Valley, Anstey Hill, the Barossa and Little Para) and another plant that serves the Iron Triangle have been completed and commissioned. The construction of the fifth plant at Happy Valley is in an advanced stage of completion, with the first stage of the plant commissioned in 1989 and the second stage scheduled for commissioning in November of this year. The conceptual design of the sixth plant at Myponga is well advanced. A seventh water filtration plant serving the Barossa Valley and the Warren country lands area is scheduled for after the completion of the Myponga water filtration plant. The Mid North towns and Yorke Peninsula will receive a shandy of filtered waters together with local catchment water.

We are progressing with our program and we are looking at what we will do, in particular in the Barossa Valley. I am aware of the interest of the local member, and I believe that he has been informed that we are moving the pilot filtration plant that has been used at Myponga to the Barossa area.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, I will be delighted to provide the honourable member with that background information. We have moved the pilot plant so that we can do the preliminary assessments regarding the cost, etc. of the Barossa plant. Water taken from the Murray at Swan Reach and delivered to the Mid North via the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline will be filtered by this seventh plant.

With respect to the provision of our whole water program, an assertion was made regarding what we are spending on maintenance and replacement. I can inform the House that this year we have budgeted to spend some $20.5 million on maintenance and replacement. I believe that really does put the Government's commitment fairly and squarely out in the open and certainly exposes the kind of allegations made by the member for Heysen that somehow this Government is not meeting its commitments to provide a safe, secure water supply and that somehow we are not progressing with our asset replacement policy. I would have thought that a commitment of $20.5 million for water piping alone is a very tangible commitment by this Government of its ongoing support for the provision of safe, clean water and, indeed, water that can be filtered. We are moving forward with the program and I would be pleased to give the House an update at any future time.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Is the Premier satisfied that SGIC has reduced compulsory third party premiums to an appropriate level now that benefits have been cut, and when will the Government legislate to enable private insurers to enter the compulsory third party field?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the first point, yes, I think that appropriate changes have been made to compulsory third party premiums. In fact, there was a 10 per cent reduction, the honourable member may recall, and rates have been held at that level, and this has been a very successful achievement indeed. It is not solely attributable

to the restriction of benefits, as some are attempting to say: it has involved administrative and other changes as well, all of which have resulted in South Australia's situation with CTP being very competitive indeed. I noticed a comparison being made with Queensland: it is true there is a lower rate there, but if you look at the rates in some other States, they have been burgeoning and are way above ours. New South Wales, under a Liberal Government, has seen the most extraordinary increases in compulsory third party rates in the last couple of years. Against that trend ours have been going down. So, I think that has been a very welcome bonus to motorists in South Australia, and a good competitive advantage.

In relation to the second part of the honourable member's question dealing with the admittance of other insurers to the compulsory third party area, I remind the honourable member that they all abandoned that some years ago. Obviously, when the going was fairly tough and it was seen as an unattractive area of insurance, they opted to get out of that area and leave the SGIC, as it were, carrying the can on what everyone assumed was going to be a major loss-making business.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a matter of these things being appropriately dealt with under the Act. I presume any applications can be made in accordance with the Act and the Minister would have to consider them. At this stage we have no intention of changing the Act either way.

WOOMERA

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Premier outline to the House the implications for South Australia of the Federal Government's decision to allow the Royal Australain Air Force to take over management of the Woomera rocket range? On previous occasions, the Premier has informed the House of plans to develop the range as a commercial test facility with significant economic benefits for South Australia. An article in today's *Advertiser* suggests that the commercialisation of the Woomera range has been abandoned in favour of the Royal Australian Air Force's plans for Woomera.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, the impression given in that article is incorrect in that the two proposals are not in any way contradictory but, indeed, are complementary. What has happened, as has been correctly reported, is that the management of the Woomera range, which refers specifically to the Woomera prohibited area and not to the broader range area itself, has been passed to the RAAF. However, it has no effect on the proposals to concentrate commercial operations at Woomera. In fact, the RAAF's taking over of the Woomera prohibited area is positive, in the sense that I understand it intends to spend about $13 million on upgrading the present equipment at the range, and that will create obvious opportunities for jobs and activity by suppliers.

On the question of commercial operations, as the honourable member will recall, some major proposals were made last year, which had been developed, and the South Australian Government took a role in aiding the development of those proposals. In the end, they did not proceed and the Commonwealth announced that it was not picking up either of those proposals, for various commercial and other reasons. But that should not be interpreted as meaning that any possibilities have been abandoned. On the contrary, we have been working closely with the Federal Government on finalising details of a study, which I hope will yield in the fairly near future to a further stage.

The commercial value is as strong and the possibilities are as strong as has been mentioned in the past; it is just a question of finding the right sort of interest on a national and international level, with the right kind of commercial package attached to it. So, we are very interested in seeing this occur. I am talking here of non-defence and civilian activities as well as defence-related activities. For instance, I refer to the trialling of new and sophisticated avionic systems in various areas in the aerospace industry. In that respect it was encouraging to see the remarks made by the Prime Minister about the aerospace industry in his statement on Tuesday, which I hope we can follow up and take good advantage of.

I would like to summarise the benefits from the commercial operation at Woomera. They can attract overseas clients and they can earn foreign currency for sale of services. They can provide an addition to a much needed world standard testing and evaluation infrastructure for the aerospace industry. These areas are very hard to come by, particularly with the supporting facilities that Woomera provides. They will aid the development of infrastructure to support Australian entry to space industry, with involvement in launch and recovery ventures.

A mention was made, of course, of the Irridium project that Motorola has been promoting, and an Australian consortium led by Transfield has reached the final stage of evaluation of that project. As I said at the time, this is a very big and complex project. It is by no means certain that they will succeed, but the fact that they have reached this stage I think is very encouraging and demonstrates the underlying strength of not only the companies in the consortium but also the facilities that we can provide. Even if they are not successful in some kind of Irridium communications operation, then that facility still has some advantages for whatever is substituted in its place.

Further, in relation to the commercial operation of Woomera, there is a focus on Australian industry for final test and validation of various communications and other systems. There is opportunity for us to be involved in collaborative ventures with overseas clients. In other words, Woomera could provide a very good vehicle entry location. Finally, small specialist companies can provide services at the range, in association with any of these activities. So, the commercial opportunities are boundless. They are contemporary. They are very much about twenty-first century applications. They are the sort of thing that South Australia should be pursuing. The Government and my colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and his department are very much at the forefront of negotiations with private operators and the Commonwealth, to in fact keep that commercial possibility alive.

TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

Mr VENNING (Custance): Can the Premier assure the House that the police have not been directed to achieve daily quotas for the issue of traffic infringement notices?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The member for Custance directed his question to the wrong Minister. The Minister who knows the answer is not here—he is at a ministerial meeting. However, when he returns I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Emergency Services for a considered reply.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

TREE REMOVAL

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning intervene to ensure proper liaison between the E&WS Department and the Campbelltown council over the removal of poplar trees in the Torrens Linear Park adjacent to Greenglade Drive, Campbelltown? Constituents have advised me that yesterday some seven to eight poplar trees were removed along the Torrens Linear Park at Greenglade Drive, Campbelltown. Residents have expressed great concern in relation to that removal.

I have spoken to both the E&WS Department and the Campbelltown council and it appears that the Torrens Linear Park Committee originally intended the removal of only those poplar trees blocking the Torrens River channel to ensure that there were no flood dangers. I understand that the trees were inspected by the Campbelltown council and a number were found to be diseased. As a consequence, the council requested the removal of the trees. Further trees will be removed today and tomorrow, I understand.

My constituents are most concerned that healthy trees are being removed and, as some are 100 years of age, I ask the Minister—my request has been to both the E&WS Department and the Campbelltown council—to ensure that only diseased or dangerous trees are removed and that healthy poplar trees are retained. The intention is to replace these trees with native vegetation.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I would be pleased to request a report from the E&WS Department and to do whatever I can to facilitate the successful resolution of this conflict. It is worth noting the difference in approach from the member for Hartley and the member for Hayward. Indeed, the member for Hartley is not going off on a tangent, making wild claims about heritage trees or trees being removed when in fact they were not. The member for Hartley has given this House a very thorough and accurate explanation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I understand that it is not even in the honourable member's electorate, although that is another matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The background noise has risen to a level where I am sure nobody can hear the Minister's response. I draw members' attention to Standing Orders relating to interjections and noise in general.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member and give him the assurance that I will have the matter investigated. As the honourable member shared some of the information with the House—namely, that some of the poplar trees are diseased and that initially they were to be removed in the whole area of flood mitigation—I point out that it may well be that this is a decision that will have to stand. However, there could be a fairly massive replanting of native vegetation to replace those trees.

As I said in my answer yesterday, I understand the concern of communities that feel that they have grown up with a particular vista and, when that vista includes trees that are introduced species and may need to be removed in some cases, they find that they have an attachment to them. I recognise and understand that. In this case, and in the case mentioned by the member for Hayward yesterday, the local community should have such information shared with it. Perhaps it should be more directly involved in making decisions about the sorts of vegetation and trees that could be planted and indeed feel a certain ownership for that part of what is really public land but is something very special and closely related to the environment of the community. I think it is a situation that can be resolved sensitively. I thank the honourable member for the constructive way in which he raised this matter. I will do everything in my power to resolve it amicably.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I direct my question to the Minister of Health. What is the current financial position of the Flinders Medical Centre, which has issued an instruction to all consulting clinics to close for a week in April? How much is it intended to save through this closure? What will be the effect on outpatient clinic waiting lists? I have a copy of a memorandum that was sent to all consultants at the Flinders Medical Centre from Dr B.J. Shea, the Area Manager for Consulting Clinics. The memorandum advises that consulting clinics be 'closed for a further week' this financial year, and the period chosen is from 22 April to 26 April.

I am advised that this move will put further pressure on waiting lists for outpatients clinics and may require the setting up of emergency clinics to deal with some cases. This move will affect about 4 500 patients, the average number of outpatients treated each week according to figures provided in the budgetary papers last year. Members of the medical profession whose clinics are affected by this move are concerned that it represents another retreat from the Government's pre-election commitment to more adequately fund our hospitals and is further evidence of a general reduction in services because of budgetary pressures imposed by, amongst other things, the State Bank bail out.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government is certainly not retreating from its pre-election commitment. I draw the honourable member's attention to the budget papers for this financial year, where the four year funding package for hospitals, which was announced by the Premier and me in June or July 1989, has been fully factored into this year's budget as it was into last year's budget. As I understand it—and I will obtain specific information for the honourable member—a number of hospitals intend quite sensibly to reduce their activity around the Easter period because there is a tendency for that to happen anyway with doctors taking leave and that sort of thing. I am sure that this is in that general category.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't seem to understand what happens in hospitals at Christmas time when naturally there are much lower levels of activity because all the doctors go on holidays and that sort of thing. It is quite ridiculous to keep up beds that will not be used. One would have thought that the honourable member would applaud any attempt to ensure that we do not waste money in hospitals and that it should all go into proper service delivery. That is the context in which I understand it, but I will obtain further details for the honourable member.

Dr Armitage: I have given you the details.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, you asked me a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. The honourable member for Price.

VIGILANTE GROUPS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether a vigilante group is operating on

trains using the Outer Harbor line? An article in yesterday's *News* quoted the member for Hayward as follows:

I have been reliably told by members of the Transit Squad that, in effect, a vigilante group is operating on the Outer Harbor line because of an incident which occurred late last year.

The article continues:

Mr Brindal was referring to an incident in which a youth was set upon by commuters after he had attacked a guard who was speaking to him about graffiti he had placed on the train.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was somewhat surprised when I saw this article in yesterday's *News*—a well-written article, I may add, with a very large, dim photograph of the member for Hayward lurking in a dark railway station or in a culvert, I am not quite sure which.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: All that was missing was the raincoat!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As the Deputy Premier says, all that was missing was the raincoat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Nevertheless, I always attempt to get information on any of these stories that relate to any of my portfolios. The STA has advised me that the Transit Squad had been interviewed about this matter and it knows nothing about it; nothing at all—not a thing. There is no indication of any vigilante group operating at all—no evidence, no nothing. It is another figment of the imagination. Of course, as outlined in the explanation of the member for Price, we all saw a news report some time ago about a group of young people who were misbehaving on the train on a regular basis. The Transit Squad swung into action very quickly, those youths were identified—it was a loose group, not a gang, of about 20 to 25—a number of them were arrested and a number have been reported for behavioural type offences on STA services.

I thought it was a little irresponsible for the member for Hayward to start talking about vigilante groups and doing so in a way that we all recognise—by saying he did not support vigilante groups. We all know that kind of tactic whereby an issue is raised. I have been assured by the STA that no vigilante group is operating on the line and that, in fact, since the Transit Squad has identified these people and taken action against them, the behaviour on the Outer Harbor line has been much improved and I am very pleased about that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY VANDALISM

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Why is the Government allowing union bans to prevent the STA from dealing more effectively and economically with vandalism of its property? On Tuesday, the Minister informed the House that the Government was considering an 'adopt a station' program—a scheme suggested last year by the Liberal member for Bright—to try to get local communities to assist with the graffiti problem.

The Minister said that, while the STA had employed more painters, 'it is impossible to keep the system free of graffiti'. Information I have been given shows that union bans are making this task very difficult. I have been advised that a community service club has put a proposition to the STA to paint and adopt a Belair line station but that this has been rejected on two grounds.

One ground is insurance, but service clubs have their own insurance to undertake community projects. The second reason is that the unions have objected to volunteers doing this work. Furthermore, I have been advised that a ban imposed by the Painters and Decorators Union and supported by the Trades and Labor Council is preventing young offenders from cleaning graffiti off STA buses, trams, trains and buildings. This action undermines the provisions of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act which apply from 1 January this year and which give the Children's Court the power to order vandals to clean off their graffiti.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Fisher for his question, although I do note that there must be no love lost on the other side: I think he has stolen this from the member for Bright. In all fairness, the member for Bright has been pursuing the issue of 'adopt a station' for a considerable amount of time. I always thought there were ethics in this game, but obviously not. In responding to the member for Fisher, I hope the member for Bright appreciates that really I am addressing my remarks to him, because it is something that he has been following through.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister means that he is addressing his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The use of volunteers on STA property is not as easy to determine as one would imagine. The STA has to make arrangements in terms of various factors such as compensation, having young people in areas that may be dangerous, and appropriate supervision. There is—and we do not run away from it—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I know, and that is even worse. There is the question of workers whose job it is to perform that function. I have no doubt that in various high profile areas we could get volunteers to do quite a bit of work in South Australia, but that would put workers—constituents—out of work. There is no question about that; there are some service clubs that would do that. I have no doubt that the member for Adelaide is a member of some of these service clubs that would love to go out there, do some voluntary work and put ordinary people out of work—people who have families and responsibilities but who do not have the background or the privileges that the member for Adelaide has. I am talking about ordinary working people who are very fortunate to be taking home $300 or $400 a week.

I support strongly the right of the unions that represent those workers to ensure that their jobs are protected. If the member for Adelaide does not support that right, I am surprised. The member for Adelaide lives in North Adelaide, so he may not know about this problem, but these people attempt to keep families on $300 or $400 a week.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Is there something wrong with that?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister were to direct his remarks through the Chair in accordance with the rules of debate in this House, we might have a quieter debate and be able to get through more questions. I ask the Minister to draw his remarks to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is a very serious issue for those workers who, as I say, are at the bottom of the pecking order. They are not doctors earning hundreds of thousands of dollars a year and they are not property owners: they are lucky to take home $300 or $400 a week. So, it is perfectly proper, and I support 100 per cent the right of unions to protect their members' work.

I believe that arrangements can be made, and discussions have taken place and are continuing to take place with the Department for Family and Community Services and other

Government agencies so that we can come up with a scheme that is satisfactory to all parties. So, if sufficient supervision is given around STA property, particularly of young people—and that is very important—if questions of compensation and safety are resolved, and if unions are satisfied that their members will not be put out of work—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member is being repetitious. He has already made the point—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the Minister to draw his remarks to a close. I think he is beginning to become repetitious, so I ask him again to draw his answer to a close.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was just about to come to my summary. The issues are complex, but I am quite confident that we will be able to resolve them. This Government has a long record of being able to work through problems that are even more difficult than this one.

INSTRUMENT OF RECONCILIATION

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs outline to the House the State Government's attitude to the 'instrument of reconciliation' being promoted by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know the member for Gilles has an interest in this area. There has certainly been considerable debate over many years about whether there should be some kind of contract or treaty between Aboriginal people and white Australians. Recently there has been a call for what has been described as an instrument of reconciliation between Aboriginal people and the wider community.

I wish to place on record today that I think the process may well be more important than any final document which may eventuate. In Australia we need a developing social contract, capable of adapting to changing circumstances, and not some kind of sterile focus for division and discord in the future. Obviously, in approaching such a reconciliation process we must recognise that this cannot be achieved by high-flying rhetoric or sentimentalism. The process must involve a genuine commitment by levels of government to eliminate the shocking gaps in educational, physical, social and cultural well-being between Aboriginal people and other Australians.

The history of strong cooperation between the South Australian Government and the Opposition on Aboriginal issues is an example of how cross-Party commitment can ensure a better deal for the Aboriginal people of this State. I am sure that Aboriginal people, for their part, will take the reconciliation process seriously only if the Government commits itself to an action plan with clear targets and firm deadlines. Certainly, in South Australia we are well on the way to meeting our targets on Aboriginal employment in the public sector and our goal of tripling the number of Aboriginal students in our universities. So, our clear priority must be to promote economic development and self-sufficiency for Aboriginal people. We cannot hope for reconciliation in an equal partnership while Aboriginal people are entrapped in welfare dependency around the nation.

I am certainly impressed with the approach to this reconciliation process by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. He envisages a decade-long program, leading up to the centenary of Federation. It will be a decade not just of talk but of real action. Aboriginal people, of course, will be more impressed with action rather than words, and that is why we need to establish accepted—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I cannot quite understand the excitement on the other side of the House. I know that tomorrow is the Ides of March, and I can see Cassius, and I can see Brutus, but I am not sure who is Mark Antony. The member for Playford asks: what about Delilah? I know what he is talking about, but I think it is a different play. I have offered the Federal Minister my full support and active involvement in the negotiations with Aboriginal people in South Australia.

GRAFFITI ON TRAINS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Will he accompany me on a train trip at peak commuting time from Adelaide to Noarlunga to talk to commuters about graffiti problems on their trains, and will he disembark at selected stations to inspect graffiti and other vandalism to facilities, and, if not, why not? The Minister has already acknowledged the graffiti problem and has undertaken to support and adopt the railway station scheme launched last year by the Leader of the Opposition and me. Many of my colleagues and I are being consistently contacted by commuters who are distressed at the damage caused to public property and are depressed at the wastage of their taxes being spent on restoring public transport facilities.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Bright for his question. The offer is a very generous one, and I do not wish to appear ungrateful, but I have done the trip that he is suggesting. In fact, I actually saw the member for Bright when he was a commuter, as he was walking smartly along the platform getting onto the train, and I said, 'Good morning'. So, I am not unfamiliar with the line and I am not unfamiliar with the problems. They are very difficult problems, there is no question about that.

The vandalism that is being caused by the constituents of the member for Bright and others is to be deplored. On that particular line we have from time to time had travelling on the train a painter who gets off at a station, paints over the graffiti ar. ', by the time the train has done a turnaround at the end of the line and comes back, it has been revandalised—and that is by constituents of the member for Bright. So, it is a very difficult problem. We are doing everything within our power to keep STA property clean.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did not want to have to repeat what I said yesterday, as I went through this at considerable length; however, in all fairness to the member for Bright, he may have been absent so I will go through it briefly again. The STA employs six full-time painters, whose sole job is to go around and paint over graffiti and tidy up stations and other STA property. We have a transit squad, which since I have been Minister has almost doubled in size. We do take this problem very seriously—but there is absolutely no question that until such time as this fad goes out of the community—

Dr Armitage: Until the volunteers give you a hand!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did not want to get back to the question of volunteers, but I appreciate the comment from the member for Adelaide, because it has reminded me of something else. There is a necessity to have arrangements with the unions. The unions tell me about the volunteers from service clubs who want to come in and do another

person's job and put them out of work. How would it be if I were to go and do their job and put them out of work? For volunteers, the painting over of graffiti at the stations is only a pastime to make them feel good, whereas, for the workers employed to do this, it is their bread and butter. Would people in those service clubs like me to come in and say, 'I'm volunteering to do your job'? So, we must appreciate the point of view of ordinary workers. I know this is difficult for members opposite, but it is not difficult for members on this side of the House, and we take these matters very seriously. Many of the constituents of members on this side of the House are living on $300 and $400 a week and trying to keep families on that. Let us not forget that aspect.

The member for Bright does have a problem with graffiti, but let him not forget that I live 400 km away from here and there we do not have any public transport at all, with graffiti on it or otherwise. We would welcome a train covered with graffiti in Whyalla—as would be the case with some other members here in their areas. Therefore, although the member for Bright may have some problems, they are very minor compared to the problems encountered by a lot of other people in the community. The Government is spending vast sums of money in an attempt to sort them out.

Members interjecting:

Mr Meier: Absolutely disgraceful.

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

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

COMMERCIAL FISHING LICENCES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Fisheries advise whether he is proposing any changes to the use of commercial fishing licences as security for loans?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I note that I received from the member for Mount Gambier a question on this matter before the session began. I can advise that this issue has been canvassed in green papers that have been released for discussion, the most recent of which was dealt with in 1989. Following that, the proposal, along with a number of others, was considered by the Government, and it is proposed to introduce in this current session legislation to make a number of amendments in a number of areas.

In regard to the issue of the use of licences as security for loans, the Government does propose to implement an arrangement which recognises that licences and endorsements can be used as a type of security for loans, but at the same time maintaining management prerogative to vary legislative, policy, administrative or procedural matters to meet the responsibilities of properly managing the fisheries resources of South Australia.

The way we believe that that could be achieved is to have the licence holder who wished to have the licence used as security for a loan advise the Director of Fisheries that a tender has a financial interest in the licence. The Director of Fisheries would then be required to withhold his consent for the transfer of the licence, endorsement or quota without the written consent of the lender who has put the Director on notice. The maintenance of a public register to identify licences subject to a financial arrangement and the collection of a fee for providing such a service would result.

The Director of Fisheries would undertake to provide the lender with information relating to prosecution action initiated against the licence holder under the Fisheries Act, bearing in mind that such prosecutions may affect the status of the licence. Such an obligation will be incorporated into the proposed legislation. The Department of Fisheries will implement procedures to minimise administrative errors, but the fact remains that persons wishing to utilise the scheme would do so at their own risk. Unforeseen circumstances or events over which the Department of Fisheries has no control may occur. In this regard it is proposed that no liability would lie against the Crown.

METROPOLITAN ABORIGINAL YOUTH SCHEME

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Family and Community Services advise me of the status of the Metropolitan Aboriginal Youth scheme which received a budget of $650 000 for its operations in the FACS lines of the State budget papers? What is the reason for the $400 000 blowout in the scheme's budget? Does the scheme still exist, and is it a fact that the manager of the department left Adelaide about a month ago and took a job in Townsville, whilst another senior officer who worked with the manager also left and is now employed by the Queensland Department of Family and Community Services?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, I cannot, but I will be able to on the next day of sitting.

ACCESS CAB VOUCHERS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether the delay in printing Access Cab vouchers has caused inconvenience to any recipients?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for his question. We had some difficulty with the size of the voucher book. A number of people who use the Access Cab service and are entitled to voucher books asked for a reduction in the size of the books. There were some problems with the printing—and I point out that it was not done through the Government Printer—and we had trouble getting the books on time. We made arrangements with the Access Cab company whereby passengers who had not received their vouchers could still travel with Access Cabs by making a telephone call explaining the problem. It has been a minor problem. We have had only two calls from people who have been inconvenienced in a minor way. I am pleased that the problem has been resolved. I am sure that the member for Henley Beach will advise his constituents on the steps we have taken.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, for the Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction), obtained leave and

introduced a Bill for an Act to approve the execution on behalf of the State of an agreement between the Commonwealth, the States, the Northern Territory of Australia and the Australian Capital Territory relating to housing; to repeal the Housing Agreement Act 1984; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: 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

A new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement has been enacted in the Commonwealth Housing Assistance Act 1989, to operate for 10 years from 1 July 1989. The new agreement replaces the previous agreement, enacted in 1984. The Premier signed the agreement on 31 May 1990. The purpose of the Housing Agreement Bill 1991 is to incorporate the new agreement into South Australian legislation. The previous agreement, incorporated in the Housing Agreement Act 1984, is to be repealed. The Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement provides the framework for the funding of housing assistance programs, including public rental housing and home ownership assistance.

The main features of the new agreement are that all Commonwealth funding for housing assistance will in future be in the form of grants; new requirements are established for State matching grants; Commonwealth funding will be distributed on a *per capita* basis between States after a three year transitional arrangement; the proportions of funds under the agreement available for the provision of rental housing, home purchase assistance, repayment of Commonwealth debt and non-capital programs are stipulated; a new cost-rent formula for public housing is established; and new rights are established for public tenants, including rights to security of tenure and an independent appeal mechanism.

The South Australian Government has strongly supported many of the principles of the new agreement, in particular the increased emphasis on rights for customers of housing assistance programs. It is no secret that the Government is not satisfied with the fact that this State will suffer reductions in Commonwealth funding under the agreement, if the base level funding established for the first three years is not improved upon. South Australia will continue to press for the indexation of the Commonwealth funding.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides a definition of the agreement between the Commonwealth, the States and the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. Clause 3 repeals the Housing Agreement Act 1984. Clause 4 provides parliamentary approval of the execution of the agreement.

Clause 5 authorises the Treasurer to impose terms and conditions when making a loan or grant and authorises the recipient of a loan or grant to expend the money lent or granted. Clause 6 provides for the establishment of a tribunal to hear appeals from decisions relating to the provision of housing assistance under the agreement. The schedule sets out the text of the agreement.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 13 March. Page 3604.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I briefly began my contribution in the debate last night and now wish to address the double standards of this Government which sits in power with the Premier in control of a board that is supposed to be running the State Bank in a proper manner. The Premier allowed the board to squander $1 000 million of the people's money. It may end up being $2 000 million of the people's money. At the same time the Minister of Finance stands up in this place on occasions and condemns members of Parliament who ask for money to be spent in their electorate on issues or projects that are peanuts compared with the squandering that has gone on in the State Bank and in some of its subsidiaries and associated companies.

I admit that I asked for a pedestrian crossing for the Coromandel Valley Primary School and for one on the Main Road at Blackwood. I admit that I asked for the Main Road from Flagstaff Hill, through Aberfoyle Park and the Mitcham Hills to be upgraded. The Minister had the temerity to say that it was wrong for me to do that whilst he was Minister of Finance. Questions were asked in this place about the actions of the State Bank over two years, but neither the Minister of Finance nor the Premier, who is responsible for hiring and sacking the board, bothered to inform themselves of the seriousness of the situation.

The Premier or the Minister of Finance were either negligent in their responsibilities or someone has told untruths to this Parliament—and that does not mean the people in the State Bank, although they may have told untruths also. It is only one of two things: either the Premier was negligent in his duty and was not prudent in what he should have been doing to protect the people's money, or he was telling untruths. I hope that down the track we will find out the truth.

The Premier holds office only because of the numbers in this House. The money that we talk about in this grievance debate is money that we spend from the people's purse. I will outline one or two areas where this money could be spent. It is claimed that our water quality is not of a high standard, but we do not tackle the problem in a fair way. We pump water out of the biggest drain in Australia—the Murray River—from Murray Bridge into the Onkaparinga River a short distance above the Mount Bold Reservoir at a time of the year when there is no run-off from the land in the Hills, when there is no seepage from septic tanks and when the streams are not flowing. However, the Minister and others talk about the problem of pollution in the Adelaide Hills. That is not the problem at all; the problem is that we pump water out of this 'drain' into the Mount Bold Reservoir, send it to the Clarendon weir, pump it through a tunnel to Happy Valley and then filter it. At the same time the people in the Adelaide Hills who draw off that main are told they will never have filtered water.

The commonsense thing to do is filter the water at the source of collection, at Murray Bridge. If that occurred, polluted water would not flow into the Mount Bold Reservoir. If there is pollution in the Adelaide Hills, as the Minister claims, what pollution is in the Murray River with all the towns that are adjacent to it?

An honourable member: The riverboats.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, the riverboats, and the properties that have septic tanks that are not connected to common effluent drains or sewer mains.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: And the industrial waste.

Mr S.G. EVANS: As my colleague the member for Alexandra says, there is also industrial waste. All those things pour into the Murray River, and then, when the Govern-

ment pumps this water into the reservoir, it blames the Hills people for the pollution. That is hypocrisy. The amount needed to build a filtration plant at Murray Bridge is peanuts compared with the money that has been lost through the State Bank fiasco as a result of the negligence of the Premier and the Minister of Finance.

There is talk about the infrastructure of our State—the schools, water mains and roads. The Government tells the people of the State that it does not have enough money to make repairs; that the mains might be polluted but they cannot be replaced; that, although there might be a risk to their health, they will have to live with it (or die with it if a serious disease breaks out). However, as soon as the State Bank, which is under the Premier's control through the board, plunges the State into a debt of $1 000 million—and it could be $2 000 million before it is finished—the money is immediately available. Not only that, but the money for the interest bill of $106 million a year is also available. That is a disgrace. Recently a member opposite stood up and said that we are trying to make a political issue out of this. What is it if it is not a political issue when the Premier, who is supposed to be a smart operator, allows our State to be plunged into that sort of debt even though for two years he was asked questions which must have raised doubts?

What did the Premier do? He stood in this House and said: you are trying to pull the bank down and denigrate the State; you are anti the State Bank, anti progress and anti the entrepreneurial skills of brilliant financial people. However, these so-called brillant people were not concerned about the State. The Liberal Party had a right and a responsibility to try to find out the truth. If last year we had been told the truth—and therefore the people told the truth—the debt would be nowhere as big as it is now. In fact, this matter could have been spoken of the year before.

Who were these playboys who were using the people's money to invest in New Zealand and other parts of the world outside the State? They were people whom we knew very little about. We did not even trust those who were born in our own State; we brought people in from other places to exploit our community and then walk away with a small fortune, as far as the majority of people in this State are concerned. If they had lost all the money in South Australia, most of it would still be here, but they did not: they took South Australia's money out and squandered it elsewhere under the jurisdiction of the Premier, because he had control of the board and he failed to inform the public of the problem or, at best, he failed to ensure that he informed himself.

What has happened is a disgrace for which our children will be paying the bill. A lot of necessary infrastructure, repairs and upgrading will not be carried out. I do not think any members of the ALP can hold their head up in this State, if they are in Government, and say they are proud of what happened or that they were not negligent as individuals, because each and every member of Caucus should have been saying, 'There is something smelly here; let's cure it.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Not only has the Federal Treasurer got it wrong but, once again, the Premier and the Minister of Tourism have got it wrong by not objecting in the strongest terms and demanding a reversal of the decision of the Federal Government to tax State and local government grants provided to tourist associations in this State. It must surely be the height of absurdity that, when the State Government and local government provide grants to local tourist associations for the purpose of promoting tourism in this State, the Federal Government comes along and taxes those grants. That is sheer absurdity—it can be described in no other way. I have received a letter from the Loxton Tourist and Travel Office, in which the Chairman states:

> I write to you regarding the proposed tax by the Federal income tax department on Government and semi-government grants received by tourist offices. In our case we presently receive a total of $19 160 directly from the Department of Tourism and the Loxton District Council.
>
> The Loxton Tourist and Travel Office is a non-profit organisation in the true sense of the word with our only trading income coming from commissions of travel income. These commissions amount to less than 50 per cent of the operating expenses of the office with the balance of expenses being financed by the aforementioned grants and contributions from business and community organisations.
>
> We cannot see any justice in taxing these grants as we see it as giving with one hand and taking away with the other. We were also under the misapprehension that income tax was only payable on profits and we certainly cannot see our office being in this position in the foreseeable future.
>
> We see this proposed impost as an unnecessary burden which if implemented can only restrict our efforts in trying to build up the tourist industry in this area.

As I said previously, what could be more stupid than the Federal Government's taxing grants provided by the State Government and local government to local tourist offices to promote tourism throughout South Australia? I urge the Premier and the Minister of Tourism to rethink this position and certainly to take up this matter with the Federal Treasurer in the strongest possible way, because there will be absolutely no incentive left for local groups and organisations that raise significant sums of money throughout the year to assist regional tourist offices in promoting tourism in this State.

The next matter that I wish to raise relates to the labelling regulations that were introduced in this House some short time ago. As a result of a visit in my company to a number of organisations in the Riverland recently, Senator Olsen raised the following question with Senator Tate in the Senate on 11 March this year:

> Can the Minister for Justice and Consumer Affairs reassure the citrus industry that he has no intention of backing away from statements made in his press release of 29 November last year that 'all fruit juice is to carry country of origin labels'? Can the Minister confirm that the national labelling standard will be gazetted exactly as he indicated? Can he explain why the South Australian Government gazetted a much watered down version of that promised standard on 20 December 1990, which states only that fruit juice labels have to indicate the presence of imported ingredients, and not the quantity or the country of origin? Does this mean the Minister is no longer going to insist on a national standard with country of origin labelling? If so, why?

Senator Tate responded by saying:

> In relation to the need for consumers to be able to exercise their power in the marketplace to support Australian farmers, orchardists and those involved in various horticultural pursuits, I believe it is extremely essential that they be given the fullest information on the label of the origin of the goods which they purchase. I believe that the health Ministers, who are in charge of food labelling laws around Australia, are in general agreement with that principle.
>
> If South Australia has acted in the way that is suggested by Senator Olsen, I believe that that is because it is acting to deal with a matter of concern in South Australia but before all health Ministers have a chance, through their combined and joint forum, to consider the proposal which I put to them late last year. I believe in the joint discussions that will be held and the consultations and deliberations which preceded that that the merit of the proposal I put will be apparent and ought to be adopted as an Australia-wide standard. As I said, I am in the hands of various health Ministers around Australia in that regard.
>
> As to the question of indicating the fact that the ingredients in, say, a fruit juice come from overseas, where there is a mixture of juices from three or four different overseas countries, it may be difficult to indicate exactly which countries of origin contributed to the particular bottle or container of orange juice and it may be sufficient for the consumer to know that the ingredients were imported. That should be sufficient to enable a distinction

to be made between that juice and one which is definitely a product of Australia if the consumer is to act in support of the Australian orchadists.

I do not think that that matter has been resolved. I look forward to further discussions with the health Ministers about how Australian consumers might be able to support Australian industry in this regard.

It would appear that the Federal Minister responsible has not backed off at this stage or been prepared to water down the decision that he took or the statement he made at that time, but it is quite clear from the regulations that have been tabled in this House that the South Australian Government, for one reason or another best known to itself, has decided to water down the undertaking that was given on the steps of Parliament House a few months ago to the citrus growers of South Australia, when a clear indication was given by the Minister of Agriculture that there would be a requirement that the country of origin would be clearly marked on the labels for all imported fruit juices.

The regulations currently before us do not do that, so I ask the Minister to rethink clearly his position and to honour the undertaking that he gave to the citrus growers of South Australia that the labelling laws would be amended so that there would be no misunderstanding by the consumer as to where the fruit juice originated from. In other words, the Minister undertook to ensure that the country of origin was clearly indicated on the label.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 15 (clause 2)—Leave out 'This' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (2), this'.

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 15 insert new subsection as follows:

(2) If a provision of this Act is not brought into operation before the expiration of three months after assent, the provision will come into operation three months after assent.

No. 3. Page 3, lines 13 to 20 (clause 6)—Leave out subsections (4) and (5) and substitute:

(4) Where—

(a) a worker has been charged more than the amount that the worker is entitled to claim for the provision of a service in respect of which compensation is payable under this section;

and

(b) the corporation considers that the amount charged is unreasonable,

the corporation may reduce the charge by the amount of the excess.

(5) Where—

(a) services of a kind to which this section applies were provided to a worker in relation to a compensable disability;

and

(b) the corporation considers that the services were, in the circumstances of the case, inappropriate or unnecessary,

the corporation may disallow charges for the services.

No. 4. Page 3, lines 43 to 46 and Page 4, lines 1 to 3 (clause 6)—Leave out subsection (9) and substitute:

(9) Subject to subsection (10), the corporation—

(a) will, by notice published in the *Gazette* fix scales of charges for the purposes of this section (ensuring so far as practicable that the scales comprehensively cover the various kinds of services to which this section applies);

and

(b) may, by subsequent notice in the *Gazette*, vary the scales so published.

No. 5. Page 4—After line 7 insert new clause as follows:

Weekly payments

6a. Section 35 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsection:

(2a) Where—

(a) a period of incapacity for work exceeds two years;

(b) an assessment of the weekly earnings that the worker is earning or could earn in suitable employment is made under subsection (1) *(b)* (ii);

and

(c) the worker's actual weekly earnings subsequently exceed the amount so assessed,

the corporation cannot reduce the weekly payments to reflect the worker's actual weekly earnings except to the extent that the aggregate of the weekly payment plus the actual weekly earnings (excluding prescribed allowances) exceeds the notional weekly earnings of the worker.

No. 6. Page 6, line 8 (clause 8)—After 'amended' insert:

—

(a).

No. 7. Page 6 (clause 8)—After line 9 insert new paragraphs as follow:

(b) by striking out subsection (4)

and

(c) by striking out subsection (7).

No. 8. Page 8, lines 10 to 13 (clause 13)—Leave out paragraph *(b).*

No. 9. Page 8, lines 43 to 45 (clause 13)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 10. Page 9—After line 27 insert new clause as follows:

The Crown and certain agencies to be exempt employers.

13a. Section 61 of the principal act is amended by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

(4) In this section—

'agency or instrumentality of the Crown' includes any body, or body of a specified class, prescribed by regulation for the purposes of this definition.

No. 11. Page 9 (clause 14)—After line 29 insert new paragraph as follows:

(aa) by inserting in paragraph *(a)* of subsection (1) the following items:

Section 26

Section 32;

No. 12. Page 13, line 8 (clause 25)—Leave out 'or'.

No. 13. Page 13 (clause 25)—After line 9 insert:

or

(c) if the disclosure is required by or under another Act or law.

No. 14. Page 13, lines 30 to 38 (clause 30)—Leave out this clause and insert new clause as follows:

Substitution of s.92

30. Section 92 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is substituted:

Representation

92. (1) A person is entitled to appear personally, or by representative, in proceedings before a review authority subject to the qualification that a person is not entitled to be represented by—

(a) a member of the board;

or

(b) a person whose name has been struck off the roll of legal practitioners or who, although a legal practitioner, is not entitled to practice the profession of law because of disciplinary action taken against him or her.

(2) Representation will not be allowed before a medical advisory panel (although a worker who is to appear before a medical advisory panel is entitled to be accompanied by a relative or friend to provide advice and moral support).

No. 15. Page 14 (clause 31)—After line 20 insert new subsection as follows:

(4a) Unless otherwise ordered by the review authority, costs awarded under subsection (1) *(a)* or *(b)* are payable by the corporation or an exempt employer (according to whether the corporation or the exempt employer is the compensating authority).

No. 16. Page 14, lines 21 and 22 (clause 31)—Leave out subsection (5).

No. 17. Page 14, lines 31 and 32 (clause 33)—Leave out all words in these lines after 'refer' in line 31 and substitute:

(a) a medical question arising in the proceedings:

or

(b) a decision by the corporation to disallow or reduce a charge for a service under section 32,

to a Medical Advisory Panel for advice.

No. 18. Page 14, line 34 (clause 33)—Leave out 'on a medical question'.

No. 19. Page 16, lines 43 and 44 (clause 42)—Leave out subsection (3) and substitute:

(3) A person is not required—

(a) to provide information under this section that is privileged on the ground of legal professional privilege;

or

(b) to answer a question under this section if the answer would tend to incriminate that person of an offence.

No. 20. Page 17 (clause 42)—After line 5 insert new subsection as follows:

(5a) Where anything has been seized under subsection (4) the following provisions apply:

(a) the thing seized must be held pending proceedings for an offence against this Act related to the thing seized, unless the Minister, on application, authorises its release to the person from whom it was seized, or any person who had legal title to it at the time of its seizure, subject to such conditions as the Minister thinks fit (including conditions as to the giving of security for satisfaction of an order under paragraph *(b)* (ii));

(b) where proceedings for an offence against this Act relating to the thing seized are instituted within six months of its seizure and the person charged is found guilty of the offence, the court may—

(i) order that it be forfeited to the Crown;

or

(ii) where it has been released pursuant to paragraph *(a)*—order that it be forfeited to the Crown or that the person to whom it was released pay to the Minister an amount equal to its market value at the time of its seizure, as the court thinks fit;

(c) where—

(i) proceedings are not instituted for an offence against this Act relating to the thing seized within six months after its seizure;

or

(ii) proceedings having been so instituted—

(A) the person charged is found not guilty of the offence;

or

(B) the person charged is found guilty of the offence but no order for forfeiture is made under paragraph *(b)*,

the person from whom the thing was seized, or any person with legal title to it, is entitled to recover from the Minister, by action in a court of competent jurisdiction, the thing itself, or if it has deteriorated or been destroyed, compensation of an amount equal to its market value at the time of its seizure.

No. 21. Page 18—After line 40 insert new clause as follows:

Transitional provision

47. (1) The amendments effected by this Act to those provisions of the principal Act that relate to weekly payments of compensation apply as from the commencement of this Act to persons whose entitlements to weekly payments arose before or after the commencement of this Act.

(2) Where a worker became entitled to weekly payments before the commencement of this Act, the corporation or an exempt employer may assess or reassess the amount of the weekly payments as from the commencement of this Act on the basis of the provisions of the principal Act as amended by this Act.

(3) Where such a reassessment is made, it cannot give rise to a right to repayment of any amount paid on the basis of a former assessment.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr INGERSON: I support the amendments, and in doing so I would like to make three brief points. It is disappointing that the major amendment proposed by the Opposition—that is, to totally remove the overtime component from workers compensation weekly payments—has been rejected by the other place. In the example that we used to put our case before the House, we showed clearly that a worker from a significant company in Adelaide was receiving $900 a week from WorkCover, $300 of which was for overtime. His mates working at the same place were receiving $600 a week. In other words, the worker was receiving an amount of $300 a week by way of an excess payment benefit from WorkCover.

How can we convince people to go back to work and to accept that the WorkCover scheme is a rehabilitation scheme when they are given 300 reasons to stay off work? It is a pity that the Government has not accepted that amendment. However, there have been some significant improvements, such as the removal of the opportunity for members of the board to appear before the review panel and the changing of the standards related to exempt employers. The Opposition supports the amendments.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the question (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3657.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): With only 10 minutes available to each member in this Supply Bill debate, I propose to address the House on one issue: the impact of the behaviour of a number of our money-shufflers in this country. I begin, first, with the Federal Treasurer, the one who we all recall said, 'We are in the recession that we had to have' and many other cliches with which he has been tagged over the period of his reign as national Treasurer.

In the early 1980s, after the Hawke Government came to power, the Federal Treasurer (Hon. Paul Keating), amongst his other dabblings with the dollar activities, decided to deregulate the banking system of this country. He did so on the premise that it would encourage international banking activities and, accordingly, competition that would cause interest rates to fall. I understand that in other countries where such fiddling with the banking system has been attempted, notwithstanding the claims in those countries that interest rates would subsequently fall, they have not. Despite those warnings, the Treasurer went ahead with his idea.

We all know of the suffering that has occurred at all levels in the community as a result of that decision. We all know that in Australia we are paying enormous costs to have access to money that is necessary for domestic, small business, rural and corporate business activities. We all know that the greatest single factor that has brought our community to its knees is the cost of money.

Interest rates have ranged from as low as 13 or 14 per cent—if one could describe that as low—to 24 per cent, where penalty interest rates exceeding overdraft arrangements occur. It is in that arena that the community at large is suffering the most. It is as a result of the cost of money in this country that currently about 750 000 people are out of work. It is as a result of the cost of money in this country that an all-time record number of insolvencies is reported across the nation. It is as a result of the cost of money—that is, the level of interest rates—that so many of our small businesses and primary producers are going to the wall. A hell of a lot of talk and time has been addressed to the depth of those problems within the community at large.

I do not propose to continue to canvass the level of difficulties that my people in the rural community are facing at the moment. What I believe that I and others in this place ought to be doing is devoting as much time as we possibly can to resolving those issues. I am aware that in this place the United Farmers and Stockowners Association has lost a bit of credibility recently and that some unfavourable remarks have been made about that organisation from these benches. As one of those who subscribed to

certain criticism in that direction, I must say that today I have been furnished with some material that demonstrates that even Mr Don Pfitzner, the President of the UF&S, and I suppose with the support of his organisation in this instance, has got off his hands and has attempted genuinely to set out a proposal for Government consideration to assist farmers. In a press release of 13 March Mr Pfitzner is quoted as saying:

> At the centre of this proposal is a requirement for up to $263 million of carry-on finance in the form of low interest loans provided by trading banks to the farming community, which will be guaranteed by the State of South Australia. Our program proposes that carry-on finance of up to $100 000 per farm will be made available on a loan basis at a reduced interest rate of 8 per cent with strict guidelines applied to ensure that these carry-on funds are used for the purposes for which they are lent.

I agree with the sentiments of the UF&S in what it is attempting to do in this instance, namely, provide sufficient funds for the right people, the right caretakers of the land, to stay on their respective properties and not drift off under the current pressures they are experiencing. The sentiments are sound and, I believe, supportable. Just precisely how that proposal will be put into effect is another matter.

What I would prefer to see happen, not in lieu of this idea but as well as, is a call on the Federal Government, from the organisations representing the rural community across Australia, either to re-regulate the banking industry to the extent that it dictate that interest rates come down or, alternatively, to underwrite those interest rates on capital debts associated with the businesses to which I am referring. Unless positive action is taken in that way, we will find in the very near future an even greater number of unemployed, an even greater number of people seeking social security (and, accordingly, draining off the public purse), and an even greater number leaving their business and departing their own land in the rural community, and an even greater number suffering stress and domestic pressure.

Positive attention has to be given to this subject. We are at a stage where we can no longer pay lip service to this matter. The fairest, the most saleable, the most publicly acceptable way to deal with it is to address the nub of the issue, which is the cost of money, and not for Governments to give handouts to primary producers or anyone else during this period, whether they be in small business, in corporate situations or indeed farmers on the land—not to prop them up by writing off portions of their capital debt, or anything of that kind, but simply to assist them with the interest on business related capital debt.

I believe that the people in the metropolitan areas of this country will recognise the importance and, indeed, the fairness of such a move. So, it is with some real support for the UF&S that I acknowledge its efforts in this specific regard, and at the same time urge it to take up the cudgels and call on the Government to assist in the interest area of debt structure. In the meantime, we have a number of people who are, of course, being harassed by their lenders, their banking institutions, stock firms, etc.

In conclusion, all I can say to those people is that on the occasions when they are contacted by telephone, or even in person, they should simply seek the position of their lender in writing; that they do not any longer verbally enter into commitments or arrangements—that is, on the telephone, around the kitchen table, or even in the bank offices—about matters associated with their respective business loans; and that they indeed treat the subject as seriously as is warranted, so that as and when they are made answerable for their debts and there is a showdown at least the record is clear and official to ensure they are reliant on neither memory nor hearsay.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): The Opposition's contributions to this debate have been very poor. The whole theme has been to downgrade South Australia, for no benefit other than some short-term political gain that members opposite have wrongly perceived. Even the member for Murray-Mallee, when he spoke immediately following the Leader of the Opposition last night, said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hartley will resume his seat. The honourable member for Davenport has a point of order.

Mr S.G. EVANS: My a point of order, Sir, it that it is not appropriate according to Standing Orders to refer to another debate that has taken place during this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I think the tenor of the debate has more to do with procedure. It would seem to me that there is a constant referring during debates to what other members have said in the House, as against what was said in debate on a particular Bill or subject. I do not think I have heard such comments or statements by a member queried before in this House.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have a further point of order, Sir. You may have misunderstood me. Maybe I did not explain it enough. The member for Hartley is referring to the debate that took place in the second reading on the Supply Bill. This is the grievance debate, and I believe they are two different debates. I do not believe the honourable member can refer to what the member for Murray-Mallee said in the previous debate.

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. I misunderstood the member for Davenport in the first place. I uphold the point of order that referral to another debate is out of order.

Mr GROOM: I will not refer to contributions made in another debate, in deference to your ruling, Mr Speaker, but I do want to say that the Opposition generally has been very negative, particularly since the commencement of this session. Its theme generally out in the community has been to downgrade South Australia, for no benefit other than some perceived short-term political gain. Leading the fray in terms of poor contributions have, of course, been the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. There is no doubt that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not last long in his present position, if one gauges his performance since he has held that position. As members know, there are at least three challengers to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I will not name those three challengers, but they are well known to everybody. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will not survive the conclusion of this session.

I will not name the members; I will give them code names. One of those code names is Brutus, and we all know who Brutus is. By any stretch of the imagination, I do not think one could not know who Brutus is. I do not want to do anybody any injustice, but we all know who the challenger Brutus is. There is another challenger to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and his code name is Hippocrates. He sits down the front. Again, I do not want to reveal who he is, but members opposite know. There is a third challenger to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (you can see his days are numbered) and I will give this person the code name Delilah, although that might be a difficult one to guess! There is no question that Brutus, Hippocrates and Delilah—one or more or all—will challenge the Deputy Leader of the Opposition before this session is finished, and rightly so. I suspect there are a few Judas's in there, too.

What I do want to emphasise is that South Australia, notwithstanding the difficulties, is a well managed State. One would think that, because of the campaign being run

by the Opposition since the months of February and March, we are some sort of enclave and that nothing else is happening in the rest of the world. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition, and a number of Opposition members, speak about New South Wales as if it is some land of milk and honey. It is not. New South Wales is faced with enormous difficulties. In England, they do not have Bob Hawke as Leader of the United Kingdom: they have had Thatcher and now they have Majors—and they have enormous economic difficulties. We have seen a 25 per cent swing against the Conservatives in the United Kingdom. In the United States there is no Bob Hawke who is President; there is a George Bush, a very conservative Republican Leader—and they have immense economic difficulties in the United States.

South Australia is not alone in the western world in facing those difficulties. It is no good saying that New South Wales is a land of milk and honey—because that is simply not the case. The fact of the matter is that, as we all know, in New South Wales the Greiner Government will be going to the polls within the next two months, and we all know the real reason for that is that Mr Greiner has to keep the lid on something. We know that he is doing the best he can to keep the lid on a particular problem that he has in New South Wales. There is no doubt that we will see Greiner going to the polls in the next few months.

When honourable members talk about the various banks, we must remember that no other private bank has had third parties involved. No other private bank has called in an outside organisation to assess its position. Westpac, for example, is reported to have had to allow for bad debts of $1.2 billion. The National Bank, $651 million; the ANZ Bank, $569 million; the Commonwealth Bank, $462 million; and the Chase AMP Bank had a reported loss for the previous financial year of $154 million, and it has only $2.9 billion of assets, whereas the State Bank has $21.6 billion in assets. If we adjust for the difference in assets between our bank and the Chase AMP Bank, we will find that the Chase AMP Bank has the equivalent of $1 billion in bad debts.

All in all, the Opposition should bear in mind that, notwithstanding our difficulties, South Australia has a low debt position and that, notwithstanding the State Bank's problems, we have a low tax ratio in comparison with other States. There is no question that, notwithstanding the difficulties, South Australia is a very well managed State. It is no good pointing to New South Wales as being a land of milk and honey, because it is not. Honourable members should not lose sight of the fact that every western world country is faced with enormous economic difficulties. In South Australia we have the capacity to recover from those economic difficulties because of good management over many years.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): It is always a pleasure to follow the member for Hartley, who I might well code name Rumplestiltskin, because it appears that he has slept for the past 20 weeks while the State Bank issue has been before us. I note that he is now disappearing at a rate of knots from whatever I might have to say about it, so I will discontinue those remarks. But it is obvious—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Napier is obviously trying to lure me into something other than a straightforward address, but I advise him that he is not going to succeed. The member for Napier, along with his colleagues, from the Premier and Treasurer and those on the ministerial benches to those on the back benches and the like, appear to have been emulating the member for Hartley in their extremely lukewarm efforts to ridicule the extremely pertinent and relevant criticism addressed to the Government over its management and administration of financial affairs in this State—and I mention the State Bank, SGIC, Beneficial Finance and so on, *ad nauseam*. As I said, those efforts have been extremely lukewarm.

One reason why of course is that members on the Government benches recognise the absolute relevance and rectitude of criticism addressed to them, through the Premier and Treasurer, for the way that they have mishandled affairs in South Australia over the past several years. I notice that the members for Napier and Henley Beach have departed the scene. They are not prepared to listen to the criticism that I am addressing to them. The Premier has also tried very hard to distance himself—in fact, completely efface himself—from any responsibility for the State Bank's dilemma. The board has largely disappeared, although, oddly enough, three of those members have been reinstated, and perhaps they are claiming that they slept through the decisions that were made by the board and therefore remained in ignorance of what happened.

However, the board has largely gone and the former chief administrator of the bank has resigned. Several hundred members of the bank's ordinary staff will lose their jobs—not as a result of any misfeasance on their part but simply because they will suffer for bad decisions made by senior administrators, backed by the Government of the day, which had to approve a large number of the decisions that were made by the bank and its board.

No matter how far the Premier and his Ministers and backbenchers may go to distance themselves from culpability—or responsibility is probably a more euphimistic word in this case—the people of South Australia will ultimately judge. In the Westminster system of Government, of which we are all fortunately a part, it has long been held that the Government of the day and the Ministers of the day (and in this case through the Premier and Treasurer and his fellow Ministers) are responsible for whatever happens in Government departments and in statutory authorities. When problems of far less magnitude have arisen the tradition has always been that the Minister responsible resigns, and sometimes the Government.

We are not expecting that to happen in South Australia. A royal commission has been appointed and an Auditor-General's inquiry is in train. We have wider terms of reference than were ever intended by the Premier and his Government, fortunately, and we are hopeful that, ultimately, the full scene will be presented to the people of South Australia, to further assess at the next election the degree of guilt on the part of the Government.

So, I would simply say that we are being patient on this side. For two years we pointed out to the Government that we saw problems, and to assume the ostrich position, with the head in the sand, is hardly adequate. For at least the past 12 months we have been asking pertinent relevant questions about the administration of this State's affairs, and all we have had from the Treasurer of this Government are constant claims of ignorance, lack of knowledge and lack of responsibility. He has said things like, 'That really lies with the board' or 'I can't give you any immediate answer.' Answers still have not been handed down to the House after promises have been made.

This is from a person whose mental acuity and astuteness has never been held in question before in South Australia. Indeed, we have always claimed that we had a Premier who was a Tennyson medallist, who was very highly qualified at university level, and who had a good memory, as has been evidenced by his answers to almost every other question

put to him on the floor of the House in relation to things that have happened over the preceding years of his stewardship.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He knew about angora goats this afternoon!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, that's right, and this demonstrates his ability to get to the very small minutiae in relation to questions and to have instant answers. So, there is something here that really does not sit comfortably in my mind, as a backbencher on this side. I am quite sure that it also stands out with the people of South Australia: what really does the Government of the day know about things that have happened? I am quite sure that there will be people within the banks and within South Australian businesses who are well aware of the true state of knowledge of the Premier and his Cabinet, to be revealed later. I suggest that we read the next exciting instalments coming from the royal commission and the Auditor-General.

I now move on to more mundane things, but very important as far as my electorate is concerned, and I refer to the Health Commission lines. The Minister of Health is in the Chamber, and I would ask him to consider these things. I am delighted that from Mount Gambier a small team—comprising Mrs Marie Lattin, who is in charge of the Mount Gambier Community House, an institution that I chaired many years ago; Miss Julienne Feast, Mount Gambier Chief Executive Officer of the Community Health Service, and formerly Matron of the Mount Gambier Hospital; and Mrs Darylin Cowling of Millicent, who is Director of Nursing at Millicent and District Hospital—were able to attend the recently held National Rural Health Conference at Toowoomba in Queensland, in mid-February.

There, under discussion, was the promulgation, ultimately, of the red book, which will be a guideline, a yardstick, for the administration of health services in rural Australia, and my particular interest, of course, is in rural South Australia. I do have some concerns, because it was pointed out to me that the deployment of staff from metropolitan areas in South Australia to rural areas could be one of the dilemmas facing the Government and the Minister.

Even within rural South Australia there is disproportionate representation because Whyalla, for example, has three nurses, a social worker, one psychologist and one full-time office staff; whilst in the South-East we have only three nurses who cover an area from Mount Gambier to Bordertown and across to Kingston—Lower and Upper South-East. It is a huge area, and the travelling time alone contributes to a major loss of working hours not only in health but also in education and a whole range of areas. We realise that distance is a problem.

One would hope that Nicky Ling, the rape crisis counsellor currently attached to the community house, will be ultimately attached to the Mount Gambier Community Health Centre and that the provision of funds throughout rural South Australia is addressed. How important is this when we are looking at a potential $2.5 billion loss to South Australia through the State Bank?

I am reminded today by the *News* that some $9 million is expended on ministerial staff and assistants—an increase of $2.9 million. That $5 million would go a long way towards the $6.5 million recommended to be redeployed to rural health affairs. That amount might be saved by the closure of the Hillcrest Hospital and the reallocation of beds elsewhere, by the sale of property as planned and so on. Obviously I will not have time to expand on these matters as I would like in this debate, but I put the Minister on notice in respect of rural health. A paper on mental health redirection from the South Australian Health Commission recommends that a large number of patients be displaced from institutions. The Health Commission does not want to destabilise these patients, but I suggest that anybody removed from an institution will be destabilised.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Today's *News* headline states, 'Job crisis at a new high'. The subheading states that 930 people a day are joining the dole queue. Regrettably this is a symptom of the disease confronting Governments of today. We must therefore look very carefully at why we are facing a depression and why this crisis is coming about. I listened with some interest to the member for Hartley but he did not offer any excuses other than to say that other people are similarly affected. Some of the issues confronting us are influenced by international markets and affairs outside the control of this State and nation. However, it is equally true that many of the things that influence us in this State are within the control of the Government of this State and the Government of this nation.

It is not good enough that we stand back and say that we are in a mess but that it is not of our doing because the whole thing gets back to what is happening with farmers and small business people in the management of their affairs and their input and production costs. Unless those costs are controlled and managed properly everyone will have great difficulty surviving. Most of those costs, apart from income returns from overseas, are within the influence of Government. Labour and production costs, along with rates, taxes and charges are growing by increments so fast that it is impossible to keep up with them. Fifteen years ago if a member in this House said that there were 10 increases in taxation in a year it became a headline. Now, with 200 to 300 or more tax increases in a year, people have given up in disgust and the increases go over their heads. That disgust is taking its toll in the community.

The policies of the Governments of today—Federal and State—have much to answer for. My interest is in the rural areas but today, thanks to the failed Labor policies, the wool industry is in a state of disaster; the wheat industry is in major crisis; the fruit and dairy industries are facing increasing problems; and farm incomes are collapsing across the board. The current account deficit for the year has now reached a staggering $11 billion—up 23 per cent on the same period last year—yet Treasurer Keating says that January's current account deficit of nearly $1.6 billion is not bad. Foreign debt continues to escalate and now stands at a gross level of around $160 billion, which is almost $10 000 per man, woman and child. So, we are looking at a deficit per family of four in the vicinity of $40 000. Bankruptcies and business collapses are at an all-time record level. Unemployment is rising at a totally unacceptable level. Inflation remains uncompetitively high, as do interest rates and the value of the Australian dollar.

Despite all of these factors, which have been apparent and worsening for several years, the Labor Party refuses to change its economic policy direction. It has no desire to increase productivity or competitiveness in the private sector, especially in our vital agricultural and mineral export sectors. There is no real commitment to wages, industrial relations or structural reform. Labor simply rolls along with its discredited policy direction whilst people suffer and the country goes down the drain.

There have been numerous articles in newspapers of recent times and over several years, and I have highlighted many in this place. My electorate and that of the member for Eyre have been severely affected by the economic downturn as a result of a series of droughts. That series of droughts has

meant that people have become hardened to the difficulties being experienced. The rest of the State is now being affected similarly. We are getting cries of help from the Mid North, the South-East, the business community and almost every sector of this State and nation, all of which are being seriously affected.

The cartoon in today's *News* is tragic in that it shows a for sale sign on a farm property. The farmer is on his knees and a sheep is standing up holding a gun obviously about to put the farmer out of his misery. It is a tragic caricature but one that I believe epitomises the seriousness of the state of our economy and the plight of the rural community. If I have said it once I have said dozens of times that, if the Government of the day—State or Federal—want to get this community back on its feet, it must encourage those sectors which have the ability to produce with renewable resources. Those sectors have the greatest ability to be able to turn around and bring in large export earnings to the State and nation.

We would all like to see that happen in the manufacturing industry. However, as successful as it might be, there is a lead time for any manufacturing industry. Even if we could find a magical product, it would still have a lead time of several years before it could be up and running or give any economic boost. The input cost to get any new industry up and running is almost prohibitive, whereas primary industry and others with renewable resources are already established and proven and, if given a chance, can survive well.

I think some of the figures I have just quoted need to be put in proper perspective. Previously I have outlined the case of a farmer from my electorate who took a triple deck semi-trailer load of sheep to the market and went home with one bag of dog nuts. That is how serious it is. It is interesting to note that a 1 kg can of dog food is worth three sheep. That is the type of parallel that we need to get across. If this $970 million debt of the State Bank were divided amongst every agricultural establishment in South Australia, they would get $66 620 each.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: That is the magnitude of what we are talking about. Nobody is talking about frightened depositors. The depositors are secure because the Government has guaranteed their savings, but there must be a realisation of the seriousness of the situation that we are facing. I am rather hurt, when we are faced with wastage of this magnitude, that the Government of the day quibbles about $20 000 or $30 000 assistance for a country hospital. It will take this State, its citizens and their children years and years to overcome this blunder.

I have stood by the State Bank for many years because it has been a pillar of strength as our financial institution. I still believe that it can and should be. However, people have been influenced when making judgments and artificially inflating interest rates while playing the wider international money markets. That is really the problem. The State Bank is not alone in that. All other banks have been doing it, too. But, we, the John Citizens of this State, have to pay for it.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I place on record my appreciation of the effort of the Australian cricketers. I believe that every person in this House would want to join with me in indicating that there is great pride for Australia in the efforts of those people in the West Indies. I ask the question: when is a coup not a coup? The member for Napier on Tuesday afternoon 5 March (*Hansard*, page 3213) asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education whether he would relate to the House the circumstances associated with the training of Qantas staff at TAFE colleges in South Australia. The Minister, with a great deal of vigour, said that this was really a coup for South Australia, that it was a great thing. More's the pity that it is not a great thing.

I point out to the Minister of Employment and Further Education that Qantas staff have been trained at Regency Park for at least 18 months that I know of. A large number of young people have come from around Australia to train in the hospitality section of TAFE at Regency Park, and have then been front-runners for appointment with Qantas. So, this announcement of a coup really was nothing of the sort. In the *News* of 8 March, just three days later, an article stated that South Australia had lost the Qantas training course. The article states:

> Training ties between Qantas and the Regency Park College of TAFE are the latest casualties of economic turmoil troubling Australia's international air carrier.
>
> Flight attendant courses developed by Adelaide TAFE lecturers have been abandoned amid a downturn in air travel activity threatening to cost 2 000 jobs at Qantas.

The article goes on with other information. I say to the great fabricator that, if we are to have Dorothy Dix questions to laud the advantages of the South Australian TAFE system, let us make sure that we are telling the truth when we stand on our feet and not say something that would suggest that it is a new initiative when it has been in place for years. In fact, it was not an initiative at all because, before the ink was dry, there had already been a breakdown in those negotiations.

My colleague the member for Flinders talked about the difficulties of small business, the availability of funds, the demands of Government on small business and the very serious consequences of that with respect to employment. I refer to a case that was drawn to my attention by a butcher in the Gawler area who has provided apprenticeship opportunities for young people for a long time. It has been his nature to make sure that his industry benefited by the assistance he could give. He drew my attention to the rebates that are available under the apprenticeship scheme and made the point that the four year course attracts a rebate of $3 000.

The first $1 500 of that rebate is received within six months of the apprentice being taken on. My constituent really has no quibble with that. However, the student is required to attend block training at TAFE and elsewhere during the first three years of the course and the employer is required to pay the costs directly associated with that training; and the employer does not receive the balance of $1 500 until the end of the four year course.

My constituent draws attention to the fact that not infrequently an apprentice, having completed their apprenticeship, is looking towards marriage, travel or other challenges and is out of the door using that training in some other person's business, and the $1 500 to be paid at the end of the apprenticeship goes to the person who is then employing the apprentice. We are looking at a situation where a number of employers find themselves in the position, having provided all the advantages of apprenticeship training—and they accept that for the benefit of their trade or profession—of missing out on the necessary assistance that is available from the Government. I believe that the Government should take up this matter and ensure that proper payment is made over time so that the employer giving this opportunity to the apprentice is not left high and dry. I believe that this situation has existed for too long. It needs to be taken into account and dealt with at the earliest possible time.

I draw attention to another matter that has quite serious consequences and possibly emotional consequences, and perhaps one could say that it is a set of circumstances that occur much more frequently than we might otherwise expect. A person who conducts a funeral business has drawn my attention to the fact that quite a number of the people make arrangements for their funeral by paying in advance. Those people or the persons directly associated with the family receive a certificate that indicates that the funeral has been paid for but, if the family moves away and the person who is the one to be covered becomes demented or falls ill and moves into a nursing home or away from the district, it is almost impossible for the funeral director to locate that person. The point was made to me that such a case occurred in the district which I represent. A sum of money had been made available in the 1960s, and there had been contact with the person or the person's family on about a five year rotational basis. However, by the early 1980s, there was no contact from the family, and inquiries by the funeral director showed that the family had moved but that the person was still resident in the district. Therefore, he believed that that person would have a document that would come to the fore at the appropriate time.

A few years later, on making the next inquiry, the funeral director found that the person was not at the address. There was little information available from the people who lived in the area, because the person, who was of considerable age, had been taken out of the district and placed in a nursing home somewhere in Adelaide. That was all that was known. He could not obtain any information from the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages or from the Electoral Office, and he was unable to obtain any direct information from the family, because they could not be traced.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): We have heard much in the past months about the rural crisis. Discussion on this matter has been so intense and negative that it has, in effect, perpetuated the problem. Confidence in the rural industries is at an all time low. Over the next few months we should be speaking more positively.

I would like to refer to a matter about which I feel very strongly. I have been a member of this House for seven or eight months. Many members have been here for 20 years. I wonder, as they sit in this House, what they think about the performance of the Parliament in relation to our economy today. Let us be honest: this House and this Parliament and so many members have been overlooking the whole situation here in South Australia. I wonder how members feel about our slowly but surely going down the gurgler. It is always easy to be wise in hindsight, but we knew we were going down this track. My concern is what we can do about it now.

The actions of the Federal and State Governments and, to a lesser degree, local government, over the past 20 years have led us down this track. The parlous state of this nation today, notwithstanding its rich resources, is absolutely dreadful. If we keep going on like this, we will be doomed. That is not an idle threat; it is not a comment designed to sensationalise. We will be doomed. It is not because of drought or national disaster: it is a result of bad government. The member for Playford laughs. I am not here to score cheap political points; I am here to say that the Parliament ought to realise its responsibility and the part it has played in where we are today, and then let us know what it will do about that while there is still time. Parliaments in this country over the past 20 years had a responsibility, and I include the Liberal Governments, although most of them were Labor Governments. The Fraser Government could have done a lot more to turn around the problems of this country. We have a responsibility to the people we represent to say, 'Hey, we are politicians; we have made some mistakes. Trust us. We will turn them around', but at this moment I do not have faith—I do not have the message from members opposite—that this will happen.

As I said, many members opposite have been here for 20 years. If I had been a farmer for 20 years and I had had a similar result, I would be long gone from my farm. As lawmakers in this place, members must have some responsibility. No wonder the public of South Australia hold us—all of us—in such low esteem. Why? It is because we do not have the runs on the board. I would like to ask members opposite—man to man or woman, member to member, as a new chum of this House—whether they are proud of the record of the Parliament? They have done certain things over the years that have helped people, but why were they done? Were they cheap political tricks? Was it for publicity prior to an election? We all know what this State needs, but a lot of us do not have the will or the guts to do it.

Today the rural people of this State are in a parlous position, and I would be the first to admit that this is rubbing off quickly in relation to Adelaide. I resent the comments by many members opposite who call my colleagues and me silvertails. I am here as a working man; I have worked with my hands more than anything else. I was as much a labourer as was the member for Albert Park. I would be the first to admit that, with respect to the whole infrastructure, we all depend on each other to make the State work; no sector should be placed at an advantage over another, but today the working man of this State is taking the brunt of bad government. He is the one who is paying through the nose with his taxes; he is the one scoring the high costs. A lot of the farmers in this country who were astute enough not to spend a lot of money in the past five years will be able to see this through, but those who have been risk takers will be the ones we lose from the industry.

I ask those long standing members opposite what they will do in the next six months to turn around these problems. They know how to do it: they must take tough decisions. They have three years before an election to do something about it, but no, it is easy as she goes. I am sure that members opposite are resigned to losing the next State election, and that is the time when they will quietly retire. That is three years down the track but, irrespective of the result—and I am endeavouring at all times to be impartial in my comments—if we are not out of these woods and have turned the corner, who would want to win the election? Where will we be in 3½ years? I hate to think. As a person who has come into the place with grand ideas and thoughts—and I have now almost done my apprenticeship, as you said the other day, Sir—I do despair about what we as a Parliament will do about this.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What are some of these grand thoughts?

Mr VENNING: My grand thoughts should be quite obvious—to get the State back to work and back into production. This State was the growing State, the envy of all States in Australia and probably in the world until 1969—to the week. What happened then? When Mr Dunstan came to power he did many things. That was the turning point. We must get this State back to work and we can do that by getting out of the way of private enterprise.

We must put the profit motive back into everything. I know that this Government is trying to get around to doing that, but it is afraid to say that the profit motive works,

that private enterprise works. Get us back to work! I am brave enough to say that we have too many holidays in this State. We should get rid of some of the public holidays; the Government should take off one or two as a sign that it is dinkum. It should get rid of the 17.5 per cent leave loading and encourage the Federal Government to do likewise. It must give us an incentive, give us back the power to produce our way out of trouble. Australians are hard-working people; they have initiative, but they are being choked by bureaucracy.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I am not treating this as a joke. Members sit over there—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The honourable member has been sitting there too long. I do not intend to stay in this place for more than 10 years if I cannot get results. People make careers out of this job. I think that it is high time members opposite performance tested themselves. We should all be performance tested because, if we cannot pass a performance test, we should not be here.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is all very well to make these grand comments, but I live in hope that in the next few months we will see a constructive bipartisan approach by the Government and the Opposition to address the problems of this State. The results can be seen. We all know what is happening. Everyone is hurting; no-one is smiling and saying, 'I am doing very well, thank you, in the present state of affairs.'

This place is a Parliament. As the newest member of this Parliament—and I do not have rose-coloured glasses—I say that, if I ran my farm like the Government has been running the State, I would be well and truly off my farm. It is a pity that the Parliament cannot do the same thing and remove some of these non-performers. I think that the biggest sin is compelling people to vote. Compulsory voting is part of the problem. If people could go to the polls and make a constructive decision, perhaps we would be much more accountable.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I will begin by making some comments about graffiti, which got a reasonable airing during Question Time. My concern is that the Government has not taken this matter seriously enough. I and many other members in this place have raised this issue from time to time. I know that the member for Albert Park is supportive, but we have yet to see much in the way of positive action by the Government to address this matter.

The incidence of graffiti is spreading in the community; we see it not only on public property but on private property. Earlier today, the Minister of Transport did a bit of a shoe shuffle when he tried to introduce a furphy by implying that the Opposition would like to see the painters currently employed by the STA lose their jobs. Nothing would be further from the truth: I would strongly oppose any of those painters losing their job. The point is that there is no possibility that those painters will be out of a job because there is no way there will be a shortage of work. They cannot keep up with the task, and the Minister basically admitted that earlier this week. There is no shortage of graffiti and, as he indicated again today, by the time those painters paint a railway station, it is virtually covered in graffiti within hours. So, there is no possibility of those six painters losing their job, and I certainly would not be party to that.

I am disappointed to hear that the Government has not come to terms with the option of encouraging people to adopt stations and bus shelters and to work cooperatively and constructively in that regard. It is an embarrassment in this State to see what has happened to our public transport system by way of graffiti vandalism. Visitors travelling into the State on the Overland must get a fine impression as they travel through the Hills when they are confronted with the graffiti on STA property! That is not the worst section of track; there are other examples that are far worse than that particular line.

It is time that we did something about this problem. It is time the Government got serious and implemented the law that was passed by this Parliament last year and proclaimed on 1 January, namely, the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, which provides for young offenders to clean off their graffiti. That is what the public want: they want to see a constructive approach whereby offenders clean off their graffiti.

We know that there are always problems in bringing about arrangements for those sorts of activities, but they are not insurmountable. It is a matter of will and application, but the Government has been very slow to develop a procedure to enable that to take place. The Act was not proclaimed for almost eight months, so the Government had plenty of time to get organised, but it still has not got its act together—it is a disgrace.

I believe that this Government could learn from its counterpart in Victoria. I am no great supporter of much of what has happened next door in respect of economic matters, but members may be aware that the Victorian Parliament last year introduced the Transport (Anti-Graffiti) Bill. Whilst we have covered some of these problems under the Childrens Protection and Young Offenders Act, Victoria has taken the problem more seriously and has introduced a Bill for an Act to tackle the problem specifically. The Victorian Transport (Anti-Graffiti) Act provides for specific offences relating to graffiti on the property of the Victorian Public Transport Corporation. It provides for graffiti clean-up programs to be carried out on that property by offenders under the supervision of Community Services Victoria, and other related matters.

In Victoria, the problem is even more serious than it is in South Australia. When speaking to the second reading of this Bill, the Victorian Minister indicated that 'approximately $17 million was spent in the 1989-90 financial year on remedial and preventative measures to help control and eliminate graffiti and vandalism'. That is a lot of money that could be spent on other more productive and useful programs. The Victorian Minister mentioned a lot of the problems of which we are well aware, so I need not elaborate on those. One aspect that the Victorian Minister highlighted, which indicates the deficiency in this State in respect of the Government's action, is the initiatives already in place to control unlawful graffiti, which included—and I will only mention one of them—community involvement in clean-ups of badly graffitied stations, and that has been piloted by the corporation.

So, the State next door already has these programs under way, but in South Australia for some reason best known to itself the Government has been asleep on this issue, out of touch with community opinion and not responding in a positive and practical way. I am beginning to question whether the Government really views graffiti as a problem at all. I believe that we have had a lot of lip service but, judging by its actions, I do not believe that the Government takes this matter all that seriously, but I hope that that attitude will change.

If the Government does not move quickly on this matter, the Opposition will have to do what it can through this

Parliament to try to bring about some positive change. We are becoming increasingly frustrated, as are members of the community, and we are not prepared to sit back and allow this wilful destruction of public property, and, increasingly, private property, to continue.

I would like to conclude by referring briefly to another matter concerning sporting facilities in the southern region, including my electorate. We know, and it need not be reiterated *ad infinitum,* that the south lacks sporting facilities of a regional nature and of a regional standard. The people of the south are seeking some redress for that deficiency. To that end, last year several petitions were circulated that attracted many thousands of signatures from people in the south seeking adequate sporting facilities, including a southern sporting complex. Many of the signatories were not only seeking a sporting complex for Noarlunga, but indicating generally their dissatisfaction with the level of sub-regional sporting facilities in that area. Unfortunately, for technical reasons, which I understand, many of the petitioners' signatures could not be accepted by this Parliament.

I do not cast any reflection on the officers of the Parliament or the Speaker. The reason was that the petition forms technically did not comply with the requirements of the Parliament. Nevertheless, I place on record the commitment and support of those many thousands of petitioners who seek, and have sought in the past, to have adequate sporting facilities provided in the south. We realise that money is short at the moment. If it comes to pass that there is a major sporting complex in the south, it will involve Commonwealth funding, but it is important at this stage for the State Government at least to set aside the land which exists adjacent to Noarlunga Centre, so that such a major facility can be provided in the future. The residents of the south do not expect it to be constructed immediately, or the sub-regional facilities to be provided tomorrow, but at least set aside the land at Noarlunga Centre so that such a major complex can be provided in the future.

I would like also to place on record my appreciation of the work by the people who have been active in organising petitions in the south, organising meetings, and generally campaigning to give the south a fair go. It is a young and growing area. There is a great demand for sporting facilities and we must not let the opportunity pass us by. In particular, I call upon the Government to set aside the vacant land currently owned by the Housing Trust at Noarlunga Centre so that a major complex can be provided there in the future. In conclusion, I point out that this matter will not go away; it is just another one of the issues facing the forgotten south.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I rise to express my disgust at the manner in which this Government has allocated police resources in a failed attempt to solve South Australia's law and order problems. During my time both inside and outside this Parliament I have witnessed the Government's knee-jerk reaction to problems and plenty of lip service it has paid to getting something done, but crime rates continue to soar.

Recently, the Police Commissioner's annual report indicated a massive increase in crime in our community. There has been a sharp escalation in the number of offences, providing further evidence of the Government's neglect of law and order in this State. The trends over the past 10 years show that the rate of crimes of violence has increased by a massive 134 per cent, and property crimes are up 85 per cent. Last financial year we saw break and entering offences in South Australia occur at the rate of 116 per day. An average of 36 motor vehicles per day were stolen. The figures in this report are a further indictment of the Government's failure to maintain respect for the law and to deter would-be offenders.

Members on this side of the House have often put forward constructive solutions to particular problems. I would like to give an example of a solution that was put forward to a problem and in so doing I will refer to the *Advertiser* of 12 February of this year. An article written by *Advertiser* journalist Bill Power, appearing on page 3 and headed 'Police squad to fight street crime', states in part:

> A special police flying squad will soon be on the streets of Adelaide to combat the rising crime rate. Ten extra offices will assigned to the inner-city area after a meeting yesterday of police and State and local government representatives including the Premier, Mr Bannon, the Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, Emergency Services Minister, Mr Klunder, and Lord Mayor, Mr Steve Condous.

It goes on to say:

> The 10 officers will be assigned to the city's high crime spots bounded by North Terrace, East Terrace, Grenfell Street and West Terrace, but they could be sent to outer area troublespots if necessary. They also will target the south-west area of the city around Gouger Street—the scene of the fatal stabbing of English tourist Deborah Westmacott on 24 January. The flying squad announcement follows public calls for the State Govenment and police to take steps to combat inner-city violence, highlighted by last month's murder.

I welcome the formation of this flying squad, but it occurred more than 12 months too late. On 22 March 1990, I asked the Minister of Emergency Services a question about city violence. My question was, in part:

> Will the Minister ask the Commissioner of Police to establish a special task force to combat the problem?

The Minister replied, in part:

> I thank the honourable member for his question. While he was speaking I was trying to recall an on-the-run briefing I had on this two weeks ago and, unfortunately, it is not clear enough in my mind, given the Opposition's predeliction for picking on minor details in what Ministers say. So, I will not give that information at this moment but I will undertake to bring back a report for the honourable member.

In fact, I did later receive a report from the Minister, and that report contained some interesting statements indeed. I received the report on 4 May 1990. The Minister concluded his report with the words:

> In response to your direct question as to whether I will ask the Commissioner of Police to establish a special task force to combat the problem, I advise that it is not my prerogative to intrude into police operational matters.

The Minister considered in May of last year that it was not his prerogative to intrude into police operational matters and to direct the Police Commissioner to instigate particular actions to combat crime in the city. It took a tragic and nationally embarrassing act—the murder of a British tourist in this country—to get the Minister to finally do something about the problem. I wonder what would have happened had that murder not occurred. I understand the murder was reported overseas. It has taken that incident to get the Minister to do something about doing his job. What a disgraceful situation to occur to force some belated action. This squad should have been formed 12 months ago, and it is my fear that it may go the way of other police operations, to which this Government has done nothing more than give lip service. It is a classic about-face that was forced on the Minister.

I do not make that statement lightly. There are many other situations where the Government has done nothing more than provide lip service to combating law and order in this State. I give as a very interesting example the maintenance of staffing in the Crime Prevention Unit. Many members would be aware that the Crime Prevention Unit

in this State is a section of the Police Force responsible for the implementation of Neighbourhood Watch. At the time of the last election the Government was only too keen to claim credit for Neighbourhood Watch. I have said on many occasions in this House that under this Government the Crime Prevention Unit had been depleted of resources at the very time the Government was trying to claim credit. Now I have proof for those statements and the proof is provided in the form of a Minister's reply to a question I asked on notice.

I asked a question of the Minister regarding the number of establishment police officers attached to the Crime Prevention section, and the figures he supplied were: as at 30 June 1986, eight officers; 30 June 1987, eight officers; 30 June 1988, six officers—a staff reduction of 20 per cent; 30 June 1989, six officers; 30 June 1990, an increase to seven officers; and at 9 July 1990, an increase to nine officers. This increase occurred after members on this side of the House had been complaining about the Government's failure to support the Neighbourhood Watch program in this State constructively. Success stories like Neighbourhood Watch have occurred in spite of, not because of, this Government. The Government claims it was providing resources at the last election. It was not providing resources; it reduced them by 20 per cent. The proof is there, and it is there in the form of the Minister's answer to my question. It is a matter of public record.

The Government's action has been nothing more than lip service. One has only to speak to people involved in Neighbourhood Watch programs. I was on the State executive at the time when all this lip service was being paid. I saw it from the inside. There was no support. I want to put on the public record details of a discussion I had at a small meeting with the Premier some three years ago. At the time of that meeting I was neither a member of the Liberal Party nor a political candidate for that Party. At that time I was invited to the meeting to discuss with the Premier Neighbourhood Watch and its future in this State. The Premier expressed concern about the program and said to me, 'But surely this program offers the opportunity for vigilante groups to run rife in this State.' I replied, 'No, Premier, it doesn't', and explained to him how the program operated. That shows the sort of commitment that this Government has for crime prevention in this State. Members of the Government cannot sit there and claim credit for the program—because it has gone ahead and operated in spite of them.

To this day, we have a program that does not even have full and proper administrative support in this State. The program has not been given the resources that it has asked for. Its requests have been continually turned down, and it continues to struggle on, to get things up and running. However, to date it certainly has not been serviced in the way that it deserves to be. The Government's acclaimed (but non-existent) crime prevention strategy continues to be referred to. It is not the only misleading information that the Government continues to circulate. Only a fortnight before being forced to announce his flying squad in this State, the Minister of Emergency Services attempted to play down the whole issue, by making some very misleading statements about the crime of murder. There is no doubt that murder is the ultimate crime, but to shrug it off by saying that people in other cities in Australia and in other parts of the world would be delighted to change places with people living in Adelaide is a cop out.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last night I highlighted many of the problems facing people in the rural areas of South Australia. Today I wish to address a problem that also affects rural areas, and I refer to charges for the use of school buses. At the last State election, the Government, in its panic to retain office, undertook to provide free bus travel for all students. It was a blatant attempt to buy votes, and I guess, on looking at the results, it succeeded. However, what was not mentioned was that this applied to people in the metropolitan area who have access to STA services. Free travel was not to be provided for anyone else, particularly people in rural areas. I want to read into the record three letters written by constituents of mine complaining about this issue, received only in the past month. The first, from the Chairperson of the Curramulka Primary School, Mr J.P. Gregor, states:

> Dear Sir:
>
> Our School Council wishes to lodge a strong protest against the recent increase in bus hire fees for Education Department buses.
>
> Presently, we have the advantage of a 24 seat mini-bus stationed at our school. Our school and surrounding small schools have gained some benefit from the use of this vehicle for a wide variety of excursions and educational programs which are an integral part of our school's curricula. Our principal has advised us that bus hire costs have increased from 35c/km to 52c/km, an increase of 49 per cent.
>
> In view of the availability of free STA transport for metropolitan students, our school parents regard any payment for country bus hire as a clear contradiction of the Government's social justice platform.
>
> To redress this situation we request that you urge your Government to waive all rural bus hire costs where the usage of such buses is directly connected to schools' curricular activities.

Hear, hear! The Curramulka community can justly say that the Government has not been applying evenly its social justice policy across the board. Country people are seriously disadvantaged. The next letter is from the Secretary of the Edithburgh Primary School Council, Di Hiscock, who says:

> As a School Council in a rural area, we feel that we are obligated to write and express our dissatisfaction on the current way in which the free bus travel scheme is geared towards the metropolitan area only.
>
> In many parts of our area bus travel to and from school is not available, therefore once again families bear the brunt of fuel costs transporting children on a twice daily basis—no subsidy is offered.
>
> Also we do not have the advantage of subsidised travel for our students, and when moving large numbers of students by bus for excursions, camps, inter-school activities, etc., the financial burden of hiring buses falls on the shoulders of the families concerned.
>
> Once again the needs of the rural community have been ignored.

This brings up an additional problem, namely, that parents in country areas often have to transport their students many kilometres, with no reimbursement at all. We all know the extent to which fuel costs and operating expenses for motor vehicles have increased. These parents are being subjected to this burden at a time when the Government has decided that students in the metropolitan area can have a free ride. Of course, the Government recognises that there are few, if any, votes for them in the country electorates. The third letter, from the Kadina Memorial High School Council and signed by Mrs Jill Sobey, states:

> The members of Kadina Memorial High School Council wish to draw your attention to the continued, and now emphasised, inequity in the availability of bus transport for students in the country when compared to their city counterparts.
>
> At the same time as students in Adelaide are being provided with free STA travel, the cost of hiring departmental buses has been increased by 20.5 per cent from $1.02 per kilometre to $1.23 per kilometre. This has the effect of making any school excursion even more expensive and in rural areas already hit by hard economic times this added impost will be quite disastrous.
>
> For a Government that has made social justice the cornerstone of policy development over the last few years this action in raising these costs is short-sighted and inequitable.
>
> As an example, if a group of 35 students were to attend a performance at the Festival Theatre using their $1 theatre passport

it would cost each student $10.61 for transport as well as taking the best part of a day. For students in Adelaide the cost is nothing.

We would like to see immediate steps taken to reduce or remove the costs to students and schools of bus travel during school time.

The point I emphasise here is that it is totally out of order that, one year after the Government introduced free travel for metropolitan students, it has the audacity to increase bus travel costs for country students by between 20.5 per cent and 49 per cent—as per the examples I quoted. I have taken up with the Minister, in writing, all three issues raised. I am still awaiting answers. I hope that the Government will reconsider its position as regards those enormous cost increases. I hope that the Government will desist from increasing bus transport costs for country students, which will at least represent some semblance of social justice.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Last night I spoke of the questionable property investments by State Government financial institutions in the city of Adelaide. This evening I will speak about a further commercial investment by the State Government Insurance Commission—in radio. The House will be aware that in the 1987-88 financial year SGIC purchased a 30 per cent shareholding, amounting to 4 million shares, in radio 5DN. At that time 5DN, a popular station with very good ratings, was on the AM band. As a 30 per cent shareholder SGIC in 1990 put up $12 million in convertible notes for an FM licence. A number of questions could be asked on how that came about, and one was asked by my colleague the member for Bragg in the House on 21 August last year. He asked the Treasurer whether he believed that Commonwealth media ownership laws should be followed by a State Government instrumentality and, if so, why had SGIC been in breach of the Broadcasting Act for more than 12 months with respect to radio stations 5DN and SAFM, in which it held a substantial shareholding, and what did the Premier propose to do about it.

With hindsight the reply was very interesting. The Premier virtually denied knowing about it. He said that he was not aware that SGIC was in breach of the Broadcasting Act, as the honourable member alleged. He stated:

If that is so, no doubt the appropriate and responsible authority would be taking up that situation and the circumstances of it. I suggest that if breaches had either wittingly or unwittingly been committed there are ways and means of redressing that. No doubt the tribunal, if indeed it had an interest in this area, would be saying so.

In fact, the tribunal said so in a letter to SGIC in November 1989. The question came nearly a year later in August 1990. Given that SGIC's purchase was clearly an investment, it is equally clear that the Treasurer must have sanctioned it because it is his responsibility to approve all investments under the foundation Act. Either SGIC failed to tell the Premier that the investment was potentially illegal and that the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal had been in contact or it got a legal opinion which stated that the shield of the Crown protected SGIC from any illegal act. In any event, it is strange indeed that the Premier did not know. If SGIC had done the right thing the Premier would have known but failed to tell the Parliament; if it did not do the right thing, one must ask why it failed to inform the Premier.

Looking back it seems that the likely scenario is that the Premier did not want to reveal that SGIC took a gigantic gamble in purchasing an FM licence and the equipment to convert 5DN from AM band to FM band. It is well known that the owners of 5DN were going to shut down the station. Had they done so, SGIC would have made a loss. It is standard commercial practice to cut one's losses and a small immediate loss at that time would certainly have avoided much larger long-term losses. However, it seems that SGIC was unwilling to accept that it had made a mistake and upped the ante by financing a conversion to FM. That $12 million was invested by SGIC, which held only 30 per cent of the shares in 5DN. SGIC put up the $12 million in convertible notes for the FM licence, which was worth $6 million, and for the conversion equipment.

We are bound to ask why SGIC took the decision to convert to FM in what was already a saturated market, and known to be such. SGIC must have known that it could not possibly compete successfully with the stations already operating. Of course the inevitable happened. There has been no obvious programming or clear marketing plan and 102 FM First Radio has proceeded to lose many loyal listeners. Ratings plummeted from over 14 per cent at the time of purchase to 3.3 per cent late last year. Ratings have inched up to 5.3 per cent currently. It is very hard to turn around a radio station, particularly in the present climate and particularly given the traditional loyalty of listeners in this State to the respective stations.

The prospect of long-term losses is a real one and yet SGIC does not seem to have learned its lesson. That lesson is demonstrated in the figures given to the last annual general meeting of First Radio. Those figures are an indictment of SGIC's capacity to manage effectively an AM radio licence. The figures list the book value of the AM licence (not the FM licence), which presumably it still holds, at $8.5 million and lists other assets at $2.5 million. That book value for the AM licence is absolutely ridiculous. No-one will pay $8.5 million for an AM licence. It has been used by SGIC to inflate the value of the assets. No bank would put that value on it in the current climate, and one can only assume that SGIC is using it to offset its balance sheet.

The annual general meeting put the total losses for 1989-90 at $1.3 million, and the total losses from July 1988 to June 1990 at $2.522 million. It put the monthly revenue at the time of the annual general meeting at between $190 000 and $230 000, and the running costs per month at $450 000. The yearly loss was estimated at between $2.6 million and $3.1 million. The $12 million licence and conversion cost was not even covered in the total assets figure. The figures certainly are not complete enough to draw too many conclusions except that even in terms of variable costs First Radio is losing money.

I am not the only member of this House nor indeed the only person to be given information (which I would like the Premier to deny if untrue) showing that monthly revenue dropped substantially for First Radio to around $100 000 in January of this year. That leaves a shortfall of $350 000 per month. It may be less than that if First Radio has managed to reduce its costs. Having sunk $12 million into a very questionable operation, with little hope of success, SGIC is now pouring good money after bad, yet the Premier stated, in answer to a question in November last year in relation to SGIC, that commercial confidentiality of transactions must be respected in keeping with normal market practice. This is the same language that the Premier used for the State Bank, and it is language that worries me greatly in view of the State's contingent liability for the State Government Insurance Commission.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): The House has just voted to appropriate sums of money to pay the Public Service of

this State. It is therefore opportune in the context of this grievance debate that we should reflect on some aspects of the value which South Australian taxpayers get for their dollar. In particular I wish to address the cost to this State of the staff attached to Ministers of the Government. The Parliament has every right to expect value for money—and I say 'the Parliament' deliberately—since, as political appointments, one of the principal functions of such officers must be assistance with the political aspects of Ministers' portfolios and, in particular, their accountability to this House.

Many people in our community are asking where the Bannon Labor Government is going wrong. I refer to an article, as follows:

It is no coincidence that most of the Labor members defeated at the election were ministerial advisers before they entered Parliament. The advice they gave in the 1970s and early 1980s remained the foundation of their belief and philosophy as they entered the 1990s. They had precious little to contribute in policy reform and fresh direction when they reached the Caucus room. Ironically, most of the defeated quintet have returned to ministerial advisory roles, waiting again for the call to pre-selection.

Too many ministerial advisers have been in the job too long. They are performing on automatic pilot, falling back on old solutions for new problems. Somehow there must be a purge of ministerial staff.

Those words are not my words, they were written by Rex Jory and were in the *Advertiser* of 18 April 1990. They are as relevant today as they were when they were first written.

I wish to refer to remarks that were made today and yesterday by the Minister for Environment and Planning, and relate those remarks to advice which I believe she was given by her ministerial assistants and which, by either omission or commission—and I hope by omission—sought to be not quite truthful in reflections on me. In that context I refer the House to file number A124.2.1 of the Department of Environment and Planning, item number 6628-13258. This document headed 'Register Assessment Report, South Australian Heritage Act 1978' is signed by J.C. Womersley, Manager of the State Heritage Branch. Rather than detain the House overly long, I will read its recommendation, as follows:

It is recommended that 'Fairford' as defined by the boundary in appendix 2, be included on the Register of State Heritage Items.

Yesterday the Minister said that the property about which I spoke, Fairford, was not on the heritage register; and that, I have to acknowledge, is quite correct. What the Minister did not say was that it was recommended for inclusion as a heritage item—I confirmed this today with Mr Conlon of the State Heritage Branch—as far back as September 1989. I believe that preliminary notice has already been served for its heritage listing, and I believe the only thing that is currently stopping Fairford from being placed on the interim heritage list is the signature of the Minister.

I was assured by Mr Conlon that the nomination of Fairford as a heritage property has gone forward and is on the Minister's desk, having been recommended by the State Heritage Committee, and is just waiting for her signature. So, on a technical point I may have erred, but I think on a point of principle I did not. It is, should and very soon will be a heritage item for South Australia, and that was the point I wished to make.

I cannot include it in *Hansard*, but any honourable member is welcome to look at the map of the site plan for the proposed heritage listing of Fairford. It includes not only the building but the environs of the building and much of the vegetation that the Heritage Branch thought was worth adding to the listing. Anyone who visits that area can clearly see that some of the items that are recommended for heritage listing, in particular half a dozen or so plum trees, have been quite deliberately cleared in the past few days. The Minister did not say that in this House.

Also, the Minister tried to say that I had erred in saying that a century old fig tree had been cleared from the western bank. I refer the Minister to a letter dated 19 January 1990, from The Botanic Gardens of Adelaide and State Herbarium's Tree Advisory Officer, Mr Tony Whitehill, addressed to Mr Brian Bowley at the Site Development Office of the Department of Housing and Construction. It states:

RE: Laffer property 'Fairford' and Sturt Creek

On Tuesday 16 January 1990 we made an inspection of the section of the Sturt Creek between Sturt Road and South Road. To the easterly side of the creek is the property Fairford. On the western side of the creek we agreed that introduced plants such as silky oak, judas tree, coral tree, mulberry, italica, Lombardy poplar, glauca, blue mountain, atlas cedar, weeping willow, lemon scented gum, and the avenue of spotted gum should be retained.

Weedy tree species—

I note that it is 'weedy tree' species and not weed trees as the Minister said, which puts the trees in a different context—

to be removed include desert ash, willow, almond, olive, fig. Specimens of claret ash are falling and therefore they should be removed. On the easterly side it was considered desirable to retain a number of large, old pear trees which help form a backdrop to the old garden.

The point I made in this House, and the point on which the Minister obviously had advice—and obviously that advice was not totally complete or totally correct—was that a 100 year old fig tree was removed. That is recorded in this letter. It is true that a fig tree remains on the western side. It is also true that a fig tree over a century old was removed. It is stated in this letter that that was a recommendation of the Botanic Gardens.

However, it was also a recommendation of the Botanic Gardens that many of the trees that were removed should have been retained, and that, Sir, is in black and white and is now on the public record. I do not mind being wrong, and I do not mind being corrected. However, I do object when Ministers come in with partial answers, I would hope provided by their ministerial assistants, and deliver them in such a way as to reflect on the integrity of members who get up in this place and try to make points honestly. It happens with this Government too often. Members opposite have indeed been in this place far too long. It is time that there was a change in government. It is time that we were over there so that good and efficient government could once again be a hallmark of South Australia.

I conclude by commenting on the question raised by the member for Hartley in Question Time today. Somehow or other he knew that I had had representations about poplar trees being destroyed along the banks of the Torrens River and the Minister canvassed that question, I thought, quite well and adequately. However, the question still remains to be answered whether all the trees were diseased and should have been removed, and why there appears to be a fetish at present towards the destruction of historical and exotic trees. I am forced to wonder whether, when the department completes the linear parks, the Minister will not instruct the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to remove many of the exotic trees in the environs of our parklands—trees such as the plane trees on Frome Road. If exotics are so bad, why not get rid of them all; why not purge this whole city of everything that is not indigenous to the Adelaide Plains? It appears that that is the way the Government wants to go. I am appalled by some of the answers that we get in this place. I am appalled at the way some members on this side of the House are treated when they raise questions and ask things honestly. The Minister of Transport

today referred to a grievance debate in which I took part a month ago.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise in this debate to refer to a couple of issues in relation to which the Government has fallen foul, both of those being in the transport arena. I refer first to an issue that is directly related to my family and, unfortunately, it is as a result of a serious road accident that I relate this problem to the House. In the accident the family car was written off—totally destroyed. Subsequently, my father-in-law went into the Motor Registration Division with the new registration listing that had been sent out to him, and he asked what he should do. He reported to the lass on the front counter that the car had been written off and that, obviously, he did not want to continue with the registration of the vehicle.

To his amazement, she promptly said to him, 'Well, Mr Goodchild, all you have to do is tear up the registration advice and throw it away.' He was amazed at that reply, and asked again, just in case there had been a mistake. He got the same reply: he was advised to tear up the registration advice and was told that in three months, when it was noted that the registration had not been renewed, he would receive another reminder notice; when he received that reminder notice, all he had to do was throw it away; and eventually, after probably 12 months, the whole process would correct itself and he would no longer get a reminder notice for that vehicle.

I found it quite amazing that the Motor Registration Division would advise a person to tear up the registration certificate. There are more ramifications than implied in this case where a car was destroyed. The reality is that a registered engine was still in the car and that engine could be used anywhere if it were not reported. Last week I decided to telephone the department to find out whether my father-in-law had been misinformed. Unfortunately, I got the same reply. I note that the Minister of Transport is now present; I hope that, after reading this short contribution, he will take up the matter.

Secondly, I refer to aged people who have to take a driving test once they are over the age of 70 years. As the Minister would be aware, under the Act people over 70 years must take a test each year to make sure that they are competent to hold their licence. Constituents of mine advised me last week that they went into the Mitcham office and asked whether they could organise to take a licence test. The licence expired the next month. They were advised to come back in August to take the test. Of course, I was quite surprised, because I knew how efficient the Motor Registration Division was and I knew it would not hold up aged people for that length of time.

I again rang the division to ascertain the situation, and was advised that it takes about six months for people to get onto the queue to undertake their driving test. Surely, if the division is so far behind, it could co-opt private sector teachers and qualified people to help get rid of this backlog of people who want to renew their licence. That would at least enable the aged people in our community to take their test before the due date. It would seem to be a simple procedure to get in these private sector operators and inspectors to clear up the whole exercise.

A young plumber who has a business in the Norwood area came to see me this morning. He employs six people and, unfortunately, in April last year one of his employees was injured at work while using a backhoe. It was agreed that it was appropriate for that worker to claim workers compensation. The young man was sent off to the doctor and it was diagnosed that he had carpal tunnel syndrome—an RSI type injury. To this stage he has been to nine doctors; he has been to seven providers and is continuing on the hurdy-gurdy because, every time he is told that he must have an operation, he quickly hops off to another doctor to get another opinion.

I find it incredible that we continue to tolerate the abuse of the workers compensation scheme by a few people. Those who are genuinely injured are being disadvantaged because of the abuse of the system by just a few people. That accident occurred in April 1990 and, because of the difficulties faced in the business sector today, this young man has had to put off another person because, under the Act, he is required to employ a person who is not genuinely injured and who is not prepared to accept the medical decisions that have been offered to him. The employer has had to put off a person who can work capably because he cannot sack the person who is abusing their position under the workers compensation scheme. He has asked me to put this situation before Parliament, because it is a major concern for those small business men who genuinely want to get on with running their business in the current climate.

We all know how difficult that is, given the problems associated with workers compensation levies, and that is the other point that he made to me: because he now has this malingerer on his staff and cannot get rid of him, his levy has gone up—because of the abuse of the system by one individual. It seems to me that that is unfair on everybody. The compensation scheme was never designed to permit the sort of abuses that can occur and are occurring today. This young person has had to put off another person, who has been affected, because of this malingerer. I do not think that is good enough, and the system ought to be changed.

Finally, I refer to the way in which the Government treats the questions asked in this House. I put to you, Mr Speaker, that there are many occasions in this House—and I know you, Sir, are not in a position to demand that a Minister answer questions—when Question Time is an absolute waste of time. When genuine questions are asked, questions which the community of this State want answered, Minister after Minister, starting with the Premier and going right down the front bench, just fob them off without any explanation at all. Today the member for Coles spent the 10 minutes allocated to her in the grievance debate referring to the investment of SGIC in 5DN—now called 102FM. I asked a genuine question of the Premier in August last year—what holding does SGIC have in that radio station. Today, SGIC still has that holding, and it is illegal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The malaise that confronts this country at present will put us, as an organised, civilised law-abiding society of people, committed to the cooperative realisation of common goals and the fulfilment of our individual aspirations, at grave risk. We come to this situation in consequence of the disastrous policies which have been pursued by the Federal Labor Government and which have been overlaid by equally disastrous maladministration in this State of South Australia.

I draw attention to this situation at this time because of the effect that that maladminstration at both Commonwealth and State level is having on the self-esteem, confidence and willingness to go on of many of the people whom I represent. They are the people upon whom this incompetence has had its greatest and most devastating impact.

They are the people who are involved in the export industry. The consequence of these policies on those people's lives, whether they be men or women or the children dependent upon them, is something that I had never expected to witness when I first came into this place. I could see that, if we were stupid enough to pursue our policies in the general framework for long enough, we could arrive at this sorry pass. I have to place on record at this point my assessment of the awful situation in which we now find ourselves: it is by no means the worst; that is yet to come, and is several months away.

In the communities I represent well over half the families involved in rural production or in servicing rural producers will have negative incomes this year. That is, the amount of money they will have left at the end of their year's work will be less than the amount they started out with: they will have lived on borrowings. The assessment of that amount is determined before they spend one cent on putting bread on the table or one shred of clothing on their backs or doing anything about finding shelter for themselves or their families.

More than 60 per cent of the people in those circumstances whom I represent will have negative incomes this year. That is tragic enough of itself, but greater is the tragedy when one realises that it is through no fault of their own, although they have been made to feel that in some way it is their lack of endeavour, determination and personal diligence which has contributed to their awful plight.

A cartoon in the *News* today struck me in the first instance as humorous and, on second and final appraisal, as poignant and then as damnable—damnable because it shows a picture of a farmer on his knees in a bare paddock with a sheep standing on its hindquarters about to shoot him. That is damnable, as it illustrates the way many of the farmers whom I represent feel at this time. Already, there is an escalating number of inquiries on my home telephone at Tailem Bend from people in desperate straits seeking advice—sometimes not asking but pleading. They are pleading not for advice but for help in understanding why they find themselves in these circumstances. They are pleading for their lives, for they fear there is nothing left for them to do in all dignity than to end it. They tell me that early in the conversation.

It requires constancy of purpose and equanimity on my part to deal with those calls, often in the early hours of the morning or just before dawn, as these people feel it is better not to face their spouse, in particular their wife—men have these feelings more than women—or their children the next day. It disturbs me enormously to have to listen to those stories and to have to counsel those people to believe that it is not a consequence of anything they have done or failed to do and that they are still worthy human beings in terms of the way in which they conducted themselves, their businesses and their affairs prior to the disastrous impact of the policies that have caused the circumstances in which they now find themselves. I counsel them to believe it will be relevant and competent for them to pick it up and go with it again, even if in another career, in another lifestyle and in another place. Certainly, it ought to be, in the interests of all South Australians, right there on their farms or in their businesses in the towns serving farmers.

Consequently, I have to tell the House of the distress which these people feel, which they communicate to me and which I feel on their behalf. They have lost so much self-esteem that they even contemplate suicide, and the numbers are increasing. Rural counsellors suffer burnout as a consequence of this and they will testify to that in conversation with any member of this place. I do not invite those telephone calls, but I would not reject any of them, and I would not want anyone to feel discouraged in deciding whether to call me as a consequence of my making these remarks today.

The root cause of Australia's problems is a group of people in this country who formed a Party that is now in government. That Government simply believes that the only factor that needs to be taken into consideration in determining the wage rates to be paid to a person working in an enterprise is what will be acceptable to both the employer and the employees' representative (the union). It is not: nothing could be further from the truth. It is a mistaken belief that we can simply put a bigger ladle into a bottomless pit to get even more than we were getting before. Somebody somewhere must provide the currency, the money, that is put into the wage packet with spending power. For it to be a disposable income of relevance and significance, it must have spending power. If in calling up, it can buy resources, products, and goods and services of greater value than is contributed by the person being given it, someone else must do the work.

There have been inequities before in this country, but they have never been as bad as they are now. There is no incentive for anyone engaged in export oriented enterprises to continue. If you are making a loss, why do it? That is exactly what is confronting our rural communities: there is no incentive for people to engage in import substitution. So, what is happening? We are continuing to lose our viability as a nation and as an economy, when we could easily be the most prosperous nation on earth, to the point where we will have our credit rating destroyed and go into hyperinflation at interest rates that are off the planet, the like of which we would not find anywhere else but in South America over the past two decades. That is the risk we run.

We must now change our industrial relations systems and restore incentive to our export and import substitution industries—and quickly. We must ensure that wages are fixed in a way that provides that no increase will be given unless there is an increase in productive output and, collectively, no increase will be given where the country does not have the gross domestic product to pay for it. We cannot expect children yet unborn to meet the cost of our present profligate excesses. We can do without the kind of economic policies being thrust upon us at present. There is no more left to be taken from the economy as taxation increases. We are on the point of collapse, and it is not the fault of the people who are suffering.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The question of Adelaide's water quality has been an issue in this State for a long time. It has been brought to a head in the past few days as a result of samples that have been taken and assessed by the University of New South Wales. I want to speak today because of the emphasis that the Minister has placed on the Mount Lofty Ranges supplementary development plan. I suggest to the House that the Minister is kidding herself and the community if she thinks that the Mount Lofty Ranges SDP is the only way to solve Adelaide's water quality problems. I have attended a number of meetings and I have read a number of reports where the Minister has placed a considerable amount of emphasis on that particular supplementary development plan.

No-one can deny that prolonged development in the water catchment area has taken its toll. The fact is that there is less primary production now in the Mount Lofty Ranges than has been the case in previous times. If one compares the quality of water in Adelaide with that in Melbourne, for example, it is very easy to recognise that Victoria, because

of its smaller catchment, has been able to protect that catchment right from the very beginning, whereas Adelaide is in a very different situation.

However, I want to refer to the lack of commitment for appropriate funding on the part of the Bannon Government, because I believe that has played a far greater part in the deterioration of Adelaide's water supply than anything else. I say that because I am aware that there are those who would like to see the cessation of all development and primary production in the Hills. That is totally impracticable. Recently introduced controls have gone some way to limit the opportunity for future major abuse of the watershed catchment that undoubtedly occurred in the past when primary production was more widespread. Regulations already prohibit new housing if less than 25 metres from a watercourse in areas outside a township or a built up region.

New dwellings must install aerobic water treatment systems if they cannot be connected to deep drainage or common effluent schemes. Large built up areas in the catchment remain unsewered, because of the lack of priority placed on those areas by the Bannon Government. As a result, we have effluent entering the watercourses that lead directly into the Mount Bold reservoir. Owners of properties connected to the sewer through the mains extension program in the Hills are forced to make a substantial financial contribution on top of the usual connection fee. It is interesting to note that no such contribution is required by people, living in Aldinga, for example which I point out is a Labor electorate, and to me, and I believe to the public of South Australia, that seems totally iniquitous.

Effluent enters the Onkaparinga River from both the Heathfield and the Stirling treatment works, while Government facilities—and I use just one example—such as the Sports Institute camp site at Mylor have effluent entering the river as a result of the use of outdated septic systems. Nothing is being done about those situations. Recently, E&WS dumping of filling onto the river plain at Verdun was a further example of the Bannon Government's lack of commitment and, regrettably, other examples will be brought to the attention of the appropriate Minister and the Government in time to come. The Government has also been very tardy in its handling of the Mount Lofty review, which has so far cost taxpayers in the vicinity of $4 million. The review was commenced some four years ago.

The transfer of titles from sensitive areas of the catchment to less sensitive areas, which I would suggest to the House is a very practical solution to many of the pollution problems, has been under consideration for four years and is still unresolved. The lack of priority on the part of the Government has meant that the determination of land capability within the ranges has not been given appropriate consideration.

The Bannon Government's misuse of Federal money earmarked for capital works to improve water quality has resulted in only $8 million of $56 million being made available in 1989-90 for use on infrastructure to improve water quality. Preventative maintenance now accounts for only 44 per cent of E&WS spending on maintenance, compared with 61 per cent in 1986-87.

Regrettably, the Government is totally bereft of policies to provide alternative water supplies for Adelaide. We hear a lot of rhetoric from the Minister, but we see no action and no policies. Adelaide's water supply is deteriorating because the Bannon Government has made its funding a very low priority and has refused to make the necessary commitment to clean up its own act in the Mount Lofty Ranges. Regrettably, the Minister hopes that strong rhetoric about the Mount Lofty Ranges supplementary development plan will divert attention from these basic problems that require urgent attention.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 4 (clause 4)—Leave out 'who does not hold a driver's licence' and insert 'who is not authorised under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to drive a vehicle'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment is simply a tidying up of a proposal that was initiated in this place by the member for Hayward. On further reflection the other place felt that the proposition had merit, but that it was not worded as well as it might have been. This amendment does improve the wording and certainly does not interfere with the intention expressed by the member for Hayward.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition accepts the amendment and thanks the Government for its indulgence in this matter. The amendment originally moved by the member for Hayward will enhance the legislation and will lead to further clarity.

Motion carried.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 March at 2 p.m.