HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 August 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

STURT HIGHWAY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House supports the submission of the Riverland Local Government Association, the Shire of Wentworth, the Shire of Mildura and the City of Mildura for the upgrading of the Sturt Highway and its inclusion in the National Road Network.

The Riverland Development Corporation, on behalf of the councils to which I have referred, had a submission prepared, a submission supported by numerous local government bodies. The submission to which I refer for the upgrading of the Sturt Highway to national road status has been strongly supported by the District Council of Light, the Corporation of the City of Enfield, the City of Prospect, the District Council of Angaston and the Mid-North Local Government region representing member councils of Angaston, Barossa, Blyth, Snowtown, Burra, Clare, Eudunda, Gawler, Kapunda, Light, Mallala, Riverton, Robertstown, Saddleworth, Auburn, Spalding, Tanunda, Truro and Wakefield Plains.

I can do little more than refer to the submission that was prepared on behalf of the councils to which I have referred. In the introduction the submission states:

The Federal Government decided to increase the national road network in its One Nation statement by including links from Sydney to Adelaide and from Brisbane to Melbourne. It allocated $60.7 million for the improvement of the Sydney-Adelaide link over the three fiscal years up to 1993-94.

Although the One Nation document mentioned the Sturt Highway in the context of the new Sydney-Adelaide national arterial link, the Land Transport Policy Division of the Department of Transport and Communications has asked consultants to define the exact route which gives the most economic benefit. An alternative link to the Sturt Highway from Balranald via Ouyen and Murray Bridge was chosen for that examination.

The consultants are due to report at the end of July 1992 and a decision will be made on the route location based on the economic benefits in the consultants' report, as well as other strategic and political considerations relating to the purpose and objectives of the Commonwealth's national highway program. The standard of the new highway route will be higher as a national highway and will make the transport of produce outwards and inwards to the districts served by the roads more efficient. The improvement of the highway will also generate economic activity during the construction period and afterwards, due to the development of new industries associated with any improvement of road facilities. This report, which has been prepared for the Riverland Development Corporation, will argue for retaining the Sturt Highway through the Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler, Barossa Valley, Riverland and Sunraysia economic regions for strategic, economic and political reasons.

For descriptive purposes, the Sturt Highway route will be considered to include the Montague Road extension to Port Adelaide. The route which includes the urban travel from Port Adelaide through Adelaide, the South-Eastern Freeway, through the Adelaide Hills to Tailem Bend, the Dukes Highway, the Mallee Highway through Ouyen and further to Tooleybuc on the River Murray and the link to Balranald in New South Wales will be referred to as the Mallee Highway. Port Adelaide has been chosen as the endpoint of both routes because of its economic significance and the importance which the objectives of the national highway system place on promoting overseas trade and roads to ports.

In relation to the Sturt Highway, the lenght of this route is 560 km from Balranald to the Port of Adelaide, which is also close to the industrial areas to the north of Adelaide where considerable interstate traffic originates. The proposed bypass of Renmark with a new bridge at Lyrup would reduce the length to 545 km and a further bypass at Mildura would reduce the length to about 540 km. The Sturt Highway route passes the major industrial areas of Gepps Cross-Salisbury-Elizabeth, the tourist, vine and winery area of the Barossa Valley and tourist, fruit and vine areas of both the Riverland and Sunraysia.

The average traffic level is about 2 000 AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) with about 380 of these being heavy vehicles. Traffic is higher between Adelaide and Gawler (25-50 000 AADT), between Gawler and the Barossa Valley (4 000 AADT) and also between Berri and Renmark (4 415 AADT). It is lower between Renmark and Mildura (1 260 AADT), indicating that the Sturt highway in SA is mainly serving trade and commerce between Adelaide and the economic regions in South Australia.

A transport survey of commercial freight carriers in the Riverland district indicated a significant freight industry in this region. A total of 38 carriers out of 60 replied to the survey, and indicated that their 243 trucks (152 articulated) were travelling 28 689 million kilometres per annum. The majority of these companies were based around articulated trucks and one half of these focused their activities on freight to the Eastern States.

The survey indicated that these companies annually exported 632 000 tonnes of primary produce (98 000 tonnes refrigerated) and 16 600 tonnes of wine and juice from the Riverland region. They imported 376 000 tonnes of building materials, consumer goods and other manufactured goods and 10 000 tonnes of fuel into the region. This gives 1.035 million tonnes of freight generated from these carriers alone from the Riverland region.

As interstate road freight between Adelaide and Sydney was estimated by the Bureau of Transport and Communications Economics at 800 000 tonnes in 1985-86, this means that the regional freight generation exceeds, or is of the same order as the interstate freight movements. The submission states:

The Sturt Highway is classified as a class 6 urban arterial to Gawler and a class 1 rural arterial thereafter. Approximately $65 million of Federal funds have already been spent on the Gawler bypass on this highway and further Federal funds will be used to link the Sturt Highway/Main North Road to the Adelaide—Perth highway/Port Wakefield Road through the Montague Road extension project.

I briefly refer to the submission's background of the Mallee highway, as follows:

The length of this highway is 555 km from Balranald to Port Adelaide. A portion of this route is already a national highway from Adelaide to the turn-off from the Duke's highway to the Mallee highway, and the addition to the national highway network will only be 431 km. The proposed new route goes through wheat and livestock country and only a few small population centres which service these industries. The population in South Australia is estimated at 4 000 and 25 000 in Victoria, although this latter population includes about 10 000 people in Swan Hill, some 40 odd kilometres from the Mallee highway. The average traffic level on this proposed new national route averages about 600 AADT with 120 heavy vehicles although it does decrease to 300 AADT in NSW.

The report also looks at the background in relation to regional economics and states:

A comparison will be made between the regional economies along the complete Sturt Highway length but only on the Mallee-Balranald highway sections of the alternative, as the regional economies in the Adelaide Hills, Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend are already being served by the existing national highway between Adelaide and the turn-off to the Mallee highway. Proceeding from Port Adelaide to the Sturt Highway and then along it one proceeds through the following economic regions:

1. The Port Adelaide—Wingfield—Gepps Cross port and industrial area, containing extensive light industry and the multifunction polis to the north of the proposed new link.

2. The Pooraka-Salisbury urban and industrial area, containing light industry, the Levels Technology Park, the Parafield and Edinburgh airfields and the Weapons Research Establishment. This area has recently received South Australia Government urban planning approval for being the major area for industrial expansion in the State. The Greater Levels commercial and industrial estate of 428 ha is presently being developed between the Port Wakefield Road and the Sturt Highway and is one of the largest estates in the country at the present time. The population is about 106 000.

3. The Elizabeth urban and industrial area, containing heavy industry (GMH) and light industry based around car manufacturing. The population is about 29 000.

4. The Gawler urban area. The population is about 15 000.

5. The Barossa Valley which has viticulture, wine industries and tourism. Many wines from this region are exported. The area has 6 000 ha under vines, produces about 60 000 tonnes of grapes and has many wineries. A total of 202 000 tourists annually visit this area, comprising 97 000 international visitors and 21 000 interstate visitors. The population is about 10 000.

6. The Riverland which has viticulture, horticulture, fruit processing and tourism. About 200 000 tonnes of grapes and 200 000 tonnes of citrus are grown in this area and it contains the largest winery (Berri-Renmano) and largest fruit juicing factory (Berri-vale) in Australia.

The Riverland produces about 30 per cent of Australia's citrus, 20 per cent of Australia's fortified wine and 12 per cent of unfortified wine. The Riverland exports the majority of Australia's citrus ($60 million) and about 70 per cent of the Australian viticulture export figure (fresh grapes of $30 million, dried grapes of $90 million and wine of $190 million). These exports, of about $270 million in value go down the Sturt Highway and are exported from Port Adelaide. There are a further 44 manufacturing establishments and 11 wineries in the area. The population of the Riverland is about 36 000 with employment figures of about 14 000. The Riverland is an important tourist and recreation destination, with over 290 000 annual visitors, of whom 5 000 are international.

The Sunraysia region has viticulture, horticulture, fruit processing and tourism. ABS agricultural census figures [indicate] 250 000 tonnes of fruit and vegetables produced in the region. Mildura is also a centre for various regional services—community, retail and manufacturing. The population of the Sunraysia region is about 50 000 and has been growing at a fairly fast rate of 3.1 per cent between 1981 and 1990, nearly three times the Victorian average. The major economic activities along the Mallee highway are livestock and wheat farming. There are also major horticultural and viticultural activities around the River Murray near Swan Hill but the production is about half that of the Mildura area.

The strategic considerations referred to in the submission are:

1. Encourage overseas and interstate trade by reducing transport costs.

2. Assist interchange between industry in major population centres.

3. Help long-distance tourist and recreational movements.

4. Improve transport movements between defence establishments.

They are important issues in determining the need for national highways. Under the heading 'National highway indicators', the submission states:

The indicators used to measure whether these national highway objectives are being met are traffic, freight levels and passenger movements. In all cases the Sturt Highway movements are at least 300 per cent higher than the Mallee Highway.

It is clear that there is a great need for the Sturt Highway to be upgraded to national standards. Under the heading 'Political considerations', it is stated:

There is undoubtedly a greater population along the Sturt Highway route (some 250 000) than along the Mallee highway (some 30 000). This difference in population should be a significant political consideration.

The other political consideration relates to how quickly the works can be started and get money flowing through the economy. The most advanced project in South Australia is the Gawler-Greenock alignment improvements which are nearly ready for tender calling.

I urge that serious consideration be given to this motion and I commend it to the House.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. I indicate from the word 'go' that I have a certain vested interest in this matter as does anyone who lives adjacent to this particular road or whose electorate the road traverses. That apart, during my time in this Parliament I have always looked at what is best for the State. I come back to the term that is often floated from both sides of the House, and that is 'cost effectiveness'. The report to which my colleague the member for Chaffey has referred very clearly picks up the cost effectiveness of the route he is suggesting, and that cost effectiveness is not only in dollars and cents but in relation to the service provided to a number of communities that exist, rather than the open spaces along the track, which is the alternative.

Cost effectiveness provides the opportunity to increase the productivity of a number of those areas which the road traverses, and I refer particularly to the Barossa Valley and the Riverland—the Riverland in both South Australia and across the border into New South Wales and Victoria, having regard to the proximity of Wentworth and Mildura and the general direction towards Sydney. It also brings forward an opportunity for the completion of the Crystal Brook to Morgan Road in a time frame ahead of the present expectation.

Members who take the opportunity to read the document to which the member for Chaffey has referred will find that, whilst the Morgan to Crystal Brook Road is not directly linked to the Sturt Highway, it does lead to a conjunction via either Waikerie-Cadell or even up-river from Renmark and would complete a cost effective route

to the Northern Territory and to Western Australia which does not exist at present; those who would take the trip from the east to the west or to the Northern Territory must now add an additional 100 kilometres, at least, and that heavy traffic is imposed on roads that were never meant to be a national route. In that sense alone, a further benefit will flow at a later time.

The preparatory work for the link from Port Adelaide through to the Salisbury connector and, eventually, through to the Main North Road has already been started. We already have massive production, which has potential for increase, throughout the Wingfield, Port Adelaide and Kilkenny area, and production is picking up in the newly developed industrial areas of Gepps Cross up to Salisbury and Elizabeth, in the Barossa Valley—Nuriootpa, Angaston, Tanunda—and further upstream from Waikerie, Berri, Barmera, Renmark and Loxton across the border into New South Wales.

Far beyond the capacity to improve transportation for export purposes and for general business activity, we also have the very large population variation, which is of the order of 250 000 *vis a vis* 30 000 by the alternative route. I do not want to talk down—and do not in any way talk down—the benefits that should accrue to those in other States with, as opportunity permits, an improvement in the facilities available to them. A national highway already services Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend, but the route from that point through Pinnaroo, Lameroo, Ouyen, up through Swan Hill and onto the national highway can benefit from local road application and from other moneys that will be made available from time to time.

Once the Sturt Highway is improved, there will be cost benefits: there will be less heavy traffic on unprepared roads and, therefore, a diminution in the funds required for repair and for bandaiding the road system. Those funds can be hived off into the other road systems, and the Murray-Mallee highway would benefit in that sense.

We have seen that most dramatically in relation to the South-Eastern Freeway; the funds that were used to keep the roadway open through Hahndorf, Nairne and Kanmantoo were wasted. That road is no longer the problem that it used to be, hence funds have been used for other systems. We must look long term rather than short term. It is because of the long-term benefit and the cost effectiveness overall that I have great pleasure in supporting the motion and, if the member for Mitchell were in his place, in due course he might concur with my comments and those of the member for Chaffey. I hope that this House will give approbation to a most worthwhile motion.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) otained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I would like to commend this measure to the House. Basically, it sets out to remove any provision in the law which would tend to favour those who abuse alcohol or drugs in order to commit an offence against others. Of course, at present the law permits the courts to take into consideration the state of mind of the person who was committing the offence. Where it could be demonstrated, in fact, that the individual concerned was so affected by drugs or alcohol that they were incapable of forming the appropriate criminal intention, it is quite possible that the person would not be liable for the offence which they would otherwise be deemed to have committed.

I believe that the community has reached the position where society expects Parliament to grapple with this issue and to determine that those who voluntarily abuse and consume drugs or alcohol in order to commit an offence or who commit offences while under the influence of drugs or alcohol which they have voluntarily consumed should be dealt with as though they, as a sober person at the time, had understood the consequences of their action. If we are to deter acts such as this, it is essential that the Parliament should ensure that people take the full and appropriate criminal responsibilities for their acts.

The Select Committee on Self-defence, of course, considered this very matter some time ago, and one of the recommendations of that committee, the report of which was debated in the last session of this Parliament, was that the criminal law should be amended so as to provide for a measure very similar in effect to this measure. That part of the work of the Select Committee on Self-defence was not proceeded with by the Government when it introduced the appropriate amendments following the work of the committee. Of course, the Bill which followed from the committee's work was adopted by the Parliament and now forms a very important part of the criminal law of the State. However, this one issue remains outstanding, and I believe that it is appropriate now that this issue should be addressed.

At the time the Attorney-General indicated to the Parliament that he had not proceeded with that aspect of the committee's report because, while it was not necessarily a matter with which he disagreed as such, it was receiving national attention, and he believed that it was more appropriate to await the outcome of those national deliberations. In the intervening period—and it is now quite a significant period—that matter has been considered at the national level, and I believe that reports about the issue are presently circulating in draft form.

However, I do not consider that it is necessary that we should wait any longer. This is quite an important reform of the criminal law. The Parliament's Select Committee on Self-defence has considered and debated it. It has been reviewed by the Attorneys-General at the national level, and I believe it is appropriate to move on the issue now. It is certainly appropriate that the Parliament itself should have the opportunity of considering it and, if it thinks fit, to passing the measure or perhaps amending it if some other mature consideration of the issue indicates that that is more appropriate.

I have brought this private member's Bill before the House because I believe that is a very relevant way of making to the criminal law amendments which do not cover page after page but which do provide a very limited and reasonable response to a selected area of the criminal law, which is a valid part of community concern. The Bill is necessarily very brief, and I would like to canvass its individual clauses.

Clause 1 is, of course, formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act come into operation one month after assent. I believe it is essential that amendments like this should come into effect fairly quickly because if they are approved by the Parliament the community has a reasonable expectation that they will be brought into law very soon after that. So, clause 2 provides for a fairly immediate operation of the Act should it be approved.

Clause 3 provides for the enactment of a new provision relating to the criminal responsibility of a person who is in a state of self-induced intoxication. In such a case, a defendant will be taken to have intended the consequences of his or her acts or omissions as far as those consequences would have been reasonably foreseeable by the person if sober, and to have had the same perception and comprehension of surrounding circumstances as he or she would have had if sober. The provision therefore introduces an element of objectivity into the assessment of the case, in conjunction with the level of understanding of the relevant circumstances that the person would have had if sober. Self-induced intoxication is defined as intoxication that results from the voluntary consumption of a drug, other than in accordance with the directions of a legally qualified medical practitioner. 'Intoxication' will include any impairment or disorder of mental facilities arising from consumption of a drug.

Clause 4 will make consequential amendments to section 19a of the Act, which relates to the criminal responsibility of a person for an offence relating to death or injury caused by the person when he or she has driven a motor vehicle while affected by a drug. The new provision will encompass the existing provisions under section 19a, so the relevant provisions under section 19a may therefore be repealed.

I commend this measure to the House and invite all members to take note of the provisions of this change in the law, to compare it with what the national debate is now considering and to take into account the recommendations of this House's own select committee of some 12 months ago now which recommended very much along these lines. I commend the measure to the House.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

That this House congratulates members of the Australian Olympic team, in particular the South Australian team members, for their marvellous overall performances in the Barcelona XXVth Olympiad.

I am very pleased to be able to summarise the performances of our athletes and coaches and put these performances into perspective. As everyone knows, the games opened on 25 July in Barcelona, and I must say that congratulations to Spain are in order for its running of this XXVth Olympiad in terms of the quality of the facilities and the running of all events. It must have been a mammoth task to run an event of that nature with all the heats and finals in diverse sporting contests. I congratulate Spain on a marvellous effort.

The overall performance of the Australian Olympic team was fantastic. Although many members of the public were pleased with the medals that were won, especially the gold medals, they were nonetheless disappointed that we did not win more. In this respect I blame the media. They built everyone up to think that we were going to win dozens of medals. They raised public expectation way out of all proportion and put enormous pressure on our athletes and coaches to perform. We have seen this often and it was especially so during these games. For example, Kieren Perkins was expected to win three gold medals. He held three world records, but that is different from competition in the Olympic Games. The media put the athletes and coaches under so much pressure that it became intolerable.

I agreed with the Australian swimming coach, Don Talbot, for once, although I do not usually agree with him, when he said that there was an appalling lack of knowledge among most sporting journalists to give unreal expectations about what we can win at events such as the Olympic Games. It is one thing to win national titles, Commonwealth medals and to break world records. Quite often those world records are set when there is not a lot of pressure on athletes and they are able to perform in a more relaxed style. It is a different situation at the Olympic Games where there is intense pressure. It is the ultimate sporting event in the world.

In congratulating Australian athletes on their performances, I particularly pay tribute to diver Jenny Donnet, who carried the flag for Australia. It was an honour thoroughly deserved by Jenny. She was representing Australia at her fourth Olympics. Bearing in mind that the games occur only every four years, it is a fantastic effort for anyone to be at the top level of a sport for that time. It means a period of 15 or 16 years at top level and I congratulate Jenny on that terrific performance, as I am sure do all members of this House.

I would also like to congratulate all medallists, and I will start with the gold medal winners. Australia won seven gold medals: Kathy Watt (cycling), Matthew Ryan (equestrian), Matthew Ryan, Gillian Rolton from South Australia, David Green and Andrew Hoy (equestrian teams event)—the first equestrian team's gold medal since Rome in 1960—Kieren Perkins (swimming), Peter Antonie and Stephen Hawkins (rowing), Clint Robinson (canoeing), and Andrew Cooper, Michael McKay, Nicholas Green and James Tompkins (rowing). Theirs was a fantastic effort and those seven gold medals were well and truly deserved.

Our athletes also collected nine silver medals: Shane Kelly (cycling), Hayley Lewis, Kieren Perkins and Glen Housman (swimming), Danielle Woodward (canoeing),

Gary Niewand (cycling), Brett Aitken, Stuart O'Grady—both from South Australia—Steve McGlede and Shaun O'Brien (cycling teams event), Kathy Watt (cycling)—following up her gold in the road race—and the men's hockey team.

Our athletes also won 11 bronze medals: Phil Rogers from South Australia, Hayley Lewis, Samantha Riley, Susan O'Neill and Nicole Stevenson (swimming), Tim Forsyth (high jump), Lars Kleppich (sailboard), John Forbes and Mitchell Booth (yachting), Daniela Costian (discus), Nicole Provis and Rachel McQuillan (tennis), and Kelvin Graham, Ian Rowling from South Australia, Steven Wood and Ramon Andersson (canoeing). Australia won a total of 27 medals (seven gold, nine silver and 11 bronze), which was a fantastic effort eclipsed only by the 35 medals won by Australia at the Olympic Games in Melbourne in 1956.

These 27 medals are far more meritorious than those 35 in Melbourne because of difficulties which I will go into later. A total of 30 South Australians were in the team, comprising 24 athletes, one coach, two medical officers and three sectional managers. Between the 24 athletes, they won four medals—one gold, one silver and two bronze. In fact, five South Australian athletes won medals, because two of them who won silver were both from South Australia.

For the record, I will name the South Australian participants in the team, commencing with the 24 athletes and then the officials. Simon Fairweather, reigning world archery champion, was a bit disappointing in this event, but that is the way they go at Olympic Games. It is the ultimate—very much pressure packed, and unfortunately Simon did not get through to winning a medal. The participants were Simon Arkell (pole vault), Sean Carlin (hammer throw), Lisa Ondieki (marathon), Kathy Sambell (athletics), Dean Smith (decathlon), Mark Bradtke and Mike McKay (basketball), Brett Aitken, Patrick Jonker and Stuart O'Grady (cycling), Gill Rolton (equestrian), Lynda Lehmann and Ian Rowling (canoeing), Alison Peek and Juliet Haslam (women's hockey), Paul Lewis (men's hockey), John Fitzgerald (tennis), Martin Roberts and Philip Rogers (swimming), Jamie Fernandez and Kate Slatter (rowing) and Carl Veart and Tony Vidmar (soccer). The officials included David MacFarlane (shooting manager), John Daly (athletics manager), Basil Scarsella (soccer manager), Charlie Walsh (cycling coach), Dr Brian Sando (chief medical officer) and Graham Winter (sports psychologist).

The Australian athletes acquitted themselves exceptionally well. Apart from the 27 medals that I have mentioned, there were many fourth places, many finalists in different events and many personal best performances achieved, including some world and Olympic records. It seems strange that some of our athletes broke world and/or Olympic records but did not win medals. An indication of the awesome quality of the competition at these Games is that, in winning the 1 500 metre freestyle gold medal, Kierin Perkins' winning time would have overlapped and beaten by four laps the gold medal performance of Murray Rose in the 1956 Games. Murray Rose was a super swimming champion in the 1950s, winning the 1 500 metres in 1956 and winning a silver medal in 1960. It is mind boggling to think of Kierin Perkins' performance, using that comparison. When the Games started, Kierin Perkins was a triple world record holder, and swam the fastest 200 metres of his life but was only the 11th fastest qualifier.

Our track cyclists, in whom I am particularly interested, as is my colleague the member for Henley Beach being a former racing cyclist, broke four world records yet did not win a gold medal. I may test the patience of the House by going into some of the cycling results, because that is a matter about which I know something, and I am very proud of the riders. We won four silver medals in cycling, and it was extremely close—it could have easily been four gold medals.

Mr Ferguson: Five.

Mr De LAINE: With a bit of luck, as my colleague suggests, it could have even been five. Shane Kelly won a silver medal in the 1 000 metre time trial. I felt particularly sorry for Shane because he was one of the first riders off the rank. He rode a time that was unchallenged by subsequent riders and had to wait approximately one and a half hours in a leading position until the last rider of the day beat him for gold by a fraction of a second. That was a marvellous performance by Shane and I think he is only 19 years old; he has a tremendous future.

Silver was also won by Gary Niewand in the 1 000 metre sprint, following an Olympic bronze medal at the Seoul Games. He is a dual Commonwealth Games gold medallist in that sprint event. That was another fantastic effort. However, being a sprinter myself, I felt sorry for him because he was the best sprinter at the games and he was out-manoeuvred and narrowly beaten by the German. The German is the reigning world champion and to give the world champion about six metres start with 180 metres to go and still miss out by about one centimetre was a fantastic effort.

We could have easily won a third gold medal (but unfortunately we did not) in the 3 000 metre individual pursuit, in which Kathy Watt competed. She had already won the gold medal in the road race. However, I must stress that the event was held during the road racing season in Australia and Kathy went to Barcelona having been able to compete in road races in Australia. On the other hand, track events were out of season in Australia and Kathy is not a track specialist. Despite that, she broke the Olympic record and narrowly went down in the final to win a silver medal.

The other silver medal was won in the 4 000 metre team pursuit. A four-man team of Stuart O'Grady, Brett Aitkin—as I said, he comes from South Australia—Stephen McGlebe and Shaun O'Brien competed in this event. In the quarter final heat they shattered the world record by almost six seconds. That was a fantastic performance. They had already broken the world record in their heat and knocked another five seconds off it in the quarter final. I might also add that that performance was on an outdoor track, which is most unusual these days—most cycling events are held in indoor velodromes. They were narrowly beaten by the Germans in the final. I was talking to Charlie Walsh the other day and he told me that one of our riders was

slightly down on the day; he was half a second a lap slower and that made that little difference and unfortunately they were beaten by the Germans. Nevertheless, it was a fabulous effort and our team needs to be congratulated. They are only very young—Stuart O'Grady is 18 years old, Brett Aitkin is 21 years old and the other two riders are 23 years old. So, they are only youngsters but they were competing against the best, mature team cyclists in Europe.

We may also have been robbed of another gold medal in the 50 kilometre point score race, in which our representative, Stephen McGlebe was tipped to win. Stephen was 1990 world champion in this event and he won his heat in exemplary style by lapping the field. That was a fantastic effort. Unfortunately, Stephen rode in the team pursuit final, which was held only a half an hour before this big event. Charlie Walsh complained about that and I have always complained about it. Nevertheless, that was the way the program was set up and no doubt the terrific ride in the final of the team pursuit event took it out of Stephen. In fact, he did not finish in the 50 kilometre event.

I would like to mention two other special performances. First, I wish to refer to Rob de Castella, the marathon man of many years standing. He is now in the veteran class and I think he will probably call it a day after this. He made history as the only man to finish four Olympic marathons. He did that despite his age and under terrible life-threatening conditions that should not be tolerated. It is about time that the officials and the powers that be staged these events—and especially those such as the marathon—at an appropriate time of day that is geared to the safety of the athletes, instead of bowing to pressure and putting them on to cater for prime time television. That practice must stop. During the past two games the timing of the event has created life-threatening situations. Experts have warned that the situation will probably be even more dangerous in Atlanta at the next games. Something needs to be done before someone dies in this event. However, I give full marks to Rob de Castella on being the only man in history to finish four Olympic marathons.

Another performance that I should like to mention is that of another South Australian athlete, the deaf decathlete, Dean Smith. There was some controversy just prior to the Games that he may have to miss out on representing Australia at the Games, but common sense prevailed and he went. He finished nineteenth of 29 finishers in a field of 36 starters. It was a very gutsy effort in difficult circumstances in view of the lack of competition that Dean would get in this country. I commend him for a very gutsy effort.

There are two other people whom I would include as being very important in our team. One is Charlie Walsh, a good friend of mine, who is reputed to be the world's best coach. I do not doubt that for a moment. He is a terrific motivator. He has received lucrative offers to coach overseas. He has been getting such offers for some years, and he received one very lucrative offer only last week. Charlie is obviously considering his position, but I believe that he will stay here. He loves Adelaide. Why not? It is the best place in the world.

Another person, who was not officially in the team, is Bruce McAvaney. Bruce is regarded as Australia's No. 1 sports commentator. He did a terrific job in bringing back, via television, the best coverage of each sport. I mention these two people because they grew up together in my electorate. They lived in the same street opposite one another and spent their early lives together at school. It is great to see two such people succeed at top international level in their chosen fields. I pay tribute to both of them.

I should like to express pride in the fact that only four South Australian cyclists have ever won Olympic or Commonwealth gold or Olympic silver medals in the Games. I refer to Ron Jonker, who won Commonwealth gold in 1970, Michael Turter, who won Olympic gold in 1984 and Commonwealth gold in 1982, and Stuart O'Grady and Brett Aitken who both won Olympic silver medals at these Games. I am proud to say that of those four cyclists three are members of the Port Adelaide Club, which is in the middle of my electorate, and they are personal friends. The fourth rider, Brett Aitken, belongs to the Adelaide Club. It was a very good performance by all of those athletes.

I said that I would discuss some of the difficulties that face Australian athletes when they go overseas to major events such as the Olympic Games. I refer to track and field athletes, swimmers, track cyclists and rowers. All those sports were held out of season for our athletes in the northern hemisphere. Our season is summer time. Those athletes not only have to overcome the problem of distance in getting to the venues, but they have to compete out of season. The cyclists have been in Europe for some months and had some competition and preparation, but they are away from home and living out of suitcases. It is difficult when one is living out of a suitcase for months on end. All the other top cyclists and athletes from Europe were able to live at home and compete in their home environments, being able to travel to the Games venue within a couple of hours.

Our best ever performance was at the Melbourne Olympics in 1956 when we won 13 gold, eight silver and 14 bronze medals - a total of 35, which is a record for Australia. Those were the only Olympic Games held in the southern hemisphere. On the only occasion when our athletes had the advantage of competing in season, they performed very well. As I said, competing out of season is one of the major difficulties for our athletes.

Another problem is that most Australian athletes at the top level are strictly amateur, unlike athletes in some countries who are sponsored and are virtually professional or semi-professional. Some of our athletes do not have jobs so they do not have much money. They make personal sacrifices to represent their country at the Games, and their families also make sacrifices. I would like to pay tribute to those families for the sacrifices they make.

Another issue I would like to raise concerns the media. I find it amazing that when the media report on the front page of the paper each day about the performance of our Olympic athletes, they start off with all the bad news. About 80 per cent of any column is all the bad news, why we did not do any good or win and, right at the

bottom, almost as an afterthought, it says we won a gold or silver medal in an event. This was done repeatedly and has been done very much over the years, why this or that athlete did not win or perform well and then, right at the bottom, an athlete who did perform well just gets the bottom part of the article. Knowing the tendency of a lot of members of the public to read only the top few paragraphs of an article, I know that many of those top, terrific performances would have gone unnoticed. I think it is disgraceful, and I do not know why the media do not get their act together in this regard.

I will finish by supporting what I consider to be a fantastic effort by our athletes. We have to bear in mind that approximately 40 countries that won medals at the games have very much bigger populations than Australia's. Performance usually goes on the basis of the number of athletes that a country has, and it goes on a triangular system, where the bigger the base of athletes competing, the higher the standards at the top of the triangle but, in Australia's case, there were 40 countries with much bigger populations than ours, yet only nine countries finished in front of us on the medal count. So, it was a fantastic effort by all the olympic athletes who went to these Barcelona Games, and I congratulate every one of them.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

That this House expresses its disappointment over the failure of South Australia's bid to win the 1998 Commonwealth Games for Adelaide and recognises the magnificent effort put in by the Games bid team and all concerned and congratulates them on a job well done.

As we all know, in Barcelona on 22 July Adelaide failed in its bid to secure the 1998 Commonwealth Games and instead the nod went to Kuala Lumpur. The voting was 40 to 25 and there was widespread criticism that the decision was based on political grounds and certainly not on technical merit. It seems that the International Games Committee was determined to award these games to an emerging country, and I guess that would have been fair enough, provided those feelings had been spelt out earlier, rather than allow a place such as Adelaide to put all the effort into coming up with an excellent bid and find that it was knocked off on the grounds that the committee was determined to give the games to an emerging country. I think it is disgraceful and something needs to be done about it in future.

It is widely acknowledged that the Adelaide bid was by far the best technical bid ever submitted for any games, whether Commonwealth or Olympic Games, and we have gained enormous international respect for that bid. The games officials and delegates who have visited Adelaide during the past two years have been lavish in their praise for our city in terms of the quality of the sporting venues that were available for the games, the geographical location, the climate and our proven record of running major international sporting events such as the Formula 1 Grand Prix. Everyone who came here was extremely lavish in their praise and, on that basis, I and others thought we would be successful in getting the nod for the games, but it was not to be.

Adelaide was the overwhelming choice of many of the leading athletes from many countries. They saw the problems that I mentioned in my previous speech about the marathon and the hot oppressive atmosphere combined with heavy pollution in some of the other cities —conditions that we do not have here. The athletes were strongly in support of Adelaide as the venue for these games but, as I say, it was not to be. The vote in Barcelona was the culmination of a six-year campaign by the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. Kym Mayes) and I congratulate the Minister on his vision and outstanding energy and dedication in driving our games bid. Of course, the Minister had the strong support of and was backed throughout by the Premier, John Bannon. It is a pity that with all the Premier's problems at present we could not have won the games bid.

Mr Hamilton: Heini Becker, too.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, I have not forgotten the member for Hanson. I also place on record the tremendous support given to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the bid by the member for Hanson (Heini Becker), who represented the Opposition. I thank Heini Becker for that support. He gave tremendous support to the Minister and the team and travelled many hundreds of thousands of kilometres with the Minister and committed himself fully to the task of seeking to bring the games to Adelaide. I also thank the Opposition for its backing of this event as well. I sincerely thank and congratulate the 18 bid committee members and the 10 staff members for their fantastic effort in drawing the whole bid together and for their collective work in selling the bid to delegates around the world. If the venue had been selected on a level playing field, Adelaide would have won easily.

I would like to place on record the names of the people involved and I congratulate them through this motion. The bid committee members are as follows:

The Rt Hon. the Lord Mayor Steve Condous, President
Sir James Hardy, OBE, Chairperson
Marjorie Nelson, AO, MBE, Deputy Chairperson—

and we all know the marvellous performances of Marjorie in previous games where she was a multi-Olympic and Commonwealth Games gold medallist—

The Hon. Kym Mayes, MP (Minister of Recreation and Sport)
Ray Godkin, OAM
Arthur Tunstall, OBE, JP
Heini Becker, MP
Michael Llewellyn-Smith
Peter Wylie
Lindsay Thompson, General Manager, South Australian Chamber of Commerce
David Prince
Ron O'Donnell, OAM, Chairman, Australian Commonwealth Games Association (South Australian Division)
Glenda Bowen Pain
John Drumm
Andrea Mason
Michael Wanganeen
Dr Peter Wilenski, AO
Merry Wickes

I also thank and list the bid staff members, who made a massive contribution to the bid:

George Beltchev, Chief Executive and Bid Committee Member
David MacFarlane, Deputy Chief Executive
Sheila Saville, Director of Marketing
Andrew Taylor, Director of Operations
Julie Nykiel, Assistant Director of Sports
Francene Connor, Assistant Director of Marketing
Cheryl Crinion, Office Administrator
Angela Forgione, Personal Assistant to the Chief Executive
Jennie Paynter, Secretary to the Deputy Chief Executive
Sandra Romeo, Receptionist

I sincerely thank those people for their personal commitment and magnificent effort. They deserve the highest possible praise. Bid members and staff, in particular, spent many long days and weekends of their time in an unpaid capacity, such was their dedication, and we certainly thank them for that. On 11 August 1990, the bid team won the right from Perth to be Australia's choice for the Games. At that time, there were several potential bids, including Cardiff, New Delhi and Kuala Lumpur, but by August this year only two remained. It was unfortunate that there could only be one winner. In a very sporting gesture our Minister (Hon. Kym Mayes) offered to assist Kuala Lumpur to plan and stage the games—a very good offer given our disappointment in not getting the games for Adelaide.

A major spin-off from our bid is that we now have a complete set of sporting facilities equal to or better than any in the world. The last venue to be completed is the velodrome. I attended a function at the velodrome on Monday where it was officially named the Superdrome. The building is nearly completed and the wooden track is due to be commenced in October with the official opening early next year. The track will be the best in the world. Ron Webb, the builder and designer of the track, has built 40 velodromes throughout the world, including the one at the recent Olympic Games. Every time he builds a velodrome, he learns something new, and he is putting all his ideas into our velodrome: it is being built specifically to be the best in the world and capable of breaking world records. We look forward to the opening early next year. I conclude by again thanking all the people involved in the bid. I congratulate them all on a job very well done.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

RAILWAY OPERATIONS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That this House congratulates both State and Federal Governments on the funding initiatives to enhance rail operations in South Australia, in particular, funding for refurbishment of the *Indian Pacific* passenger train and upgrading of both the Port Augusta and Islington railway workshops.

As you would realise, Mr Deputy Speaker, this has a direct impact on the members of my electorate. It is a very topical and important issue for all people in the Port Augusta area. I realise that part of the motion includes the Islington workshops, but at this time I will concentrate most of my remarks on Port Augusta. Over the past four or five years there has been a rather traumatic Statewide restructuring of Australian National, particularly in Port Augusta where a great number of staff have taken voluntary retirement packages, mainly because they could not see any future for the Australian National operation.

I will give some background on the benefits that Australian National has given to the community at Port Augusta and the region as a whole. Port Augusta has been classed as a railway town for quite a number of years. Prior to the advent of Australian National, the old Commonwealth Railways was the main body operating out of Port Augusta. As a bit of anecdotal interest, the Commonwealth Railways was one of that rare breed that actually operated at a profit, unlike the South Australian Railways which at that time ran as far as Port Pirie.

The Commonwealth Railways took over from Port Pirie and continued further north from Port Augusta and across to the Western Australian border. So, Port Augusta for a number of years has been basically a railway town. One can imagine the trauma caused when the major employer in the city began restructuring and shedding many staff. People who had lived there all their lives became uncertain as to their future, because these days, with unemployment the single biggest issue that we face, there is not much in terms of alternative employment for these people.

It was not only people in the older age group who were taking separation packages: it was younger workers, who really did not get much out of the separation package in terms of financial reward. During the early years of the negotiations I did take exception to AN's restructuring and voluntary retirement packages because I think that AN did it very badly. It did not advise its workers of what their payments would be, no prior information was given and no financial counselling—all in all, it turned out to be a very traumatic exercise. With that downturn in Australian National came the additional restructuring carried out by the second largest employer in Port Augusta, ETSA. As a result of both lots of restructuring the unemployment queues lengthened, and the people of Port Augusta were becoming quite worried about their future. When the Federal Government decided to set up a National Rail Corporation that was to include all the States, a further traumatic element was added to that which was already in existence.

Both I and, I believe, the State Government felt that Australian National should actually be that National Rail Corporation, the infrastructure being already in place. It made good sense, given that since it had been given its commercial charter AN was actually able to operate on a reasonably commercial basis and had been building up in order to get into a profit situation. It had not yet reached that, but all the hard work had been done. This was part of the restructuring that had to occur for AN to reach a position where it would be a commercially viable operation. However, when the Federal Government decided that the National Rail Corporation would be set up at Federal level, that put at risk and made very uncertain the future of Australian National. Again, the people of Port Augusta and the people here in Adelaide became very worried about the future security of their

jobs. Not much was known about how the National Rail Corporation would actually operate, so there was still a degree of uncertainty.

Eventually, the charter of the National Rail Corporation came into existence, and AN found that it would have to work with that corporation if it were to exist as a separate entity. One of the real problems that was going to eventuate from that was where the locomotive maintenance would be done, what effect this would have on railway workshops, whether they would be given some guarantees of work from the National Rail Corporation or whether, in fact, they would go out of existence because the National Rail Corporation would push work off to the eastern States, where private enterprise would cope with some of it.

All in all, the situation was still fairly untenable for those in the north of the State as well as those in the metropolitan area. Australian National had had a very successful exercise in refurbishing the Ghan train, which goes to Alice Springs, and had marketed it as one of the train trips of the world, one to be classed as an excellent exercise for train buffs and, in fact, for families and anyone who was interested in train trips, because the future of rail, particularly passenger rail, was being progressively downgraded in South Australia and in Australia generally. That had occurred during the time when Australian National had been concentrating very heavily on the cartage of freight rather than on passenger services. The work that was done on the Ghan was considered to be world class—and I totally support the concept—and has been commented on by all those who have ridden on the train to Alice Springs. The work was done in the Port Augusta railway workshops where an expert group specialised in that refurbishment exercise. As I said, many accolades were given to the workers in the railway workshops for their work.

The train was uniquely Australian in that it promoted Australian flora and fauna as well as the States it traversed, namely, South Australia, the Northern Territory and the Eastern States. Because of the set up of the National Rail Corporation and the concern of Australian National for its future viability, it was proposed that the Indian Pacific be refurbished with a view to marketing it nationally and internationally as one of the great train journeys of the world. I totally support that.

I was present at the Australian National presentation of the plans for this refurbishment. Again, Australian National had been very sensitive to the areas through which the train would be travelling: as part of the upgrade, motifs relating to the various States were to be used and different themes for each car would identify those States. Thus there was a uniquely Australian flavour.

In order to obtain the $17.5 million for that refurbishment, given that Australian National did not have the funds available, Australian National lobbied the Port Augusta community, the politicians and the State Government for support. There was a lot of uncertainty about whether money would be available. The community I represent, the Premier, the Minister of Transport and I considered the upgrade to be essential if the workshops in Port Augusta were to remain viable until they could become accredited workshops meeting national standards and then being able to tender for National Rail Corporation work.

The lead time as to when that work would be available was two to three years. So, the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific was considered to be essential if Australian National was to keep the staff in the workshops at Port Augusta occupied while the accreditation was being processed and if it was to maintain a great tourism potential for South Australia and, in fact, Australia as a nation, in terms of great train journeys.

At one time, it looked as though the money for the refurbishment would not come through, but the community got together, led by the unions and the Federal member, who led a delegation to Canberra. The local politicians—Lloyd O'Neil, the endorsed candidate and I—lobbied the South Australian Federal Government members, the Cabinet and the transport infrastructure committee. The member for Custance also lobbied in that regard, and the member for Eyre was also a member of the team that lobbied to get this money for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific.

Because it was such a community united effort, we were able to convince the Federal Government that that money had to be provided to Australian National, otherwise the whole community in the area of Port Augusta would fail, more people would join the unemployment queues, and many more problems would be created in terms of a social welfare mechanism to support those people on unemployment benefits. As I am sure all members would know, there are no jobs available in that area or in other areas of this State.

So, the Prime Minister's announcement, which was made at the Labor Party convention here a few weeks ago, was welcomed with open arms by the community of Port Augusta, with perhaps a couple of exceptions, probably on political lines. By and large, the community totally supported the allocation of that money so that the Port Augusta workshops could continue the good work in the area of refurbishment. I feel very certain that they will continue to carry out the top quality, world class work that was evident in the refurbishment of the Ghan—in fact, they will surpass it in the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific.

I strongly urge Australian National to start right this minute in promoting this train both nationally and internationally. One of the things we have to ensure is that the train becomes an economically successful proposition, and we need to do some pretty good public relations work overseas to promote it. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, and most members in this House would be aware that there are not many great train trips available any more. I think probably the Russian—

Mr Atkinson: The Trans Siberian.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I thank the member for Spence for that. There may be one in the United States of America. There are not many other train journeys anywhere else in the world which are as long as and have the unique flavour of the Indian Pacific trip. It incorporates one of the longest straight stretches of any train trip. The Indian Pacific could promote tourism in South Australia and the nation as a whole. With those

few words, I have much pleasure in moving this motion. I urge all members of the House to support it and, in doing so, to support tourism generally and in particular in the northern region of this State.

Mr VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

DECENTRALISATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That this House urges the Government to broaden the scope of regional development policy to ensure more decentralised development and resolves that this matter be forwarded to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee for investigation.

I do not think I need to tell anyone that almost every State in Australia, including South Australia, has had a tendency over the past seven to eight years to centralise in the metropolitan areas. I do not agree with that; I have always been a supporter of decentralisation. If this State and the nation are to go ahead, we have to revert to that decentralisation policy so that we have planned development for all the State rather than in only one area of the State. I supported the planning review that was conducted for the State of South Australia; it came up with some very important planning issues for the future, but they were mainly for the metropolitan area. We must plan for regional development along the same lines as we plan for development within the metropolitan area.

Mr Brindal: There has been 10 years of neglect under Labor.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I note the comment from the honourable member opposite but I point out to him that there was an awful lot of neglect under Liberal Governments, as well. They too have had centralist tendencies. All Governments have had a tendency to concentrate development in the metropolitan area. It is across the board. I reiterate that it is not good for the State or for the nation. We need sensible development that is planned for the metropolitan and country areas. That is something that I support and will continue to support, particularly in my electorate.

Country areas have suffered to a large degree from the drift back to the city of Government departments. In addition, when developers come to the State, there is a tendency for the city area to be marketed. As part of our investigation into this issue, we need to look at the strengths of the various regional areas. If we are looking for development along the lines of power generation, we should look specifically at Port Augusta, which has the ETSA power stations. We need to look at development that can build on the existing structures. I do not believe that we should broaden that if the infrastructure is already in place in one region.

Whyalla, with its steel production, is another good example. There has been some debate about Morrison Knudsen's locating at Whyalla, but it has done that specifically because of BHP's presence in that centre. It will work in with BHP. I see regional development plans as linking that sort of development. When a major development comes to South Australia, we need to have done the research to find out which areas could cope with such a development. We need also to look at incentives to encourage developers to locate outside the metropolitan area.

I do not believe that transport is a problem in South Australia but we could certainly address that issue. I am not sure that you, Mr Speaker, would agree with me, but I believe that giving the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link the go-ahead would open up this State and give it a great transport advantage over the Eastern States. If it were to go ahead, it would mean a whole new ball game with regard to development in the north of the State, particularly, and in the south of the State. There would be a direct link from north to south and to the Asian markets—to whichever markets in which we were interested. In development plans, we need to look at the strengths of the regions and assess where they can be linked into a regional development plan for this State.

A lot of discussion has occurred about value-added products, and I support such a concept. We export far too much raw material, and I will take wool as an example. We export it as a raw commodity. I have promoted the viewpoint that we should consider a wool scouring plant, and a very good location for that would be in the north of the State, right in the middle of the wool production area. The benefits of value-added production are innumerable.

We could do such a lot in the area of value added products. That is just one instance where we could be looking at development in the regional areas. I am sure there are a number of areas, and the member for Mount Gambier, who lives in the southern area of the State, could talk about the sorts of value added products that could be produced in that area. Rather than concentrating completely on the metropolitan area—and I realise that we have to start somewhere with our planning and I applaud what has already been done there—we must now broaden that approach. We have to look at the regional areas of this State and say, 'If a development comes here, that could fit very nicely at Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Augusta or Ceduna—anywhere in the State. That could actually be located without any vast disruption to the particular industry concerned. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee could do a very good job in researching the particular strengths of regional areas and how development could fit quite nicely within those areas.

I am sure that the member for Elizabeth was quite happy with the discussion concerning the location of Public Service head offices. It was stated that, rather than their being located in the city, they could be located in places such as Elizabeth. I would suggest that perhaps consideration be given to locating some head offices outside Elizabeth and in country areas. With computer link-ups these days, there is really no need for those head offices to be in Adelaide. They could be somewhere in the country because of the technology that is available. It would not cause any problems in taking them outside the metropolitan area. That is another issue that we could look at to strengthen our country and regional areas in order to make the State generally more productive and much better for everyone to live in. In fact, it would

broaden our economic base, because we could offer so much more to developers who came to South Australia.

I referred to incentives, and that is something that must be seriously considered by the committee when addressing this issue generally. This is an extremely important motion, and all country members, from both sides of the House, should seriously consider supporting it. It will have an impact on all of us in relation to whether the State moves ahead, moves only marginally or stays as it is. I urge all members to support the motion.

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed; calls on the Federal Government to re-examine the NRC concept and ensure that the NRC does not interfere in the continued operation and survival of AN and the rail industry in this State and in particular the rail workshops at Port Augusta and Islington and, further, calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs Rail Link and release the $17.5 million for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific.

Since I gave notice of this motion, a certain number of things have happened in relation to some of the matters referred to therein. Yesterday, the Minister quite amazingly indicated to the House that the Government had signed the National Rail Corporation agreement. That is a matter on which I will spend some time discussing in the future. Secondly, the Government has released some of the $17.5 million for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific. The future economic development of this State and nation requires that we have a well-managed, effective rail system in this country.

That also includes passenger services. In my judgment, the concept that has been put forward has been rushed into in the past few months without complete consideration of the situation or the ramifications of the decision. Everyone recognises that we need to do a number of things to improve the rail system in this country; it has been starved of capital and the networks have not been integrated as they should have been. There has been an unfortunate degree of State parochialism in relation to rights, and that has interfered with the better management of the rail system.

In view of the recent decision taken by the Minister to sign this National Rail Corporation agreement and the need to endeavour to ascertain what assurances the Minister gave or received from the Commonwealth Government in relation to the future of Australian National and the long-term employment opportunities at Port Augusta and Islington, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WATER RATING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Water Resources to ensure that the current review of the Government water rating policy results in the introduction of a fair and equitable user pays water rating system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased, Mr Speaker, to receive such strong support from members opposite. I can understand why I am getting that support because I am sure that members opposite would have been receiving the same sort of representations that I and my colleagues have been receiving. With respect, I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, would have also received the same representations in your own electorate.

The fact is that the present water rating system introduced by the Minister is not working. More importantly, it is not at all acceptable to the community—and that is across the board. Originally, when complaints started coming in, we were told that we need not worry about this and that we should not get too concerned about the representations being made because it was really a matter that affected only the south-eastern suburbs. We were told that it was a concern only in the Burnside council area.

I commend the Burnside council for the strong stand that it has taken in organising a most successful public meeting and for the representations that it has made in various forms to the Minister and to the Government generally. However, there is widespread concern and anger on the part of the community. I refer particularly to elderly people, who find the system confusing and totally unfair. I will expand on that a little later. It is also of concern to families who need to use more water. As I have said on so many occasions, I guess the Minister can request, instruct or whatever people to spend less money and to put less water on their gardens. In fact, that is what has happened and to a large extent people have stopped watering their gardens totally. However, it is a different thing with families that comprise two, three or four children or young people and who continually need to use water to wash nappies, to shower and to wash sports clothes. We all understand those issues. The Opposition has continually and strongly opposed the new water rating system since it was first introduced.

Mr Atkinson: What is your policy?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am delighted to tell the member for Spence what our policy is. I am surprised that he does not know our policy, but I would be happy to remind him of it. The Opposition has opposed the new system for a number of reasons. The main one is that it is not equitable and it contains what can only be referred to as the wealth tax component. It can be referred to as the property tax, wealth tax or whatever. The fact is that a large number of people in domestic circumstances are paying a lot of money to the Government through the E&WS, even though they are not using an extensive amount of water, purely because it is based on the value of property.

The Liberal Party has made perfectly clear that on coming to government it will introduce an equitable user pays system. As I have indicated to the House on a number of occasions, we have spent a lot of time looking at user pay systems in other parts of Australia and we have been particularly interested to learn about the

system used in the Hunter Valley under the Hunter Valley Water Board. I have spent a lot of time talking to senior authorities in that board, and intend to continue to do so. I understand that the E&WS is also having discussions with the Hunter Valley Water Board, and I welcome that. I would be thrilled if the Government accepted the same system as that being used by the Hunter Valley Water Board. Unfortunately, I do not believe that is likely to happen.

It is a great pity that the Minister did not listen to her own advisers, rather than having a blinkered attitude and listening only to her former ministerial colleague, Mr Hudson, who is the architect of this system about which there is so much concern in the community. It is interesting now that Mr Hudson has been called back. He was paid very well for preparing the first report. He was paid about $20 000 to bring in that system, which has been a disaster, and now he has been called back to review it. I do not know what he is being paid for the second time and I would be most interested to know. Perhaps the Minister will indicate to the community what he is being paid the second time around to try to fix it up. The fact is that he was the architect. The Opposition believes that it is totally inappropriate to have Caesar judging Caesar—that the person responsible for the original report and system should be brought back to check it out and try to improve it. Yet that is what is happening.

I was interested earlier this week to read that the Government intends to have the new system introduced by the beginning of December. The article in the *Advertiser* tells us:

> The State Government's controversial water-rating system may be scrapped, even though the Water Resources Minister, Ms Lenehan, claims that it has been a success.

How in the world can the Minister claim that it has been a success? The article goes on:

> A spokeswoman for Ms Lenehan said yesterday that, despite the system being a 'tremendous' conservation success, its poor public image meant there had to be changes to the system.
>
> She said the system's success was shown by estimates that in 1992-93 water consumption would drop by 15 per cent and South Australians would use 11 million kilolitres less water—a saving of $8 million.

Let me put on the record again that the Opposition totally supports policies that will encourage people to conserve water. Of course that is important, but let us be quite factual about this. The main reason why water consumption has dropped in South Australia is, first, as a result of the relatively wet year and, secondly, as a result of the fear in the community associated with this new system, with so many people just stopping watering their gardens. We only need to drive around the metropolitan area and the various council areas and look at median strips that have not been watered to see that, because of the cost, councils have stopped watering. I have received a number of letters from elderly people, people with families and people of all ages and in all circumstances, who have indicated to me that, because of the concern they have with this new system, they have just stopped watering totally, and then we have the Minister coming out publicly and commending the system because it is conserving water. I think we really do need to get our facts together.

As for alleging that image problems justified the proposed changes to the rating system, I would suggest that the Minister is merely walking away from the community relations disaster of the State Government's own making. As I said earlier, it was Minister Lenehan and her Cabinet colleagues who approved the $20 000 payment to the former Minister in the Dunstan Labor Government, Hugh Hudson, who devised the system with its wealth tax component. When there was a natural and very strong community reaction against the unfairness of the charges, the Bannon Government then spent at least a further $60 000 on a public relations campaign, which was obviously a disaster as well, because it has not proved a thing. Just as many people are concerned now about the new system, as was the case when it was first introduced and, if members opposite do not agree with that, they should go out and ask a few constituents whether they understand the new water rating system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Members opposite are throwing their arms up in the air, because they know that, even after the expenditure of $60 000 of taxpayers' funds to try to let people know how it works, it is still a disaster. Soon after the new system was introduced the Minister made an incredible claim when she said that more than 80 per cent of consumers would be better off under this new system. Now, on numerous occasions I have asked the Minister to provide some detail to back up that statement. It has never been provided, and I doubt that it ever will be, because it does not stack up, and the Minister knows that. Now that we have had the 12 months for all meters to be read throughout the metropolitan area, I challenge the Minister yet again to provide the statistics that clearly show that that claim can be substantiated, as the Minister would indicate to be the case, and that more than 80 per cent of consumers are better off under the new system. We have constantly been told, and constituents have been told, 'Do not get excited about the cost of water yet; do not get excited about the increase in your bills. Don't worry, just wait until the end of the year and at the end of the year you will find that you are better off.'

We have reached the end of the year, so let the Minister now substantiate her claim. Again, I challenge her to do so, but I doubt that she will, because I do not believe that she can do so. I sincerely hope that we do see a significant change in the water rating system. Some suggestions have been put forward about options that are being considered by the Minister, and I presume they are options being considered by her former colleague, Mr Hudson.

Those options include a step system, in which a base line quantity of water, for example, 500 kilolitres, would be provided to all users at the same price and kilolitres consumed in excess of that would have a price loading. That is one of the options. I am certainly not very thrilled with that proposal. There are others: a universal increase in the cost of water regardless of income or property, or increasing the universal water supply charge to make up for the loss of property charge revenue and leaving the

supply charge but cutting the provision of 136 free kilolitres with supply. A number of options are being considered. I have requested publicly that the Opposition be given an opportunity to have some say in looking at these options, but that has not been accepted by the Minister, unless she wants to change her mind.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Unfortunately, I was not the Minister of Water Resources but I can say that, if I were the Minister now and were aware of the community concern about this new system, I would welcome the opportunity for the Opposition to have some input if the system could be improved. I believe the Opposition could improve the system considerably.

We all know, particularly as a result of a report released recently coming out of the Minister's department, of the tremendous morale problems within the department. We all know that the Minister introduced the system without providing the opportunity for her own advisers to have a final say and then, when things started to go wrong, the Minister has walked away and left the departmental officers to answer all the questions. How many members in this place have tried to contact the department and seek answers? How many constituents have tried to do the same and encountered tremendous waiting periods? The department has had to put on a large number of people with the specific task of trying to answer these questions, and I would hate to be in their position. We then wonder why there are morale problems in the department.

The other day in reply to a question I asked about the E&WS, the Minister suggested that I was always attacking the department. I believe the department is a very efficient department and has been so for a long time. It has some dynamic people within it and, if they were left alone to get on with their work instead of having to contend with the political interference that we have seen occurring even outside the present Government and Ministry, we would not be in the mess we are in at present. So, let us not hear any more of the Opposition only being critical of the E&WS, because that is not the case.

However, we believe that we understand the morale and other problems that officers are experiencing in that department because of the rating system introduced by the Minister, who has now come onto the front bench. I and all members on this side of the House can only hope that, for the sake of the whole of the metropolitan area and all domestic and other consumers of water in this State, the Minister will reconsider the situation and bring down an equitable system.

The most equitable system that can be introduced in this State is a true user pays system with concessions being made available to the disadvantaged. We cannot make it any simpler than that. I urge the Minister to continue to have discussions with organisations such as the Hunter Valley Board to determine how that organisation has gone about the introduction and maintenance of the system in that area and to mirror that system in South Australia. I also urge the Government to ensure that, when a new system is brought down, it is a fair and equitable user pays water rating system for South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AIRLINE CARRIERS

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House instructs the Government that, in the absence of a formalised tender process, its departmental officers and instrumentalities be required to use interstate airline carriers on an equitable and cost justified basis.

This motion is clearly in two parts and addresses two very real concerns which this Parliament should have: equity and good use of public funds. If the member for Napier in his typical fashion wants to make flippant comments during the debate, I know, Mr Speaker, that you will rule him out of order. However, I urge him not to do that, because this is an important public matter.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the member for Napier wishes to contribute he will have an opportunity during the debate.

Mr BRINDAL: The first part of my motion, which concerns a formalised tendering process, is so self-evident that I wonder why the Government has not adopted a cost-effective approach such as this before. Officers of Government instrumentalities and members of this Parliament are often forced to fly interstate and overseas on business connected with the Government or this House.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park may also contribute later.

Mr BRINDAL: Senior officers of various departments and instrumentalities and, indeed, many other officers are often required to fly all around Australia. Yet, there has never been to my knowledge any formalised tendering process. I am appalled that this Government has not seen fit to save the money that it could from the public purse. It is quite clear that, if the Government were to tender for a carrier to carry members of the Public Service and this Parliament, it could effect considerable cost savings in airline fares and probably accrue some additional benefits for those people who travel.

I am confident that most members of this House and most departmental officers with the present economic circumstances in mind would travel economy class, but it has been pointed out to me that another Government with an airline tender arrangement has all its fares upgraded automatically in accordance with that arrangement.

It strikes me that it is no more than commonsense that a Government whose officers travel as much as this Government's do, especially when you add the travel of the officers of the instrumentalities, should have a rational method for the purchase of airline tickets. This Government does not have one, and it should. I urge this House to support a motion that, in effect, calls on the Government to institute a formalised tendering process for the airlines. I cannot understand why any member of the Government would object to this, because it is not

costing the public purse any money at all. It is a legitimate attempt to save the public money and to make our travel more cost-effective.

Until that occurs, the second part of the motion calls upon the Government to ensure that there is an equitable distribution between the airlines on a cost-effective basis. Clearly, that brings me to the failure of the first Compass Airlines. I note with disappointment that one of the reasons put forward for the failure of the initial Compass Airlines was that big volume users such as the Government failed to buy tickets at market rates; thus Compass was left to sell all its tickets at discounted rates and, inevitably, went broke. That was because the Government and Government instrumentalities continued to use the two established airlines, Ansett and Australian.

That strikes me as being totally unfair not only to the third airline carrier concerned but to the people of Australia. Members opposite know the staggering rise in travel by air when Compass was operational. There was an almost unbelievable change in the travelling habits of Australians. I forget the exact figures, but I can remember being shocked by the number of Australians who had never travelled on an airline in their life, and then by the drop in that number—and this was because of Compass and its discount fares. All members of this House would be very conscious of the symbol that the first Compass Airlines was to Australia through the contribution of the very many ordinary Australians who tried to bail out the airline.

Mr Atkinson: It was a Labor initiative.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence interjects that it was a Labor initiative. Quite frankly, I do not know whether that was the case, nor do I care. I do not think it matters whose initiative it was: it was important and I applaud it, whether or not it was a Labor initiative. The fact is that, despite the wishes of many, Compass went under, and it went under because the big corporations, big Government and large Government instrumentalities failed to patronise it.

Mr McKee: It was giving money away.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Gilles comments that it was giving money away. There may have been some bad business practice, but if we are to condemn everyone for bad business practice I would remind the member for Gilles that no group stands more condemned for that than does the Government of which he is a member. The one thing that members of the Government benches cannot do is trumpet about bad business practice, because there has never been a better example of bad business practice than that exhibited by the Ministers opposite. I draw the attention of the House to the poll this morning which shows quite clearly what the public think of the performance of this Government, and I would challenge the member for Gilles to state otherwise.

Compass Airlines was important because it provided a measure of competition which we had not seen before in our domestic airlines, because of the two airline policy. The new Compass will be equally important and, I think in fairness to the people of Australia and in particular the people of South Australia, the new Compass deserves equal support from this Government, as does any other airline. This Government owns no share in any of the airlines concerned. It is a legitimate buyer in the marketplace, and it can and must be expected to buy on a cost-competitive and cost-effective basis, which should lead it into the tendering process, or failing to do anything other than buy at market rates. I believe it is incumbent on this Government to see that there is an equitable distribution of the Government's business throughout the marketplace. It is not this Government's business to interfere and to manipulate the marketplace and it should not be seen to do so. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRAM BARN

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I move:

That this House expresses its sincere and profound admiration at the dazzling display of political flexibility exhibited by the Minister for Environment and Planning, which, with respect to Hackney Tram Barn A, required her to adopt a position on 11 August 1992 totally opposite to her stance of the previous day.

I am happy to offer congratulations to the Minister for this dazzling display for a number of reasons, not the least of which is I agree with the Minister's final decision—or I guess it is the Minister's final decision—the decision that is there at the moment in the public view, anyway. The reason that I agree with the Minister's decision of 11 August is that the building in question has been listed by the National Trust, it is on the Register of the National Estate and it is on the Register of State Heritage Items. That is a pretty impressive list for a building. In my view, it would be appalling for a Government to bulldoze such a building in direct contravention of those various listings, taking a decision unto itself which private owners are unable to do.

I am a little perturbed in relation to the fact that, because of the Minister's about face, there is some degree of uncertainty in these matters. It is my view that there is a clear call from the community for the fact that, when a building is placed on the register, that is the level of certainty. As the member for the State seat of Adelaide, which contains many of our heritage buildings, I am constantly regaled by developers who maintain that there is no certainty in building and planning in South Australia, and in the State electorate of Adelaide in particular. I say to them that that is not true: there is certainty, it is the City of Adelaide Plan. However, what makes it uncertain is that many developers put plans for five, six or seven-storey buildings, where the City of Adelaide Plan states quite clearly that they can only be three storeys, or whatever,

However, while offering my congratulations and sincere and profound admiration to the Minister, I would say that she has in fact restored hope for South Australia and, with this Government at the moment, that is a badly needed commodity in South Australia. The reason she has restored hope to South Australia is that for those hospitals whose budgets have been cut perhaps the funds will be there tomorrow. Perhaps the kindergartens that have been closed will be re-opened. Perhaps there will be

a different decision with respect to water rates from the very Minister involved in this particular about-face. Perhaps the Department of Transport offices and depots in the country that have been closed will be re-opened.

Mr Atkinson: You will re-open them, will you?

Dr ARMITAGE: I am suggesting that, with the precedent that has been set by the Minister, perhaps there is already a press release in the pipeline indicating that they will be re-opened tomorrow. In the country railways, Mr Speaker, there have been devastating decisions. But, who knows? With this we can continue to hope. The decision to demolish the building had been made and was announced with much fanfare. It did provoke an enormous reaction from the National Trust, the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Society, the Aurora Heritage Action Group, a number of city councillors, the Institute of Engineers, the Conservation Council, the History and Conservation Executive Committee for the Bicentenary, the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the Construction, Mining and Energy Union of South Australia and the Building Construction Workers Federation.

Mr Atkinson: Your mates!

Dr ARMITAGE: Indeed, my mates. I speak regularly with Mr Ron Owens about a number of matters. Well may those—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: I bet he is. He may well be amused, but I think we will get some action on that project, and that is terrific. I applaud Mr Ron Owens; we look like we are getting somewhere. What a grouping of people were angry at the Minister's decision! However, it is not only the Minister's decision. In fact, I contemplated broadening the terms of my motion because not only should we express sincere and profound admiration to the Minister for Environment and Planning but we should also include in such solicitations the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Transport, because we find that on 29 March 1989 at 11.30 a.m. there was an inspection of the then nearly completed Bicentennial Conservatory by the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Transport, and they in fact confirmed the need for the demolition of the tram barns.

Perhaps we should extend it even further, because on 30 March the whole Cabinet approved funds for further landscape renewal to the south of the conservatory by demolition of the STA car park, with temporary screening of the STA depot to the east and funds to permit a landscape plan to be prepared within indicative estimates of costs for when the STA vacates the depot site. So, I think I may have done the Minister for Environment and Planning an injustice because having expressed admiration only to her I think all her Cabinet colleagues deserve a gong, and I am happy to give it to them.

This matter provoked further reaction. In the *City Messenger* of Wednesday 19 August the columnist, Matthew Byrne, in his column 'Talk of the Town', wrote as follows:

> Environment and Planning Minister Susan Lenehan's sensational backflip, which probably would have put her into gold medal position at Barcelona . . .

I will not comment on that. Perhaps the member for Price, given his accolades for our athletes earlier, would like to do that. Mr Byrne continues:

> [the Minister's decision] is really the best decision for Adelaide. We get to keep a piece of our history that all Adelaidians recognise and the Botanic Gardens gets back some more precious parkland.

Well there we are, Mr Speaker. As I indicated before, in my view the Minister for Environment and Planning eventually made the correct decision. I am not sure whether she was dragged kicking and screaming to that decision by community reaction—

Mr Holloway: It wasn't by me, I can tell you.

Dr ARMITAGE: It may not have been by the member for Mitchell, but it may have been by the environmental lobbies and all those people I mentioned before, including the Construction, Mining and Energy Union of South Australia and the Building Construction Workers Federation. As I indicated, in my view the Minister has made the correct decision, which does nothing more or less than respect heritage listings. The important feature of all this is that the Minister has set a precedent for buildings which are on heritage listings. I applaud her for that and, clearly, as this motion does, express my sincere and profound admiration for her political flexibility.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It was a pity about A Division at Yatala being pushed down!

Dr ARMITAGE: And the Bridgewater line.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: I think she was but, whatever, she has made the correct decision now. I intended to put into my motion that the Minister be congratulated on being so dexterous but, given that she can see the view on both sides of the debate, it should have been 'ambidextrous'. Well done Minister! She has made the right decision and her flexibility is to be admired.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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 19 August. Page .)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): In this debate I will take up the matter of the announcement in the budget of expenditure of $350 million for 'Communities at Work'. It is the latest con on the public of Australia to try to get the unemployment rate down temporarily coming up to the next election. I notice that the Minister for unemployment is leaving the Chamber. He is probably going to cleanse his thoughts on the matter of unemployment. This program was announced as the panacea for unemployed people and what it would do for councils was touted throughout Australia.

No doubt many members have already received documentation about what it will do in their electorate

and they will have noted that the safe Federal Liberal seats do not get much funding at all. Members will also have noted that, in the marginal seats, the old political con is going on: the spending is much greater in those areas. This morning I heard the Prime Minister refute that his electorate had received twice as much as any other in Australia. He said, 'Well, that is because of double counting.' Being a former Treasurer, he would know all about double counting. The Minister for unemployment in South Australia has never had a problem with that. He usually tears off the back page where the facts are and lets it go.

For the 'Communities at Work' program, $350 million will be spent to try to alleviate conditions for the one million people in Australia who are unemployed so that the statistic does not look as bad coming up to the next election. Whitlam once said, 'God help the Governor-General.' Well, God help the Prime Minister of this nation when he goes to the people for judgment, as will the Premier and Treasurer of this State, because they will be judged on their past record and not on the hollow dreams for the future that they are presenting to the public of South Australia and Australia. It is a con on the unemployed to give them some temporary training or a temporary job so that we have the most skilled dole queues in the world, and the con to get them to vote on those lines is, quite frankly, one of the great frauds that this nation has seen.

Most people would understand that, until business is provided with incentives to create jobs and some profits, and they are ploughed back into infrastructure, this nation will wallow at the bottom of the heap by world standards. The $350 million 'Community at Work' program will help quite a few councils. I managed to obtain the document this morning and, when one looks at the fine print, it becomes more interesting. What will happen throughout South Australia to all those council areas that are included? They will have to proffer up to 20 per cent of the funds. He who giveth taketh away!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister for unemployment's council area will have to find by December 1992, 20 per cent of the total funds out of its current revenue base, which is set as at 30 June 1992. It will either have to borrow that money, if it is allowed to borrow it, or it will have to go back to the ratepayers and try to ask for more funds.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister for unemployment keeps interjecting. I would have thought that this subject of unemployment would be embarrassing for him. He has fabricated so many figures on it, I can understand why he is now leaving the Chamber. If these councils that have to find the 20 per cent to put towards it are not in a financial position to provide that money, will they still get the funds? If their program is already committed for the next 12 months, how will they find these additional funds? Will they be allowed to borrow them? Will they have to put a further impost on ratepayers? If their programs are already in place, will the Federal Government, with this fraud, allow those councils to put the contribution in their budget, as is allowed for a program, to go towards the new program as it is instigated?

It is a fairly relevant point, because it is all about the program being put in place very quickly. It is all about doing something urgently with the February unemployment figures so that the election can be held soon after. However, it will put an unfair and urgent impost on councils throughout Australia and South Australia that may have access to these funds. Also, it will put an impost on their ratepayers at a time when the councils are in desperate straits with respect to collecting their rate revenue. Does the Federal Government not understand that we have had record bankruptcies throughout South Australia? It should realise that, because we are pleading for more money. Does it not realise that many councils will have tremendous difficulty in even collecting their rates? Do Federal members not read the press statements and listen to the submissions from the Local Government Authority which says that local government has never been in a worse situation with non-collected rates?

Now the Federal Government is asking them to be partners in this fraud to collect more money from their ratepayers to try to help the Federal Government through the next election. The reaction of councils to members opposite will be interesting, because I believe that many of the councils on this list in South Australia just cannot afford the 20 per cent of that money to be involved in the program. I received a fax this morning from the Gold Coast City Mayor in Queensland who stated that it will be a significant obstacle to his municipality's becoming involved in this scheme. In his opinion, he thought the offer was a fraud, and that is the word I have used several times in my contribution.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Minister for unemployment keeps interjecting. He might take the opportunity for a five minute grievance debate this afternoon to explain to us the benefit of this to his council area and to the unemployed in South Australia when a further impost is being put on ratepayers in South Australia to fund this scheme. If he were fair dinkum, he would give the money to the local government areas without any strings attached. What the Government wants to do is to give the money to those areas where it can gain the most political benefit. Of course, it wants to throw the target from Federal taxpayers' money back onto ratepayers. It is the old trick of giving a little bit and getting all the publicity, but the councils will have to pick up the bill.

That reminds me of a matter raised by the Deputy Leader yesterday, and I refer to WorkCover. What will happen in this case with WorkCover? Will the Federal Government indemnify councils against the highest workers compensation rates in Australia in this State to allow the councils to take up this grant? Not only is there the 20 per cent impost but also there is the further impost of WorkCover, which some councils are still smarting over after past employment schemes—and that was when the WorkCover levies were much lower than they are today. Now we have the highest WorkCover levies in Australia and the councils will be asked to increase them. That is the problem. The Federal Government is prepared

to give money away. I want to know whether this State Government will get behind those councils and give them the indemnities and help that they want and not ask the ratepayers of South Australia to pick up this impost, because it is another fraud.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I am most concerned at the lack of response by the Government to questions on notice. I believe that the Government is holding the members of this House in contempt by refusing to answer questions on notice. Some months ago, before the conclusion of the previous session, I placed questions on notice concerning Foundation South Australia and the State Bank. I have been assured by the bank that answers have been provided to the Premier's department, but no further action has come from the Premier. It is not good enough.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Davenport reminds me, that is improper. Well, this is an improper Government in terms of the way it treats members of this House. Of course, it is not carrying out the proper intentions of the Westminster system. Foundation South Australia was set up by the Government to receive a certain level of taxes from the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products and to replace tobacco advertising. What concerns me is that the administration costs of Foundation SA for the financial year ending 30 June 1991 rose by $139 000 to $772 000. If we subtract that money from the funds available for sponsorship of sport, we see that $772 000 could have provided a lot of equipment and a tremendous number of opportunities for young people in this State.

I do not see why we need an expensive multi-bureaucratic organisation to allocate the funds that were previously allocated by tobacco companies. In my opinion $772 000 seems to be an awful waste of taxpayers' money in this respect. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.*]

GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 1 100 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce gaming machines into hotels and clubs in South Australia was presented by Mr Such.

Petition received.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that a member of the House is improperly clothed in accordance with the customs and conventions under Erskine May. Will you give a ruling on that, please?

The SPEAKER: I am informed that Standing Orders allow for the wearing of a hat except when the honourable member is speaking. Personally, I do not agree with it.

FISHERIES LICENCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In response to a question asked by the member for Goyder yesterday in this House, I can now provide the following information. Before doing so I will take this opportunity to point out that this information does, in effect, reflect what I said in my answer yesterday.

Under the Scheme of Management (Marine Scalefish Fisheries) Regulations 1991, which would have been available to the honourable member because they were tabled in this House:

a licence in respect of the fishery expires on 30 June following the date of its last renewal—this means that the licence is renewed until 30 June next upon payment of the prescribed annual fee (currently $878) or upon payment of the first quarterly instalment (currently $219.50);

a licence holder has the option of choosing to pay the fee in full or by four equal instalments as prescribed in the regulations—the prescribed instalment payment dates are date of lodgment of renewal (usually 1 July); and 1 October, 1 January and 1 April following renewal;

where a second, third or fourth instalment of a renewal fee is not paid in full within 21 days of the instalment becoming payable, the Director of Fisheries may impose an additional amount (late payment penalty) not exceeding 10 per cent of the instalment;

where an instalment or an additional amount (late payment penalty) is not paid in full on or before the due date, the amount unpaid may be recovered from the holder of the licence or the person who last held the licence as a debt due to the Crown (that is, court action);

if at time of renewal the licence holder is in arrears, the Director of Fisheries cannot renew the licence unless the licence holder has paid the current prescribed fee (or first instalment) and—and this is very important—the amount of any previous renewal fee remaining payable in respect of the licence together with any additional amount payable for late payment.

The quarterly instalment provision was introduced in August 1991, as I said yesterday, at the request of industry, to assist licence holders with fee payments that better matched the actual cash flow situation in the fishery. The Government, and I as Minister of Fisheries, was pleased to assist industry in this manner.

SASFIT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There have been many questions raised in this place regarding SASFIT's investment in the ASER project. Members opposite would be well aware that the latest audited accounts of the ASER Property Trust for June 1991 have been presented as evidence to the Select Committee on Statutory Authorities. Those accounts are therefore not confidential. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition has been briefed on the issue and I would like to extend that offer to other members should they wish to become better informed.

SASFIT's exposure to the ASER project is in two forms. Its exposure to the commercial elements of the project is $104 million—being the latest independent valuation of its investment. The second exposure is in essence a Government guaranteed loan currently valued at $91.7 million and cannot be regarded as an exposure to the commercial operations of ASER but merely as a Government guaranteed loan.

SASFIT's investment in the commercial elements of the ASER project mainly comprise the office block, hotel and casino. The independently assessed value of SASFIT's interest in the commercial elements of the project at the end of June 1992 was $104 million, giving a return on the cash flows injected by SASFIT since inception of 20.3 per cent per annum. Those cash flows have resulted in SASFIT having cash outlayed over the period of as much as $97 million, but to the end of June 1992 the net cash paid out by SASFIT has been less than $1 million. That investment growth would be something which would make many investors very happy indeed.

The $100 million put option entered into with Westpac relates to the taking out in 1995 of the financing facility which was provided by Westpac in 1988 and which matures in 1995. This debt has been taken into account by the independent valuers in arriving at the $104 million value of SASFIT's interest in ASER. The ASER Property Trust expects to be able to refinance the facility at expiry.

Even in the unlikely event that the put option was exercised, the proportion of SASFIT's portfolio invested in ASER would only be approximately 15-17 per cent at that time. It is the case that the total cost of the project including capitalised interest was approximately $340 million. This cost cannot sensibly be compared with initial estimates of the project in 1983 as at that point the casino premises had not been awarded to the Adelaide railway station building. Following the awarding of the casino licence, the joint venture parties to ASER substantially revamped the proposal to upgrade the hotel and incorporate the cost of refurbishing the old railway building.

The increased costs on the commercial elements—casino, hotel and office block—were accepted by the developers as justifiable, based on the increased revenue expectations following the awarding of the casino premises licence to the Adelaide railway building. The accumulated losses with the ASER Property Trust amounted to $65.9 million at the end of June 1991 and are technical accounting losses that relate to the way the trust and company arrangements were put in place to maximise tax advantages for SASFIT and Kumagai Gumi.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order. Leave has been granted to the Minister to make a ministerial statement. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Most of the losses relate to fees and interest due on loans from SASFIT and Kumagai, but in a conventional corporate structure such changes would not have accumulated, as the funds provided by the owners would have been by way of equity. Irrespective of the historical cost balance sheet position of ASER and the accounting losses recorded in its accounts, the market value assessment recorded in SASFIT's accounts to be tabled next week is based on current and prospective cash flows and is the most reliable measure of investment performance.

The total gross value of the commercial elements of the ASER Property Trust as at June 1992 is $382 million. Comparing that value with the Valuer-General's value of the site and the value of the commercial elements of the site and its earning capacity is like comparing the value of a car and the value of the same car with a taxi licence attached. The commercial elements of the ASER development which have a gross value of $382 million provide a net value to the joint venture developers (SASFIT and Kumagai) of $182 million, after allowing for $200 million of bank finance. Despite the difficult economic times, the investment in the ASER project has been very sound. The ASER investment has been a solid performer for SASFIT since its completion.

The past effect of the ASER investment on the long-term performance of the State's public sector superannuation schemes is that it has enhanced the investment returns of SASFIT by producing a return in excess of 20 per cent per annum, a return well above share market averages over the same period. The future impact of this investment on the superannuation scheme's viability and returns is related to the latest market valuation of ASER. This has been assessed by independent valuers on quite conservative realistic assumptions on economic recovery and other financial indicators.

SASFIT's return therefore should be in excess of average equity returns from the share market generally and there is no expectation that unit holders in SASFIT will be required to inject further cash beyond the $1 million already injected for the existing developers. There has been no massive blow out in costs—the changed cost structure compared with the original estimates largely reflected the changed scope of the development arising from the awarding of the casino premises licence to the Adelaide railway building. There are no continuing losses.

The Government's direct purview of the costs of the ASER development has been limited to the cost of the Government of public elements, that is, car park, Convention Centre and a portion of the public spaces, because it was agreed by the Tonkin Government in 1982 and subsequently the Bannon Government in 1983 that the public elements of ASER would be financed for the Government by ASER by way of a long-term lease of

those elements to the Government with rents based on the capital cost of the public elements.

The Government has kept itself fully informed about the cost of the Government elements of ASER but not the cost of the commercial elements. The changed cost of the entire ASER project (both Government and commercial) from the original 1983 estimates reflects the changed nature of the project brought about by the inclusion of the casino in the development.

The increased cost of the commercial elements was accepted by the developers as justifiable based on the increased revenue expectations. The increased costs on the commercial elements of the ASER development have not impacted on the Government, nor have they resulted in reduced returns for SASFIT. If SASFIT had not participated in the venture, SASFIT's overall returns since 1983 would have been slightly worse than the very acceptable 14.7 per cent per annum average return over the 10 years to June 1992.

As the cost of the commercial elements was of no direct interest to the Government, it has not sought such information and has therefore not been aware of it. The Government has, however, been aware of SASFIT's overall investment performance since its investment in ASER began and is pleased the investment has contributed as strongly as it has to increasing the purchasing power of the pool of contributors' money managed by SASFIT. It is complete nonsense to suggest that the State budget and hence the taxpayers of South Australia will need to make greater contributions for public sector pensions because of SASFIT's investment in ASER. The reverse is more likely, namely, that the State will need to contribute less.

Not only has SASFIT benefited but the South Australian economy more generally has benefited through:

the creation of hundreds of jobs over the construction period;

the ongoing employment of over 1 500 at the hotel and casino; and

the creation of an attractive asset in the City of Adelaide which caters for a wide range of entertainment seekers in the local community and tourists.

The costs of the Government elements were monitored by a steering committee set up for the purpose. The changed costs from original estimates reflected the need to revamp the Convention Centre in the light of the Casino premises being awarded to the railway station building. At the time of the completion of the Convention Centre in July 1987 the cost of the public elements (including capitalised interest) was $64.4 million, which resulted in a rental in the first year of operation (1987-88) of $4.03 million, being the agreed 6.25 per cent of cost.

Rentals have been escalated with inflation since that year and also as a result of further capital costs since July 1987, resulting in an annual rental cost of $6.08 million in 1991-92 and total rents of $26 million over the five years to the end of June 1992—not $40 million as claimed by the Leader of the Opposition. The initial rental of $4.03 million in 1987-88 is greater than the Premier's original estimate of $2.65 million in 1983 because the Convention Centre cost more due to changes in the nature of the building, as I outlined earlier, and delays in its commencement and hence completion.

STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Last Sunday evening I had the opportunity on radio 5AA to debate with the member for Hayward a number of issues relating to management of Government assets under my portfolio, including the refurbishment of the State Administration Centre. During this debate the member for Hayward made the allegation that the cost of this refurbishment and fitout had blown out by an extra $26 million. The member made a very firm statement that this amount was recorded in last year's budget papers as an actual expenditure, and implied that these funds could have been spent only on the State Administration Centre.

At the time, I was somewhat mystified by the honourable member's claims, because, quite frankly, his reasoning did not seem to me to make a lot of sense. However, I publicly undertook to investigate his claims and provide him with a report on the actual situation. As I said, I was somewhat flabbergasted by the honourable member's claims, but nevertheless we investigated whether there was any evidence that the $26 million had been reported in last year's budget papers as spent on the refurbishment and fitout of the State Administration Centre. We could find no evidence of such expenditure.

However, I am happy to report that the member for Hayward has himself shed further light on the matter, because he rose in this House yesterday and repeated his allegation. Citing the actual capital expenditure of the Department of Premier and Cabinet for 1990-91, the member claimed that the cost of the refurbishment has blown out to $53 million. In making this outrageous allegation, the member has in this House professed himself to be a simple person, not well versed in understanding figures. How right he is, Mr Speaker! Because if we turn to the budget papers of last year, on page 4 of the section dealing with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet we do in fact see that there was actual expenditure of $26.581 on capital items in 1990-91. Then, if we turn to page 14 of the papers, to the program description, we read that this expenditure is based substantially on the costs of completing the Entertainment Centre!

Now, I understand that the member for Hayward has a problem with figures but it also appears that he has a problem with the English language, because nowhere in this section of the budget papers dealing with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to which he refers is there any mention of the State Administration Centre. Nor is that particularly surprising because, in fact, the State Administration Centre is my responsibility and is part of the budget of the Minister of Housing and Construction. I would have thought that the member

might have at least come to terms with that fact, given that we spent an hour debating the matter on radio last Sunday.

The member for Hayward has made a most serious allegation in relation to this matter, both publicly in the media and in this House yesterday: indeed, he has in this House implied that his so-called blowout is a financial scandal. The member has made this outlandish allegation without a single shred of evidence: indeed, a simple reading of the budget papers reveals otherwise. Given the member for Hayward's admitted financial illiteracy, I suggest that in future he might save himself and the Opposition further embarrassment by seeking a briefing, before making these mischievous public allegations.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is it proper for a Minister to attack a member of this Parliament during the course of a ministerial statement by way of debate in the fashion that the Minister has just attacked the member for Hayward?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is granted by the House for a Minister to make a ministerial statement, the content of which is then subject to the will of the House. I am not aware of anything particularly out of order with this ministerial statement, in line with the many others that have been presented in this House in the 13 years I have been here.

QUESTION TIME

HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION MINISTER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Does the Government endorse the view of the Minister of Housing and Construction that the current hearings of the Economic and Finance Committee relating to the use of consultants are a 'nuisance', a 'Spanish inquisition' and a 'media circus' and, if not, will he use his authority as Acting Premier to require the Minister to apologise to the Parliament for this contempt of a very important committee which is working hard to reveal what the Government has attempted to cover up?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is clearly Thursday afternoon and obviously it has been a long week. I understand that the Minister made one or two tongue-in-cheek comments to the Chairman of the committee. That is all they are. In fact, the Government has cooperated fully with the committee.

FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Finance advise the House of the impact on State-owned hospitals of the Commonwealth Government's decision to extend fringe benefits tax provided to employees? It has been suggested to the House that the Royal Adelaide Hospital provides parking facilities for its employees and, as such, may be liable for this tax.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I said yesterday in answer to a question from the member for Adelaide, he laboured long and brought forth a mouse. Perhaps it would have been wiser for him to wait until the position was clarified, although I do note that the clarification was assisted by the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament. He seemed to agree with me that there were rorts in this area and perhaps they ought to be tidied up, so it is probably the first time I have ever been supported by a Liberal Leader. However, the member for Adelaide need have no worries.

Dr Armitage: How much will the Health Commission have to pay? That is who will be liable.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thought the question yesterday referred specifically to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Section 57a of the Fringe Benefits Tax Assessment Act exempts benefits provided by public benevolent institutions to their employees.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The exemption for public benevolent institutions extends to benefits provided by public hospitals, and this includes those employees who work in public hospitals but who are technically employed by a State health authority, for example, the Health Commission. In these cases it is always best to wait until the facts are known. In that way, one does retain a shred of credibility rather than firing from the lip, as the member for Adelaide often does, and his credibility diminishes accordingly as, I note in passing, has his position in this House—all of a sudden, he has slipped off the front bench.

HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION MINISTER

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to you, Sir. Will you rule whether the reported comments of the Minister of Housing and Construction, such as 'nuisance', a 'Spanish inquisition' and a 'media circus' represent contempt of Parliament and, if so, what action will you take?

The SPEAKER: It is always nice to have a question from the member for Hanson. I am not aware of the statement that was made. I understand that it was reported in the newspaper this morning. I can go only on the question asked in the House and the response given that it was made in a 'tongue in cheek' manner—I believe that was the terminology used.

An honourable members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: While I am the Speaker, I can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage, that is all the information I have and therefore I see no basis to take action.

HOUSING DENSITY

Mr De LAINE (Price): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What steps has the State Government taken to ensure that local government authorities in the metropolitan area are made aware of the need to make provision for increasing public demand for medium density housing?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I particularly thank the honourable member for this question, because there are quite a number of areas within his electorate that have already been the subject of implementation of the Government's policy of urban consolidation. I remind members that in 1987 the Government introduced a policy on urban consolidation and changed the objectives of residential development, as expressed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Residential Development Plan.

This plan covers all of the metropolitan area apart from the city of Adelaide. I am delighted to inform the House that local governments, with a few exceptions, have been reasonably quick to adopt and implement appropriate planning policies that reflect the Government's urban consolidation objectives. The councils have been assisted by the Green-street joint venture program, which provides funds for the employment of a promotions officer to assist in the administering of the Commonwealth programs and which also promotes models and model codes for residential development and urban housing.

The recently released planning review strategy for metropolitan Adelaide identified a number of low density, middle suburbs where affordable urban infill could well constitute the most economical form of development. In fact, it is in these areas that have already established human services facilities such as medical care, education and transport, as well as existing infrastructure facilities, that the greatest potential for consolidation lies in the future.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say how much will be spent on refitting No. 1 Anzac Highway to accommodate ETSA? I have been told that Hassell and Partners have a contract for the refit of that building, that quotations have been sought for the replacement of a carpet at a cost of some $400 000 and that the total cost associated with relocation, furniture, equipment and communication needs will be up to $11 million. Is that correct?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not aware at this stage of the specific figure, but I will make inquiries and, if a specific figure is available, I will provide it to the honourable member.

HEYSEN TRAIL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport give the House an update on the development of the Heysen Trail? Will the Minister also inform the House what is the proposed timetable for its completion?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for Stuart for her question, because I am sure that this issue is very dear to her. Certainly, as member for that district, I am sure that she will be delighted to be a participant in the opening of the full trail—which, I hope, is not too far away.

I am pleased to inform the House that the final section of the Heysen Trail between Woolshed Flat—which I am sure is well known to the honourable member and which is near Quorn—and Hawker is currently under construction. In the past few months, our team in the trail section of the department, plus many people from the Friends of the Heysen Trail, have been working together to complete the section of over 130 kilometres. I have been provided with information about markers, warnings and information signs, buildings, bridges, stiles, fences and all the erosion control barriers, which are very important in all those areas because of the need to ensure that farmers' land is protected. In particular, we must ensure that stock are not injured or damaged in any way by any of the activity, especially later when walkers have access.

There has been cooperation between the department, landowners and district councils. I want to thank the district councils because, without their cooperation and support, we would not have achieved the end result. I hope that a formal opening will take place in October this year. The timetable is set for October when we will be able to open the whole of the Heysen trail. I think that it will be unique, because I am sure it will attract not only many South Australians but also many overseas visitors. It will also bring in many interstate visitors. It is becoming one of the major outdoor assets of this State, and nationally it is recognised for what it will provide in terms not only of recreation but of opportunities for people to see South Australia from another aspect. I thank the honourable member for her question and look forward to the opening in October.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Why is the State Bank offering to guarantee rental returns for a period of up to five years on a major Gold Coast commercial development, and will these guarantees be paid from the taxpayer funded bail-out of the bank?

Literature advertising the sale by international tender of the Waterside Office Park on the Gold Coast explains that the State Bank of South Australia will provide income support over tenancies in this building. The scope and nature of this support is described as 'flexible' with net income from rentals estimated at $3.6 million in the first year.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On the face of it, one could imagine circumstances in which that would be a perfectly proper commercial arrangement. However, I will obtain the information because clearly at this stage I know nothing about it.

WORKCOVER

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Labour inform the House as to the billing policy of the WorkCover Corporation where it concerns outstanding payments? In yesterday's press an article suggested that the WorkCover Corporation has been billing clients for as little as 1c. Is this the standard practice of WorkCover?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Gilles for his question. In this House on Tuesday the member for Murray-Mallee asked a question about a 1c bill sent out by WorkCover. The article in the newspaper was accurate. I am aware that a 1c bill did slip through WorkCover's checking procedures. However, I should like to recount to the House what was happening at that time. Some 48 000 reconciliation accounts were sent out by WorkCover at the end of the financial year. As the House would know, WorkCover bills employers one month in arrears. At the end of the financial year, a reconciliation has to be made as to whether the employer needs to pay more or to get a refund. Some 48 000 of those accounts were sent out and they recovered an extra $8 million for WorkCover. The 1c bill was the only mistake of which WorkCover was aware. It is confident that the procedures that it has in place will eliminate that sort of mistake.

I make the point that, when 48 000 accounts are sent out in a reconciliation process and only one mistake gets through of which WorkCover is aware—we must remember that it is for the end of the financial year—it is a very good effort on the part of that organisation. It also demonstrates a lack of issues that this bankrupt Opposition has to take up with the Government.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Before I ask my question, Mr Speaker, I would ask you to deliberate on the way in which the question was asked in response to a previous question that was asked in this House and whether it is to be normal practice for a Minister to use one of his own members to seek to give a reply which has already been asked for.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am in some confusion over what the honourable member is requesting. Is he raising a point of order and, if so, will he refer specifically to the point of order, because I missed it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rose on a point of order, Sir. A question was asked in this House by the member for Murray-Mallee, and it is normal for the Minister to respond by ministerial statement. On this occasion the Minister responded to a question from his own side; is this normal and will this be accepted practice?

The SPEAKER: It is very difficult now that the question has been answered for me to rule on it. It is a matter of fact now. If there was a problem with the response or the method of response, the point of order should have been taken at the time. I cannot rule it out of order in retrospect.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Sir, I was interested in the response and I was asking you to deliberate on it and rule next time.

HEMMERLING, Dr M.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. As the Grand Prix Board is under ministerial control, does the Government accept ultimate responsibility for the large salary packages of the board's executive staff, including more than $383 000 a year being paid to the Executive Director?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Only in part. Let me explain how Dr Hemmerling is paid. His income can be divided, like Gaul, into three parts. The first is a base salary which was approved by the Premier when his present contract was negotiated; it was a renegotiation of an earlier contract. That amounts to $108 675 per annum, which is roughly equivalent to what a chief executive officer of a Government department would get. That was approved by the Premier and was the only aspect of the salary package to be approved by the Premier, and any other income is a matter for the board.

Over and above the base salary, the board decided to make available to Dr Hemmerling an allowance of $166 000 a year. I am not in a position to comment on the appropriateness or otherwise of that decision; I understand that the board took advice in respect of that and came to that decision. It may reflect what is paid to people who run similar events around the world; I do not know, but the point I would like to make in relation to the allowance is that, if the honourable member has concerns about that, it is something he should take up with the board.

As to the third part of the package, I should explain that under Dr Hemmerling's previous contract he was allowed to carry on his own consulting business and indeed, through a business he had, he gave advice as a consultant to the running of various other events around the world, and that brought in a considerable income for him. At the renegotiation there were those who felt that there was at least the potential for a conflict of interest between Dr Hemmerling's responsibilities to the Grand Prix Board here and his other business interests, so what the Grand Prix Board decided to do was make it a condition of Dr Hemmerling's contract that he not undertake these other business interests but, rather, that the Grand Prix Board would purchase the business from him.

I do not have the exact figures here, but I understand that that additional business brings in an income to the Grand Prix Board of about $300 000 a year and from that, as recompense for the sale of that business, Dr Hemmerling is paid an extra $90 000 per year. So, if I can sum up where we seem to be in this, if the honourable member is concerned about the appropriateness of the base salary, the $180 000-odd per year—that is a matter to take up appropriately with the Government. If, he is concerned about the additional allowance of $166 000 a year, that is a matter to be taken up with the Grand Prix Board. If, thirdly, he is concerned about the deal that was done or the commercial arrangements made whereby for an additional outlay of $90 000 per year the board gets an income of $300 000, that is something else he should take up with the board

and perhaps also with whoever suggested to him that that was a pretty dicey commercial arrangement.

OPERATION PARADOX

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate to the House what advice he has received from the police about the outcome of yesterday's Operation Paradox phone-in, conducted to encourage children who are being or who have been sexually abused to make contact with the proper authorities? The House will be aware that increased police activity in relation to child abuse had its origins in and around my electorate through the setting up of Operation Keeper which, in fact, was so successful that it has been adopted throughout the State and indeed elsewhere in Australia. Operation Keeper's successor was named Operation Paradox, and last year the House passed a resolution congratulating the South Australian Police Force on its efforts in combating those heinous activities against children. Hence my question.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question, being aware of his concern and indeed the concern of all members in this House that the pernicious practice of child abuse of various kinds needs to be dealt with by the police to the maximum extent possible. The information I have received from the Deputy Police Commissioner indicates that this time Operation Paradox took 448 calls, an increase of eight on the previous year; to all intents and purposes it is roughly the same number of calls as last year. Early estimates indicate that about 20 per cent of the calls came from country areas and the balance from the metropolitan area. The Deputy Commissioner has advised that 14 matters raised during the operation required immediate action, 10 in the city and four in the country. These inquiries are still to be finalised, and I am advised that no arrests or reports have yet been made. Members will appreciate that full analysis of the figures and follow-up on many of the matters raised during the phone-in will take some time. I hope to keep the House informed of progress as further information is provided by the police.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Correctional Services undertake to investigate the alarming amount of breakouts from Cadell Training Centre and implement procedures to ensure that dangerous prisoners are appropriately restrained? Escape figures from Cadell Training Centre show that there have been 29 escapes since 1990, with 15 so far this year. This contrasts dramatically with the early 1980s when there were no escapes in 1980, four in 1981 and two in 1982.

I am told that the increase in escapes is placing considerable stress on police officers and rural residents. At a public meeting on 6 August, residents formed the Cadell Community Action Group as a measure of their concern. They point out that their property is at risk, particularly their cars which are obvious targets for escapees, and that at least eight prisoners at Cadell are serving life sentences.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would like to welcome the member for Bright to the portfolio. This is his first question, and I thought I would do him that courtesy. He joins the members for Hanson, Mount Gambier, Newland, Heysen and the Hon. Trevor Griffin, the Hon. Jamie Irwin and the Hon. John Burdett who have shadowed me during my period as Minister. None of them has come to any good. Not one of them, with the exception of the member for Mount Gambier, had a clue what the portfolio was about. However, I do welcome the member for Bright. Cadell is a prison farm. It is an open prison and security is minimal. There will be escapes from time to time—more sometimes and less at others, depending on the number of people in the institution.

I can assure the member for Bright that escapes are not new. Perhaps if the member for Bright wishes to have a conversation with the member for Kavel, the member for Kavel will inform him of some quite notorious characters who escaped during his brief interlude as Chief Secretary.

Mr Matthew: Thirteen escapes in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is very difficult to treat the member for Bright with any seriousness at all. I am trying, but the member for Bright is not helping.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order again, and I would caution him on his behaviour.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is an open prison farm. If we increased security measures, it would change the nature of the prison altogether. The prison has been there since, I think, the mid-1960s, and it has been a tremendous success. I suggest that the member for Bright talk to members with responsibility in the area. We have very little difficulty with local communities in locating prisons throughout South Australia. In fact, I can assure you, Sir—and members opposite will be aware of this—that some communities write to me inviting a prison in their council area. And so they should!

The security at Cadell is minimal—and it will stay minimal. The fact that there are life sentence prisoners there is not news. There have been life sentence prisoners at Cadell since the day it opened. I will not put the department to the trouble of working out how many life sentence prisoners were at Cadell between 1979 and 1982, but I can assure the House that it was a considerable number. They were notorious and they were serving their sentence at Cadell in the appropriate manner. Of course, we will see whether any other reasonable measures should be taken at Cadell without turning the prison into something it is not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not believe that members opposite are paying sufficient attention. I do not believe they want an answer, so I will leave it there.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Education provide the House with details on the progress of the school discipline policy, particularly in the areas of suspension, exclusion and expulsion of students? As the Minister would be aware, there is considerable interest in the school community with respect to this policy and specifically among parents of students and school councillors in my electorate.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. There is a problem in our schools, which has been readily accepted, with a small number of students who, unfortunately, are severely behaviourally disturbed. That reflects the spiral of violence in our community, which is reflected, unfortunately, in our school community. However, it involves only a small minority of our students, and over the past five years the Education Department in this State has embarked on a very substantial program with a number of strands to deal with this particular group of students. It is well accepted across this country that this has been a very important and, indeed, effective innovation. It is not possible to eliminate the incidence of this form of behaviour from our schools, nor is it possible to ask the Education Department alone to deal with the management of this group of students. For that reason, an inter-agency referral process has been established with other key human service agencies to deal with this group of students.

Procedures for suspension, expulsion and exclusion have been the subject of a green paper type of process, and it is anticipated that the new regulations dealing with these powers vested in our schools will be put in place in the fourth term of this year, and in offices of the Education Department for implementation in the 1993 school year. Further, a review of student behaviour management services is being undertaken by our teacher and student services managers throughout the Education Department. Some nine additional salaries have been provided for key withdrawal programs, that is, students who are actually taken from schools, and they are located at Pennington, Park Holme, Brahma Lodge, Bowden, Brompton, Aberfoyle Hub, Modbury, Gawler, Whyalla and Port Augusta. I should also refer to the provision of some 70 primary school counsellors throughout our schools to help in counselling and other behaviour management programs.

HEMMERLING, Dr M.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is directed to the Acting Premier. Does the Government intend to express any concern to, or seek any further clarification from, the Grand Prix Board about the allowance of $166 000 payable to Dr Hemmerling and the $90 000 buy back rights from his private business interests?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will have to refer that to my colleague.

NORTH INGLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. What progress has been made on the North Ingle Primary School rebuilding after the 1991 fire? Can he assure the North Ingle community that all speed will be used by departmental officers to overcome difficulties that so far have delayed the refurbishment? North Ingle Primary School was badly damaged in an arson attack almost 12 months ago. The community is becoming restive and feels that departmental officials have been slow to react; consequently they have sought my assistance.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest and his support for this particular school which, as he indicated to the House, suffered a great deal of damage as a result of an arson attack. As a result of that fire, I am advised that the following works have actually taken place to date: there has been a thorough cleaning of the total school; the burnt out administration building structure was demolished; the site cleared and made safe; the heating and cooling plant was moved and re-established; the activity hall has been fully repaired and reinstated; temporary administration facilities have been put into place; new and additional security lighting has been installed; and a new telephone system has been installed and commissioned.

As a result of very recent meetings between the school principal and the Chairperson of the school council, representatives of SACON and the Education Department, the new proposal for refurbishing the school and making good the buildings that were lost in the fire is ready to proceed. It is anticipated that the bulk of the work will be conducted during the Christmas vacation period, although work will be commenced prior to then. The anticipated completion date of all the works for the North Ingle school is term two of next year.

INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Is the Minister of Housing and Construction aware of strong opposition from housing subcontractors and the Housing Industry Association to the independent contractors legislation on the grounds that it will deliver control of the housing industry into the hands of trade unions and on behalf of home builders who stand to pay an estimated $15 000 extra per house as a result of this legislation? If so, will he make his Federal colleague, the Minister for Industrial Relations, aware of this strong opposition and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, it has been brought to my attention. I have read the media, as I am sure the honourable member has. There have been discussions at both State and Federal levels about the impact. The figures referred to by the honourable member are somewhat exaggerated. I will refer the question to my Federal colleague and also liaise with my State colleague as to the implications and impact on the State industry of the proposed Federal approach. I make it clear that, in the discussions I have had with the Federal Minister in

passing on the concerns of the State industry, he has in fact countered by saying that some positive effects will flow on as well. So, it is an ongoing discussion. I am happy to pass on that view in terms of not only the honourable member's question but also the industry's concerns.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I direct my question to the Minister of Employment and Further Education. In his discussions with the Commonwealth Government about the allocation of employment funds under the local capital works program announced in the recent Commonwealth budget, will the Minister use his good offices to ensure that funds are allocated to those councils whose districts are the most seriously affected by unemployment?

The Minister will be aware of limited funds, details of which I understand have just become available under the budget announcement, and that areas such as the northern suburbs, some southern suburbs and, of course, the Iron Triangle region, are in the most serious need of assistance to generate further employment.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I totally agree with the member for Elizabeth on this. Of course, the employment package to which the honourable member refers relates to Commonwealth funding that is specifically aimed at local government and not through State Government. So, the Commonwealth Government decided, following the Youth Employment Summit, not to involve State Government in this process. However, there is some welcome funding, because this is a capital works program and not a labour market program.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Playford asks how much we are getting, and I am very pleased to give him some information that I have just received from Canberra. However, the State Government is working with the South Australian Local Government Association with an agreed aim of ensuring that the maximum number of new jobs is created. I am informed that the contribution by councils of up to 20 per cent of the cost of projects should not be a problem for the vast majority. It is certainly not a problem for the Australian Local Government Association, which made submissions on this, because in many cases it simply involves bringing forward the existing capital works programs of local government.

I share the view of the member for Elizabeth regarding the criteria that must be used in determining which areas receive support: they should be those areas with the highest unemployment level. That is the assurance we have received from the Federal Government. I was therefore rather concerned to hear comments from both the member for Victoria and Dr Hewson, who said that employment creation money given to local councils in the Federal Government's budget is simply aimed at marginal seats. I am sure that the Hon. Peter Arnold, Mr John Oswald, Mr John Olsen and Mr John Meier would be delighted to know that their Federal Leader believes that they are in marginal seats, because councils in each of their electorates receive some of the highest funding per capita under this employment initiative. Other areas that receive similarly high funding in South Australia include the districts of Adelaide, Napier, Kaurna, Eyre, Elizabeth, Price, Spence and Peake. It is interesting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite want to know how much their individual areas are receiving. I am pleased to tell them that the following council areas will be offered these amounts: Elizabeth, $1 815 000; Enfield, $1 883 000 plus; Gawler, $486 000; Munno Para, $1 616 000; Tea Tree Gully, $1 959 000; Noarlunga, $3 340 000; Henley and Grange, $398 000; Hindmarsh, $421 000; Port Adelaide, $1 580 000; Thebarton, $482 000; West Torrens, $1 546 000; Woodville, $2 905 000; and, of course, and most justly, Salisbury, $4 208 000.

PUBLIC SECTOR PERSONNEL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Why is the Government taking no notice of serious criticisms of its personnel management practices by Mr Jim Betts, the Presiding Officer of the Promotions Grievance Appeal Tribunal? In his latest annual report, tabled yesterday, Mr Betts stated that he sees little evidence of a planned approach to determining employee performance goals or the assessment of job performance. He also states that there is an extremely high incidence of internal promotions and therefore very little lateral movement of staff between departments. Again, two years ago, in his 1989-90 report, Mr Betts told the Minister that there was an acute need to improve personnel practices in some agencies.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government will be introducing amendments to the Government Management and Employment Act which will overcome some of the problems that Mr Betts is talking about. Members opposite should appreciate that this Government is going through an enormous restructuring of the Public Service in this State. It has seen enormous relocation of resources and, contrary to what members opposite may say, there has been a real reduction in administrative forces. There has also been a considerable increase in the number of people employed in areas of need, such as law enforcement, hospitals and education. I think that, before members opposite criticise what is happening in the Public Service, they should appreciate the enormous changes that are taking place, the need to adjust those and the fact that managers are managing with scarce resources and I believe are delivering the best public services in Australia.

RECREATION SA

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. I understand that the recreation division of the Department

of Recreation and Sport now operates under the name 'Recreation SA'. Will the Minister advise the House how Recreation SA will enhance the development of recreation associations in South Australia?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. It is important to place on record the activities of Recreation SA, particularly the establishment of its new projects unit, which will have a specific role to work closely with State recreation associations to develop the opportunities for recreation for all South Australians. I know that the member for Albert Park, in his own electorate, enjoys and takes part in some of those activities. He was foremost in the Locomotion campaign, which was launched on the seashore in his electorate. In fact, he participated with many others in the first stages of that recreation exercise—something which the Recreation Institute (now called Recreation SA) will be promoting throughout South Australia.

The programs will offer assistance to recreation organisations throughout the State. The theme will be to conduct recreation programs that will develop and raise public awareness of recreation and the benefits that flow from it. It will promote a healthy lifestyle and increase self worth for members in the community who are involved, increase the range of events to which the public has access, increase participation in club membership and, of course, improve access and availability to programs for groups in the community with physical or other disabilities. That is a very important aspect which I am sure all members endorse.

The special projects unit of Recreation SA will be embarking on that in particular with community organisations in South Australia. I encourage all members to support them. I am sure there will be events taking place in their own electorates in the coming year which will be supported by the special projects unit. I look forward to their support, because it is important to have local members involved from the point of view not only of the public image but also of the support that it offers. I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest and look forward to his participation, as well as that of other members, in Recreation SA projects.

CONSULTANCIES

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. As the South Australian Sports Institute has a marketing department with a manager and paid staff, why did the department employ an outside consultant to work for it to launch the velodrome this week?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Those issues were brought up before the Economic and Finance Committee to consider. The situation, as explained to that committee, is that the department does not have expertise in marketing. In fact, its expertise is in recreation and sport. It employs a person who acts in many ways as a multifunction generalist but, for specific programs, such as the Superdrome as it is now called, it is important that they receive the best possible promotion. In fact, as part of the commercial package, we are endeavouring to market and attract sponsorship, and that has been a very important part of it. I am sure that the honourable member knows from his involvement in other exercises and areas of industry, particularly the racing industry, that it is very important that the product be promoted so that potential sponsors are attracted. That is what has happened. The promotion, which was undertaken in a very short time by the public relations firm, was excellent. I am sure those members of the community who were there—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: If the honourable member wants to ask supplementary questions, I am happy to deal with them as they come. The fact is that the program was very successful. As part of that we have secured additional sponsorship in the past few days. I would think that, from the point of view of sports promotion, it is important for us to bring in those commercial experts from the private sector. I might add that the private sector is constantly at our door saying, 'We should be having a share of that cake; we're the experts in the area and the private sector should be doing it.'

RECREATION AND SPORT DEPARTMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Will the Minister inform the House of the outcome of the recently conducted review of the Department of Recreation and Sport undertaken by the Government Management Board?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question, because it is important to reflect on the review that was undertaken. Under the auspices of the Government Management Board and particularly the Commissioner for Public Employment, we undertook a total investigation of the operations of the Department of Recreation and Sport, including the Sports Institute and Recreation SA. We also included the racing division as part of that exercise. Doctor Swincer, who was appointed and who is at the moment Acting Director of the department, undertook the investigation with Mr Ian Bidmeade, a private consultant who is probably well known to the community not only because of his role as a management consultant but also because he is a former State champion tennis player. There was additional support from Miss Leonie Shaw from the Office of Cabinet and Government Management.

The review was undertaken and the report tabled in Cabinet in July of this year. It examines the management, structural and equity issues relating to the department, and we identified a number of areas which we needed to strengthen and for which we needed to provide a better corporate plan and organisation within the Department of Recreation and Sport. I am delighted with the work that has been undertaken by Dr Swincer and the team. I think it will add to the facility and the efficiency of the organisation, improve the delivery of services and give far greater value for the money invested in that department.

I think we will see a much more improved service to our community, and it is important to consider this from

the point of view of elite athletes participating in national or international events such as the Olympics. If we look at the State performance of one gold medal, four silver and a bronze, we see that it is a pretty good performance from a population of 1.25 million. So, I think we can see an even better performance ahead, and I look forward to not only the elite results as a consequence of this survey but also the greater participation of our children and the whole community in South Australia.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Why did the Education Department not act on complaints lasting for 2½ years about problems at Clare High School before the school council felt compelled to take the unprecedented step of moving 'no confidence' in the school principal?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question; this is a matter that I have discussed with him on a number of occasions on a confidential basis in order to try to resolve the difficult situation in that high school with personality conflicts and other conflicts that have arisen between parents, groups of parents and staff of the school. I thank the honourable member for his efforts in trying to assist in the resolution of this most difficult and complex matter and, indeed, his support for those officers of the Education Department who have been working with that school committee over a long period to try to resolve these issues.

It is unfortunate that it became a public issue, because it has harmed the standing of what is a very good school with a very proud record of service to the community over a long period. It also harms the stability of the school in the eyes of students and the local community and affects the support it receives from that local community. Nevertheless, that has occurred and now the damage that has been caused must be repaired. The honourable member is aware that a senior officer of the department prepared a report on what has occurred in that school. Recommendations were contained in that report and the department is acting on them. The report has been criticised and I guess whatever was recommended would have been subject to criticism because of the conflicts that exist at that school.

Every effort is being made to resolve the matter, but it is not one that can be resolved by the waving of a wand or simply by taking administrative decisions because they do not relate to deep-seated issues that have become ingrained in that school community over quite a long period. I can only assure the honourable member that we are doing all we can to try to remedy this unfortunate circumstance.

DOCTORS, COUNTRY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health advise the House whether he has any details of the package of grants announced in the Federal budget to encourage doctors to locate in country regions? Will he also advise whether he has details of South Australia's proportion of the $8 million allocated towards this project? I am sure that the Minister would be aware, as I am, of the problems we have been facing in the past five years in attracting doctors to locate in country areas.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First, the honourable member is right in saying that there is $8 million in this year's Commonwealth budget for this purpose, and I believe $15.2 million has been earmarked for the following financial year. People are aware how important it is to maintain general practice in country areas, so this is a welcome initiative indeed. I can give the honourable member and the House a detailed rundown in writing. In fact, it will involve, for example, payment for locum support, which is often a difficult problem in country areas, and relocation incentive grants, travelling grants and a number of other measures like that which, as I say, are included to try to get additional assistance for GPs not only in remote areas but in rural areas as well. I will make that information available to the honourable member.

As to the amount coming to South Australia, that is almost impossible to tell at this stage and we may never know, except by a very close examination of the Commonwealth budget, because most of this will be paid by the Commonwealth department directly to these practices or individual doctors and it will not be paid to South Australia via the normal scheme. I suppose all we can say is that, if we divide the $8 million into about 10 on a rough population basis, that may be the outcome for this financial year. I make the point that there will be direct payment to rural practices rather than through the State Government itself. We certainly welcome the initiative.

INFORMATION UTILITY

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. What assurance can he give that the Government's proposed information utility will not be open to massive abuse with the disclosure of personal details about South Australian residents? In this week's *City Messenger*, Flinders University lecturer Dr Joseph Wayne Smith is quoted as saying that the utility left itself wide open for private details to be used illegally, similar to practices unveiled by the New South Wales Commission against Corruption last week. Similar concerns have been raised by the Public Service Association. The South Australian utility will encompass data from WorkCover, the State Bank, the South Australia Police Department and SGIC.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I really do thank him because I have been waiting for this question for some time. Having seen the *Messenger* yesterday morning, I thought it would be a certainty for a question yesterday afternoon. With a fast running Opposition, really on top of issues, it was going to be quick on this, so I was ready for it yesterday and I have been sitting here getting increasingly bored with the situation. It has taken until the last quarter of Question Time this week for the

honourable member to finally come up with the question. Thank you for bringing up the question. It is not exactly the speediest attempt to respond to issues of the day, but nevertheless you have made some attempt.

I have to say that the article to which the honourable member refers is something like the member's speed of questioning: it is a pretty poor effort at journalism. It is a very ordinary article, if you read the number of allegations it is making without any real substantiation, with no real effort made to analyse the question. It does make the point about raising the fear of Government information being openly accessible. It has the headline 'Computer giants to take over all Government information' and there is another heading 'Fears that SA is selling out to Big Brother'.

It raises a number of other fear tactics as you go through it. It talks about 'Information on SA citizens in private hands', and then says 'Main player Digital posts $3.73 billion loss'. The next heading is 'Thousands of Public Service jobs to be shed'. Just for good measure, having raised all these other fears, page 5 brings in another hoary chestnut when it says 'Government Information Utility could be another State Bank'. I think that the entire article lacks any credibility at all. It makes no serious effort to look at the question of the Information Utility, to examine the real issues, to raise genuine questions and then to put those questions to the Government so that they can be answered.

Every one of those spurious points can very clearly be answered. The honourable member is trying to chip away at this concept by associating himself with that kind of spurious approach. There are so many serious questions that need to be asked about any major concept such as the Information Utility. I acknowledge the fact that the Public Service Association has asked many of those questions, and we are in the process of providing it with answers. There are a number of issues that need to be discussed and about which members opposite and members of the community need to feel satisfied.

As to an assurance about the Information Utility not being open to massive abuse with the disclosure of personal details about South Australian residents, I point out that no system anywhere can ever be said to be 100 per cent failsafe. I am too cautious to say that there will never be any problem with any system anywhere, be it in the private or the public sector. What I can say is that it is not only the intention but it will be the case that the Government will provide the same extensive assurances that personal details made available to the South Australian Government will not be open to any form of abuse, let alone massive abuse. It will be exactly the same for any degree of private involvement in the Information Utility as it would be if there were no private involvement. In other words, the assurance will be exactly the same as applies at the moment with the Government's handling of information through its existing systems.

SHEEP

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House whether sufficient checks and balances have been put in place to control sheep lice infection since compulsory sheep dipping procedures were removed from the Stock Act in May 1991? The House will be well aware that when the Stock Act was debated last year I was very vocal in supporting the removal of compulsory sheep dipping from that legislation. Since that time, I have come under considerable criticism from fellow farmers who inform me that, as a result of the removal of compulsory sheep dipping, even my own flock on my selection is at risk.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for this very important question. I know that it is an important question. Members opposite have serious problems with what the Government did last year. It took some degree of convincing of my colleague the member for Napier to get this measure through the Caucus room, let alone into the Chamber, so I am aware of his serious concerns about these matters. We need to understand the level of frequency of lice in sheep, and it might be useful to quote some figures to the House. A survey in 1982 showed that only 16 per cent of the flocks in South Australia had sheep lice, and more recent surveys in other States have shown that infestation apparently occurs in approximately 30 per cent of flocks. Therefore, it is probable that the prevalence of sheep free of lice is somewhere between 70 and 85 per cent. The question then is whether or not it is worthwhile having compulsory dipping of sheep.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I do not wish to canvass the debate again as this matter was canvassed in the House last year at great length. Some matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition were canvassed during that extensive debate. If I recall, the debate was a touch too extensive and went on for something like 4½ hours. But I need to remind members, including the Leader of the Opposition, that, despite the removal of compulsory dipping from the new Act, the Department of Agriculture continues to maintain regulatory control of sheep lice. Under the Stock Act it is still an offence to fail to report that sheep are infested or suspected of being infected with lice, to sell infested stock, to permit infested stock to stray or to transport infested stock.

So, if the member for Napier is making sure he is watching all those four points, he will be in a good position. A team of departmental officers has planned a Statewide advisory program called LICECHECK. The program was officially launched on 18 June this year and has the support of the UF&S, the Advisory Board of Agriculture and 10 sponsoring companies comprising agents, resellers, chemical manufacturers and the Australian Wool Testing Authority.

The LICECHECK program is based around three elements: check for lice, keep lice out and the efficient use of chemicals. These principles will be dealt with at farmer field days, agent and reseller meetings, and other appropriate occasions during the next three years. On-

farm surveys will be conducted to determine current information on lice prevalence in South Australia and to evaluate the effectiveness of the LICECHECK program.

A reduction in the use of dipping products may prolong the useful life of these chemicals. Lice which are resistant to chemicals are present in some South Australian flocks and have caused significant dipping break-downs interstate. Changes to environmental legislation may occur in our major wool markets and force producers to reduce chemical use. Industries using the wool by-product lanolin, for example, may well demand a chemically clean product in the future because of its use in cosmetics. I thank the honourable member for his important question and I will keep him posted of developments in this area.

PRIVILEGE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I rise on a point of privilege. It has been reported in today's *Advertiser* that the Minister of Housing and Construction said words to the effect that the Economic and Finance Committee hearing on the use of consultants by Government departments was 'a nuisance', a 'Spanish inquisition' and 'a media circus'. Will you investigate this matter, Mr Speaker, and rule whether there is a *prima facie* case for breach of privilege?

The SPEAKER: Order! This matter was the subject of two questions earlier today. I now have some knowledge of it. It has also allowed me a little time to look at the standing of such a point of privilege. Erskine May is very clear on this on page 136 as follows:

> A matter alleged to have arisen in committee, but not reported by it, may not generally be brought to the attention of the House on a complaint of a breach of privilege.

Further, section 28 of the Parliamentary Committees Act, which all members have, I am sure, provides—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier is out of Order. Section 28 provides that the privileges, powers and immunities of a standing committee are the same as for any other committee of the House. The alleged breach took place while the Minister was a witness before the Economic and Finance Committee, and it is my view that the matter should be first dealt with by that committee. If the committee is of the opinion that a contempt of it has occurred, it should report that fact to the House for its consideration. As I believe that the honourable member is a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, it may be appropriate for him to take the matter to the committee initially.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I thank the House for the opportunity to participate in this debate. Unfortunately, and sadly, I rise to correct a misleading piece of information and an untruth that the member for Mitcham has been spreading in my electorate about the position I have taken with regard to the change in bus routes that go through my electorate, namely, the combining of routes 171 and 172 into route 170. A constituent contacted me yesterday very concerned because she had been contacted by the member for Mitcham who was endeavouring to explain to her that the route 170 change, which travels along George Street, Maud Street, Duthy Street and Fisher Street, was in fact my idea. Let me set the record straight. It was not my idea but in fact was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir. As a matter of convention in this Chamber, it has not been usual for Ministers to participate in grievance debates in the past.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr LEWIS: On two occasions on consecutive days Ministers have participated in the grievance debate against that convention. I ask that you rule on that point of order or otherwise refer it to the Standing Orders Committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Under the sessional orders adopted by the House it is perfectly in order for Ministers to speak if they wish to speak in the debate. If those orders are to be changed, it is a matter for the House.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am referring to matters related to my electorate and I understand that that complies with the arrangements under Standing Orders. The member for Murray-Mallee is endeavouring to waste the little time that I have to correct the record; he is trying to save the member for Mitcham from whatever embarrassment he will encounter because of the statement he has presented to my constituent.

As I said, my constituent contacted me and was most concerned because information had been conveyed to her by the member for Mitcham that the route change was my idea. Let me make quite clear from the outset that it was not my idea. In fact, the STA presented this as one proposal in a whole package that it presented to the Government. From the outset, I have not been happy with this route proposal. Quite obviously, I would prefer to see a continuation, even if the frequency of the services was reduced after 7 p.m. and on public holidays and Sundays. I have conveyed that position to the Minister on several occasions and also to the General Manager of the STA.

It is quite clear that I have taken a position which is not that which the member for Mitcham has alleged. In fact, he has spread that untruth to several constituents. I regret that he has done so, because I guess the end result will bounce back on him. I communicated to the residents only yesterday that I will take up with the Minister not only their interests but also my concerns. I have already spoken to the Minister about what options we have to alter route 170 up Fisher Street so that the residents of that street are not faced with that route through their street. Indeed, in the communications that I have had in the past—and it is all on the record—my position is quite clear in relation to route 170.

There is a concern about the impact not only on the residents of Fisher Street but on those residents who are using public transport at those times and outside the normal distance recommended by the STA. I have done a very crude exercise in drawing up a map. The distances involved comply with what the STA put forward previously as the maximum distance between people's homes and the bus stop. Notwithstanding that, my preferred option would be to continue routes 171 and 172—one along Fullarton Road and one along Duthy Street—to provide a continuation of the service, understanding that there might have to be a reduction in the frequency of the service.

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Earlier today during a ministerial statement the Minister of Finance responded to the questions I had asked earlier this week about the ASER Property Development project. It is interesting to note from that ministerial response that all the basic facts that I outlined to this House in my questions have been confirmed as correct. The Minister raised one or two other matters, and I would now like to take them up and challenge them.

First, it was stated that this project was returning to SASFIT 20.3 per cent on the funds injected by SASFIT. My first argument against that as a general statement is that they have included in that 20.3 per cent return the very money that the Government has paid into both the Convention Centre and the Riverside building, going through the ASER Property Trust and then back to SASFIT. Therefore, they are claiming a 20.3 per cent return, whereas in fact $40 million of that was paid by the Government, first, into the property trust and then half of that back out to SASFIT. It is like taking some money out of this pocket, saying, 'I have $20 in my hand,' and putting it into another pocket and saying, 'I have just had a $20 return.' The net effect is that the Government has paid at least $20 million of the money now included in that 20.3 per cent return.

My second point is that the method used for putting a value on it to determine that 20.3 per cent is what is called internal rate of return. It works on the basis of what money was put in by SASFIT, what money has come back to SASFIT, and the present value of the property. Therefore, the property valuation is extremely important. The ASER Property Trust has put a value on the whole project at present of $382 million; the Auditor-General has put a value on it of $170 million. One could rightly ask: why the difference? The difference is that they have used cash flow to determine the valuation of part of the ASER Property Trust assets.

That is very significant, because cash flow valuations are unacceptable under AAS24 which is now required for all public companies. I might add that this is a private property trust, so that standard did not have to apply. However, they have not been prepared to use present market valuation of the assets: instead, they have used this cash flow method, calculated by Price Waterhouse. I acknowledge that it is an international accounting firm of some repute, but I would want to see the basis on which that cash flow has been determined.

They have selected the Casino to determine the valuation on a cash flow basis. Of course, the Casino has a very high cash profit and therefore it is put in at a very high valuation. The Riverside building has a very low cash flow and they have used market valuation for that. Therefore, I challenge the Minister of Finance to table the full valuation for this Parliament so that we can examine it in some detail.

The third point was that they said the cost blow-out, which is now acknowledged to be $200 million, was due to the inclusion of the Casino. The present value of the Casino is $45 million to $50 million on their own calculations. That is based on the actual value of the building. Some $45 million to $50 million has been spent on that building. Yet the blow-out was $200 million, so there is still a shortfall of at least $150 million and they have not justified why there was a blow-out in the costs.

The fourth key point is that they have said that the costs of the commercial elements were of no direct interest to Government; it has not sought such information, and, therefore, it has not been aware of it. It is like the State Bank story all over again. The Premier has just spent two weeks out of this place justifying the fact that he did not even worry about a Government guarantee that is now costing this State $2 300 million. They are about to repeat the whole thing again. The final point is that they said the Government has contributed only $26 million.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): There is no doubt in my mind that cigarettes kill people. Smoking is a filthy, disgusting, rotten habit. This year, during the last recess, I received correspondence from Martin Riordan, Manager of Corporate Affairs of WD & HO Wills, in which he complained about the placing of Quit messages and other notices across cigarette packets without any consultation with his company—Australia's oldest manufacturers (or should it be killers?) of tobacco products. In response, I wrote to Mr Riordan on 14 May in the following vein:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated 11 May concerning the Health Ministers' conference held in Sydney concerning tobacco advertising.

In response I wish to advise that I had smoked since the age of 14 years until 1985 and, because of this filthy, disgusting, stinking, rotten habit, I developed bronchitis. My doctors informed me in 1985 and prior to then that my bronchitis had been brought upon by this disgusting habit.

This habit almost brought about my premature retirement. Since I gave away this filthy habit of cigarette smoking my health has improved dramatically; no longer do I get up in the morning with a sulphur taste in my throat; a slimy taste in my mouth; and no longer do I cough up brown coloured phlegm from the products that you sell to the Australian community.

You may not like me being outspoken but it is what I believe to be my truthful response to your products. I can advise you that I will do everything in my power to expose what I believe to be an attack on the health of this nation through people smoking cigarettes and tobacco products.

I can assure you that you will receive no assistance from me as a member of Parliament in relation to your request and, given the opportunity in the next session of the South Australian

Parliament, I will place this upon record as I have done in the past.

I have sent that off, and I make no apologies to those people, who are purveyors of death, in my opinion. I would now like to give some recognition to the Adelaide City Council.

Earlier this year I was approached by a constituent, who, I think it is fair to say, has had more than her share of problems as a single parent. Because of a distressing situation in the family she had to leave home and, to cut a long story short, she received a parking fine, which was disregarded for a number of reasons because of the turmoil in her life. My constituent came to see me when she received a warrant. She was very distressed about the matter and asked whether there was any way in which I could assist her in this matter. Bearing in mind that my constituent is a supporting parent with two young children aged six and two years and that her financial position was such that she was unable to pay this large amount of money, I wrote to the Adelaide City Council and was delighted to receive the following correspondence:

> Thank you for your letter on behalf of your constituent . . . regarding the summons in her name heard by the Adelaide Magistrates Court [on the date mentioned]. I am pleased to advise that, as a result of your representations, the court has been advised that the corporation does not wish to recover the penalties imposed against [the constituent]. Accordingly, in due course, the warrant will be withdrawn.

The letter goes on to say:

> I will leave it to you to advise your constituent at your convenience.

It is signed by Michael Llewellyn-Smith, MA, City Manager. I would like to thank the Adelaide City Council very much for its compassion in this matter. Quite often we criticise councils in this place when we do not receive support or assistance from them, but I believe that I call it straight, and I acknowledge on behalf of my constituent that compassion has been shown by the Adelaide City Council. I believe it shows that councils do have compassion in cases such as the one I have indicated to the House. Again, I thank the council very much for its compassion.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Education and the Minister of Emergency Services certain events which have occurred in my electorate over the past weeks and which are now out of control. Immediate action from both those Minister's departments is required at this time. All members in this House are aware that vandalism and graffiti have been a cause for major concern in all our communities. In monetary terms the costs have been devastating and for the victims of those senseless and savage attacks they have been devastating and tragic.

Fairview Park Primary School in my electorate has in recent months become the focus of a concentrated series of vandalism attacks that have left the whole school community of staff, parents and students reeling from the savagery and mindlessness of such attacks on their school and its property. In the past year the school has been hit by vandals on no fewer than 24 separate occasions, and the damage inflicted on each of those occasions now totals over $9 000.

The school canteen, which is run by the school council and which has already been struggling to survive to offer what is a much needed service to students at that school, has suffered its fourth break-in over seven weeks. To recoup the initial theft costs from insurance cover for canteen funds, the canteen initially had to pay a $50 excess. Because of the continued criminal assault on the canteen, it has meant that the insurance excess has now doubled and the current total of excess insurance payments is equivalent to the meagre profits made by the canteen over a four-year period.

The parents of the students of that school have been forced to fund-raise by baking cakes for sale to pay the $400 upfront cost for replacement of the insurance excess, and I must commend their very fine efforts for rallying round their school. Unfortunately, it appears that even their rallying efforts of fund-raising may not even keep that school canteen open. On 8 August the school community was again thoroughly demoralised when the mindless vandals took to the school with even greater savagery than before. I would like to read into the record the Principal's account of the damage that was done to the school on 8 August, as follows:

> This time the canteen and all administration offices were affected. Computer, copier, telephones, typewriter, cash register, etc., were damaged—some beyond the point of repair. The mess and wanton destruction are hard to comprehend—photographs defaced, sports trophies broken, sports pennants ripped, paintings and works of art destroyed, carpets, furniture, walls defaced, stained and in some cases, broken.

One of the terrifying aspects left for those people to contemplate when they went into the administration building was the fact that the only photographs that survived defacing were the photographs that were taken of previous damage. The canteen door had been smashed. Vandals sprayed sauce all over the canteen, removed food from the freezer and cupboards and dumped it around the school and destroyed kettles, glasses and even spoons. This situation is one that must not be tolerated. Therefore, I call on the Minister of Emergency Services to organise a special task force to deal with these criminal acts of vandalism and to ensure that the perpetrators are caught and brought to account for their actions.

I also call on the Minister of Education to immediately arrange through his department for suitable security measures, including installation of security lighting and detectors, according to the recommendations already presented to the Education Department by the Police Department, Wormald Security and the school watch committee. Anything less from the areas of responsibility in the hands of these Ministers will not be acceptable to our community or to me. Inaction will be seen by our community to be assistance to the criminals who are among us in the community and certainly not as assistance and support to the law-abiding citizens who rally when vandalism on this scale is perpetrated in our community.

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to speak briefly about two important events that have occurred in my electorate this year. The first was the official opening of the Port Adelaide police complex by the Premier on 5 February this year. The move to new premises was very timely and was welcomed by officers of the South Australia Police Force based in Port Adelaide. The South Australia Police Force has a very proud history in Port Adelaide, having been established at the port in 1860 in the old Police Building in Commercial Road, Port Adelaide.

Interestingly, it has often been said that the architecture of the building is somewhat strange for Port Adelaide. I understand that in England in the 1850s two sets of plans were prepared: one for a police station in Port Adelaide and another for a police station in India. I believe that those plans got mixed up and we used the plans for India, so somewhere in India is a police station built to a plan intended for Port Adelaide.

The building is heritage listed and is now empty and requiring some sort of future use. The first South Australian Governor, Captain George Hindmarsh, established the South Australia Police Force on 28 April 1838. This was the first organised Police Force in Australia and one of the oldest in the world. In fact, it was set up about 40 years before many English forces were established and many years before the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Ever since 1838 the ideals and objectives of the South Australian police have remained unchanged and they are 'the preservation of law and order and the prevention and detection of crime'. Over the years the City of Port Adelaide grew, as did the police presence there, and as time went on other premises were needed and leased, but in recent years, because of improved policing methods and new technology, the accommodation became totally inadequate and quite substandard.

Port Adelaide police now employ the most modern policing methods and they have world class technology in the new police complex. The South Australian Police Force has very proud traditions. The department comprises about 3 700 officers and about 600 support staff, totalling about 4 300, which is the highest ratio of police per population in the nation. At this stage I would like to pay tribute to the police, particularly because of their presence in Port Adelaide, where especially these days there are problems, many of which involve Aboriginal people. The police do a marvellous job and go about their work in a very sensitive and efficient way.

The second event that occurred in the area was the official opening of the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court on 28 February by the Attorney-General. The court is connected to the police complex and is thus an efficient and good double unit. As with the police complex, the occupants—magistrates and their staff—were happy to move into the new accommodation. They moved in on 23 December last year. Since 1883 the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court had been accommodated in the old courthouse on Commercial Road, next to the old police station. That building is also heritage listed and in the future a use will have to be found for it. Over the years, that accommodation, like the old police station, became inadequate and additional space had to be leased. Part of the court functions were housed in temporary Demac buildings at the back of the old courthouse.

The new court complex is beautifully designed and appointed. Computer systems are installed which have not only brought us almost into the twenty-first century but are also world class in this area. As I said before, the complex is connected to the new police station, which is of tremendous advantage in terms of convenience, efficiency, security and also economy.

The whole double complex is a credit to its designers and architects and, in fact, fits in wonderfully well with the adjacent buildings in that area of Port Adelaide. It is built on the old Port Dock station area and the buildings in those blocks are almost intact as heritage buildings, with which the new complex fits in well.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Today in a ministerial statement and again in a grievance debate afterwards we have seen examples of the desperation that will characterise members of the Government benches, particularly the current member for Unley. The member for Unley made a ministerial statement about comments I made in a debate with him on 5AA on Sunday and yesterday in the House. He accused me of being a financial illiterate. Indeed, I have informed the House that I can be corrected and can learn from matters which people more senior to me in this place put before me.

However, some of the Minister's remarks were couched in terms that I consider were unbecoming to him both as a Minister and as a member of this House, and the verbiage he used was somewhat extravagant. The Minister said:

> The member made a very firm statement that this amount was recorded in last year's budget papers as an actual expenditure.

What happened at 5AA was that I pointed out to the Minister that in the Estimates of Payments 1991-92, at page 179, there was a line under 'Other Government Buildings' in the Department of Housing and Construction, as follows:

> Department of the Premier and Cabinet: actual expenditure $26 640 000.

I asked him whether that expenditure was for the State Administration Centre. It is under the Department of Housing and Construction and is listed as an expenditure against Premier and Cabinet. In fact, most departments are listed under Housing and Construction. The Minister was not able to give me an answer. If anyone cares to study the transcript, they will find that the Minister gave some answer that suggested that it was not; that it was projected money to be expended. My response to that was that I would be questioning him during the Estimates.

If the Minister is saying that a heading that clearly says 'Actual expenditure' was only money put away against the advent of the State Administration Centre, something is very wrong and we are squirrelling money away. That was the context in which it was said. I accept that the Minister said today that it was expenditure for the Entertainment Centre, but also yesterday, in repeating my questions—and that is clearly what they were, and people

who read *Hansard* can see that—I made no claims. I said that, if it spent $26 million on the State Administration Centre, it means that, by the time the State Administration Centre is finished, it will not have cost $27 million but $53 million.

I went on to say that I hope I am entirely wrong, and I also said that, if it did cost $53 million, it is a scandal—that is quite clear. I do not need to try to win a seat by coming in here and misquoting, misrepresenting and using over-emotive language that does not become this House. If I say something that later turns out to be wrong, I will admit it. I accept unequivocally the Minister's explanation that that expenditure was for the Entertainment Centre, but I do not resile from asking legitimate questions. If the budget papers show me that $26 million is expended, then $26 million is expended.

It was the Minister who was incapable of answering my question, and who caused me to repeat the question yesterday in the House. If the Minister does not understand his own budget lines and if the Minister has not the competence to answer questions from people in this House who are much more junior to him in terms of years in this place, let him resign as Minister and let us get a Minister who can answer questions and who does know what he is talking about. The Minister must really believe the old adage 'How can I soar like an eagle when I'm surrounded by turkeys?' He is on the way to being a dodo, an extinct being, and he cannot hide that fact by suggesting that members of the Opposition are turkeys. I suggest that he get on with his job, that he do it a bit more honestly and competently, and then the State will be better served.

POLICE (POLICE AIDES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Act 1952. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Police Department has employed Aboriginal people as police aides for several years. Initially, several police aides were employed on an experimental basis in Aboriginal traditional areas. Both the Police Department and the Aboriginal communities concerned have been pleased with the overall success of the scheme. Police aides are not recognised as such in the Police Act 1952 or the Police Regulations 1982. As an expediency they have been appointed as special constables under the Police Act, thereby acquiring limited police powers and immunities, and are employed on weekly contracts.

Police aides are now an established feature of policing in this State. Depending on funding, by the end of the 1992-93 financial year, it is proposed that there will be 32 police aides employed in traditional, country and urban locations. The advantages police aides have over white police officers is their acceptance by and ability to liaise more effectively with the Aboriginal community. Furthermore, it is hoped that some Aboriginal people will progress from being police aides to police officers, a desirable way of increasing representation within the police force of Aboriginal people. I believe now is the time to give the scheme formal recognition in the Police Act. This is the wish of the Aboriginal people presently employed.

At present, police aides are not represented industrially by the Police Association because the rules of the Police Association prohibit membership by special constables. The association supports the move to amend the Police Act as it would allow the Association to represent police aides without alteration to its constitution. It is considered desirable to recognise police aides in the Police Act because—

- police aides are respected members of their communities and their existence and special functions should be formally recognised.
- with the ongoing development of the police aide program, the number of police aides is becoming numerically significant.
- it will permit the Police Association of South Australia to represent them industrially.

The proposals will not alter their conditions of employment in the short term (except for bringing them within the Police Superannuation Scheme) but will pave the way for proper industrial representation which may lead to their current and/or improved conditions of employment being incorporated into an award.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 inserts a new Part, Part IIA, into the principal Act. The new Part deals with the appointment, employment and powers of police aides.

New section 20a empowers the Commissioner of Police to appoint police aides by written minute. They can be appointed for the whole of the State or any part of the State specified in the appointment. The area for which an aide is appointed can be varied by the Commissioner. New section 20b requires a police aide to take an oath or affirmation.

New section 20c gives police aides the same powers, responsibilities and immunities as a member of the police force subject to any limitations specified by the Commissioner in the minute of appointment or subsequently imposed (by notice in writing) by the Commissioner. Any limitations can be varied or revoked by the Commissioner. New section 20d empowers the Commissioner (at his or her discretion) to suspend or determine the appointment of a police aide. The Commissioner can remove a police aide from office for misconduct, neglect of duty or inability to perform duty. This power is subject to the requirements in section 19a of the principal Act as to the procedures to be followed in the case of termination for disability or illness.

New section 20e empowers the Commissioner, with the approval of the Minister, to determine the conditions of employment of police aides. A determination must provide for payment in accordance with a specified scale and may be general or specific in its application.

New section 20f provides that, subject to that section and to the regulations, a reference in an Act (including the principal Act) or an instrument (whether of a legislative character or not) to a member of the police force extends to a police aide. However such a reference does not extend to a police aide if it concerns powers or responsibilities that lie beyond any limitations imposed on a police aide under new Part IIA. Those sections of the principal Act that are not applicable to police aides are specified.

Clause 4 amends section 22 of the principal Act by inserting new paragraph *(na)*, which empowers the Governor to make regulations concerning the training of police aides.

Schedule 1 contains a transitional provision. It provides that where a person is, immediately before the commencement of the amending Act, a special constable employed as an Aboriginal police aide, that person is to be taken to have been appointed as a police aide under new Part IIA on the commencement of the amending Act.

Schedule 2 makes a number of consequential amendments to other Acts.

The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 is amended by removing two references, in sections 26 (2) *(ab)* and 27 *(b)* of that Act, to special constables employed as Aboriginal police aides.

The Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985 is amended by altering the definition of 'prescribed officer or employee' in section 3 to ensure that the provisions of that Act that are applicable to special constables are also applicable to police aides. The Police Superannuation Act 1990 is amended by inserting a definition of 'member of the Police Force' in section 4 to make it clear that a police aide is a 'member of the Police Force' for the purposes of that Act.

Mr MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING (DIVIDEND ADJUSTMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 August. Page 158.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition supports this Bill and is very happy to facilitate its passage so that the racing industry can meet its commitments and deadlines to next month. Members will recall that earlier this year another racing Bill came before the House that brought about the amalgamation of the pools between South Australia and Victoria's VICTAB. This debate presupposes a knowledge of the difference between fractions and commissions on the part of members who are following the debate. I will not spend any time trying to explain the difference between the two other than to say that I am sure that plenty of ministerial advisers or others will be prepared to explain them after the debate.

Putting it in its simplest form, as I understand it, when one goes to the races, invests a 50c bet on a win and place and, for example, the final result on the TAB screen shows as less than 50c, the amount is made up so that the punter at least receives his money back, if he happens to be successful. For example, if a person had a 50c bet for a place and the return on the screen after all the investments had been made turned out to be only 46c, obviously that person would have lost even though their horse came second or third.

In South Australia the TAB makes up the dividend to a round 50c, so that the punter does not lose. The punter does not win, either, since he or she has outlaid 50c, but to ensure that the punter does not lose, the amount is made up. That figure is made up from fractions. The same policy applies in Victoria and the amounts are made up so that the punter receives the same dividend as his investment, but in that State the amount is made up out of commissions. The Bill we passed earlier this year allowed South Australia and Victoria both to take commissions, but part of the Bill also provided that, if we link with VICTAB, the same rules must apply to the operation of the computers.

We could not have a system in South Australia where the computer relied on fractions to make up the dividend and in Victoria it relied on commissions to make up the dividend. As I understand it—and the Minister has confirmed this—the Bill is all about bringing in a system identical with that of VICTAB, so that we both work on the same basis and so that the computers are aligned on the same system. There is no other part of the Bill that should cause any concern. The Opposition is keen that the amalgamation of the South Australian and Victoria TAB be a success. We believe that it is in the interests of racing generally that this happens.

I understand that there could be an estimated loss, which I picked up from the second reading explanation, of about $5 000, but I understand that the racing codes are not unhappy with that because the amalgamation with VICTAB will result in a greater gain for South Australia. With those few words, the Opposition is happy to facilitate the passage of this Bill. I trust that it will have a speedy passage through the other place so that in September, when the new system is up and running, this minor hiccup will have been covered and that the rules governing the operation of the computers will have been tidied up so that racing generally will benefit.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I thank the member for Morphett for his comments. It is a pleasure to have someone opposite with an understanding of the racing industry, as that assists in the passage of all these Bills with regard to what is a very important industry. I should like to say that the honourable member's knowledge in this area is probably thanks to the time he spent at Port Pirie. We at Port Pirie have the ability to accommodate very quickly these complex Bills. This Bill is complex in its application, as it relates to the introduction of the pool with VICTAB. It is fundamental to that, so that we have a system that can operate in tandem.

Obviously, at times there will be a situation where the systems will come back on their own merit but, from the point of view of coordination, it is important that it be operating by 4 September so that the national pool can be introduced. We hope—and I am sure that the honourable member joins with me—that New South Wales joins the clan and that we can see a national pool to enable us to spread our tentacles outside Australia in terms of the services we can offer Asia, the Pacific Ring and other countries that may be interested in the type of racing services that we offer. That is of enormous potential from our point of view. In my view, the sooner it happens, the better.

The honourable member has summed it up very adequately. We are addressing this from the point of view of that linkage. We are not quite sure what is happening with the tax issue at this point—I am sure the honourable member appreciates that. There has been a move in New South Wales away from what we thought would be the position to 15 per cent. There appears to have been a change of heart in New South Wales. I hope—and this is unusual (and I will probably get a clout from Treasury)—that they move back and that we can see a common 14 per cent tax throughout Australia. We believe that the turnover will increase. Of course, the return to the investor will increase and we will see more stability and an opportunity for the industry to gain some benefits as well. That is yet to be resolved, but we have to resolve it fairly quickly. Hopefully that will occur and be of benefit to the industry. I am delighted to have the

Opposition's support. I, too, look forward to the quick passage of the Bill.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 19.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill which has been restored to the Notice Paper following the original introduction of a series of amendments in another place. It was one of the unfortunate Bills that got left behind in the hurly-burly of the last session. In fact, all but one aspect of it could have been passed without difficulty had the Minister been prepared to forsake the clause relating to advertising boards on streets, but that was not to be and, as a result of the interval between the last session of Parliament and this one, commonsense has prevailed, discussion has taken place with people involved in the community, and a series of amendments will be put forward in the name of the Government with which the Opposition has no difficulty. We believe that the Local Government Association and other bodies, with the possible exception of the *Advertiser*, will be quite satisfied with these amendments. I will come back to the *Advertiser*'s circumstances in a few minutes.

With the Local Government Act being so large, as issues arise in the community, court cases are held or specific cases come to the attention of a local government community, deficiencies in the Act are found, ambiguities are often identified and, from an abundance of caution, changes take place by way of amendment to offset those deficiencies that are revealed. At least once in every session we have what we might call a grab bag piece of legislation which picks up a number of disparate issues directly associated with local government, and seeks to correct them. Much is the case with this Bill. However, this Bill picks up an issue relative to the making of by-laws and regulations which will enhance the value of those powers in the hands of local government. Personally I am completely in accord with that issue because it gave the Government an opportunity to make arrangements with me that a Bill that I had before the House in the last session, taking issue with the slaughtering of large animals in township areas, can now be accommodated in the new by-law making process of the measure before us.

I was not personally concerned as to whether it was my Bill or that of another member that went forward. What I was concerned about was that the deficiency that currently exists in relation to the slaughtering of animals in township areas was corrected. I was more than happy to accommodate the Minister's suggestion that my Bill be stood aside, or left on the sidelines, whilst the requirements were taken up in the way that this Bill approaches the matter. We have a number of issues in relation to council liability insurance, rating, controlling authorities and the relationship between those controlling authorities, movable business signs to which I referred a moment ago, parking, the control of cats and septic tank effluent disposal. We have been able to accommodate a number of requests of individual local governing bodies and regional local governing bodies from discussions that have arisen out of the implementation committee between the Local Government Association and the Government in this bag of amendments.

I indicated that I would say a little more relative to the circumstances of business signs and the views put forward by the *Advertiser*. This was a measure addressed by way of letter to my colleague the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in another place. With respect to clause 15 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment Bill 1991, the letter from the *Advertiser* refers to clause 15 as it presently stands. I say 'presently stands' because that is the way the Bill has been delivered to us by way of message from another place. The Minister has made available the amendments, with which the Opposition has no difficulty. They will change the circumstances, but the *Advertiser* letter suggests it will not be entirely to its satisfaction. The Opposition is not opposed to the method of approach undertaken by the Government after that overall consultation. The letter from the *Advertiser* states:

> 1. For the reasons set out in my correspondence to the Hon. Jamie Irwin late last year, I am pleased to note that the proposed licensing system for signs has been abandoned.

That is not correct. The proposed system has been abandoned as a licence, *per se*, but the general purport of the original intent is not changed. The letter continues:

> 2. The original Bill centred around a prohibition and offence, namely to place a movable sign on a street, road or footpath. Exceptions (in particular licensing) could then apply to that prohibition. The new section 370 embodies a different and much more palatable philosophy. The implication from sections 370 (2) and 370 (3) is that the use of movable signs is a legitimate exercise, provided they do not endanger the safety of the public and do not contravene the conditions (if any) stipulated in by-laws of the relevant local council.
>
> 3. I am pleased to note that the Bill makes provision for the stipulation of standards and conditions for the use of moveable signs, a matter which was also addressed in my earlier correspondence.
>
> Concerns and Reservations. Although, in general, the new Bill is a vast improvement on its predecessor, I still have some serious reservations about its content and effect. Some of these reservations applied equally to the Bill in its original form and were addressed in my earlier correspondence. Those concerns include the following:
>
> 1. Under section 370 (2) each local council has the ability to pass by-laws to regulate the placement of signs, the standards to apply to them and the conditions to apply to their use.
>
> There is no doubt that this will lead to different councils adopting different by-laws. Consequently, business proprietors in one location will find themselves being treated quite differently to those in others, depending on the particular council's policy on whether moveable signs are desirable in their locality. There is already clear evidence that councils have vastly differing attitudes towards the desirability of moveable signs and these attitudes will continue to prevail under the new by-law provisions in the Bill.

That thought is not new: it is one that has applied not only to the Local Government Act but to local governments' attitude to the Planning Act. There has been a frequent cry from developers, real estate persons, builders and others about the disparity between councils'

interpretations of clauses of various Bills. However, after some discussion with the Local Government Association, and hearing of its intention to ensure that a reasonable education process that will overcome some of these anomalies is put into place in respect of local government, we believe that the fear that is expressed by the writer on behalf of the *Advertiser* is one that can adequately be controlled.

I also draw attention to the fact that the by-laws will come before the Parliament and are subject to disallowance. Any council that sought to go overboard or to put too much unnecessary pressure on any section of the community would immediately draw the attention of this House. The Opposition believes that is an adequate protection for the doubts that have been expressed. The writer goes on to state:

> If there are to be standards and conditions then, in the interests of uniformity and consistency, these should be set out in the regulations to the Local Government Act. This would mean that business proprietors situated within different local council areas would be treated equally. It would also provide uniformity for those proprietors who conduct the same type of business from outlets situated within a number of local council areas.

I believe that that will be addressed by the by-law system and by the education process that I mentioned a short time ago. The writer goes on:

> A council could easily impose standards of such a nature in relation to moveable signs that their effect would be to prevent people from using the signs, for example, by requiring expensive materials, or points, to be used in their production. A council could also impose conditions on the use of moveable signs in such a manner that they effectively prohibit the use of such signs. For example, a council's by-laws could contain a conditions that signs are only to be placed on footpaths between very limited hours, for example, 6 a.m. to 8 a.m.

We would have no argument with that being an impediment upon natural trading if it were to be undertaken. However, in all conscience, we cannot believe that local government and individual councils will be so pernickety as has been suggested by the writer. Whilst they have correctly brought to our attention the fears that they might have, we correctly, I believe, have adjudged that those fears are more of a fairyland nature rather than of the real world. We therefore go along with the proposition that what is offered is adequate. The writer also states:

> As different councils will undoubtedly adopt different by-laws, business proprietors' advertising and marketing abilities will differ depending upon which local council area they are situated within. The Bill is therefore anti-competitive in that it does not create an even playing field.

Again, one can stretch all sorts of points from that. We are not overly impressed by the argument. The writer goes on to say:

> The amendments reintroduce a definition of 'moveable business sign'. This is for the purpose of a new prohibition set out in the proposed sections 370 (2) *(b)* and 370 (2a). I most strongly object to the inclusion of the proposed new section 370 (2) *(b)* as this will clearly enable any local council to effectively ban the use of moveable signs.

That is rather in contrast to the argument put forward by the same writer on the first page of this three page letter; he initially said that new section 37 embodies a different and much more palatable philosophy. One would take from that that there was a certain regard for the action that was to be taken; yet, we suddenly find the other comment about its being quite improper.

Having drawn attention to those points that have been made in the *Advertiser*—and only in the *Advertiser*—I indicate the philosophy of the Liberal Party that commonsense would and will prevail in local government, otherwise we have the opportunity to take action of our own motion in this House to correct any stupidity that might arise. I am not laying stupidity at the door of local government wantonly: I am simply indicating that, if a set of circumstances arose where one or two councils started to play up, so to speak, the Parliament has within its rights the opportunity to take the necessary action to correct the position. We would undoubtedly do that.

It is part of tradition that newspaper hoardings relating to publications are placed alongside shops or adjacent to a selling point. That is not to say that the material sometimes displayed is necessarily acceptable to the public at large. In more recent times we have seen an expected response from members of Parliament to their community in respect of pornographic-type material that has been exhibited on some of those boards. That apart, the use of those signs outside shops selling newspapers, periodicals and the like will and is expected to continue.

A particular matter has been taken up on behalf of the Real Estate Institute, and I refer to the use of signs alongside the road to advertise the open inspection of a house, which occurs on an occasional basis for one or two hours. We are assured that there is no problem with those types of signs being placed, as long as they are not in the middle of the footpath. A question was asked about garage sales, in relation to which signs are placed on stobie poles and the like. The signs are home-made, cardboard and filled out in biro. We would expect—and indeed local government has confirmed—that those types of signs, which are occasional, will continue to be considered as periodic and no action will be taken.

For all these reasons and knowing full well the degree of debate that has taken place in the interval since the last session to this, I indicate on behalf of the Opposition that we have no real concerns about the proposals that are before us. In respect of the other issues, whether rating, council liability insurance, controlling authorities, parking and septic tank effluent disposal, the Opposition gives its support.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I support this Bill. As its name suggests, a number of miscellaneous provisions in the Bill represent a tidying up of the Local Government Act. The only matter to which I wish to refer is clause 18 *(b)* which enables councils to make by-laws to limit the number of cats kept on any premises. I fully support that proposal. I remember a constituent coming to me about his neighbour who had at least 15 cats. I say 'at least' because this neighbour had so many cats it was impossible to count them. The cats were breeding out of control and wandering all over the suburb. Of course, the council was somewhat restricted in its ability to deal with that problem. This amendment will enable the council to deal with it.

Of course, there are more general problems concerning stray and feral cats. I know that the Minister with responsibility for animal welfare recently released a discussion paper which canvassed many of the issues. However, I believe that the limited measure under clause 18 *(b)* is a good start towards addressing the problems of stray cats in our suburbs. I warmly welcome this measure.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My contribution will be brief. I am pleased that the issue of moveable signs is closer to resolution. I acknowledge that it is likely to be still somewhat of a grey area and will ultimately be tested in the courts. As my colleague the member for Light indicated, if some councils go overboard it might have to be dealt with in this place. I welcome the amendment which addresses some of the concerns raised by real estate operators. I have been contacted by several in my electorate who are concerned about the original proposal, so I welcome the amendments in this Bill.

I should like to highlight a couple of points and flag my concerns, which I will pursue in Committee. The first relates to the use of political signs, which come into two categories. First, there are those used during election campaigns. I am aware that some councils have varying policies and there is no consistency throughout the metropolitan area. This issue needs to be considered so that we may have a consistent approach throughout the State, not just in the metropolitan area. I will pursue that matter further.

The second point relates to moveable signs which are used by members of Parliament. I have two such signs, but I have not yet used them. I wish to resolve the issue of liability. Recently, I wrote to the Minister of Housing and Construction, as follows:

> I write to ask if sandwich boards which advertise my office . . . are covered by the Government in the event of a public liability claim or any other insurance claim. The sandwich boards are 120 cm high and made of metal.

The Minister replied last week:

> I have been advised that if an accident did occur as a result of the sandwich board, the Government would be liable. I request that you remove it from the footpath as soon as possible.

I have again written to the Minister:

> As an MP I spend time in local shopping centres with a sandwich board nearby which states 'Bob Such MP—Shop 3, Hub Shopping Centre, Phone 270 5112. Can I help you?' and I believe that it is appropriate for me to operate in that way.
>
> Accordingly, I seek clarification and advice that that is within the ambit of electorate work and therefore covered by the Government in regard to public liability in the event of a claim.
>
> I would also find it useful to use the sandwich board within the Hub Shopping Centre (as other businesses do), given that my office is tucked away and not readily visible to pedestrian traffic in the centre.

That was written only recently and I await the Minister's reply. I do not seek any special treatment for myself or for other members of Parliament but I believe that, like other people operating in shopping centres, we should have the opportunity to use those sandwich boards. I look forward to the Minister's clarification on the question of public liability so that we can do so.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I should like briefly to acknowledge the contribution of the member for Light. He very clearly highlighted the amendments made in the Upper House. I shall be moving some amendments on which I understand the Opposition has had a briefing and which it will be supporting. I also acknowledge the support of the members for Mitchell and for Fisher. I think the comments made by the member for Mitchell will be welcomed by all local councils.

With respect to the contribution made by the member for Fisher, I believe that the amendment that I shall be moving represents a sensible compromise. It is the outcome of the debate in the Upper House. I think that it has given an opportunity to all parties to sit down and work out something they can live with. I think that the question of public liability or the liability of the Government for members' individual signs is a little outside the thrust of this Bill. The Bill is not really about that matter. However, I understand that the honourable member might have wanted to get it on the public record. I am sure he will take it up with the appropriate Minister. I thank the three members for their contributions. I am sure that the House will support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

New clauses 3a and 3b.

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

Page 1, after line 17—insert new clauses as follows:

Local Government Superannuation Scheme

3a. Section 73 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (6) the definitions of 'officer' or 'employee'.

Date of elections

3b. Section 94 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsections (1b) and (1c).

New clauses inserted.

Clause 4 passed.

New clause 4a—'Rateability of land.'

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

Page 1, after line 26—Insert new clause as follows:

4a. Section 168 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (2) *(l)* 'or any controlling authority';

and

(2a) A council must not make a by-law under subsection (2) *(b)* unless it is satisfied—

(a) that the prohibition is reasonably necessary to protect public safety;

or

(b) that the prohibition is reasonably necessary to protect or enhance the amenity of a particular locality.

(2b) A by-law under subsection (2) *(b)* cannot operate in relation to—

(a) a sign designed to direct people to the open inspection of any land or building that is available for purchase or lease;

or

(b) a sign of a prescribed class.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am more than happy to support the new clause. It takes away an element of ambiguity and perhaps makes a little more certain the end result in the practice of local government. It has support outside as well as within this place.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 5 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Moveable business signs.'

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

Page 5, lines 30 to 35—Leave out subsection (2) and substitute new subsections as follows:

(2) A council may, by by-law—

(a) provide that any moveable sign (or moveable sign of a specified class) placed on a specified public street, road or footpath within its area, on a public street, road or footpath within a specified part of its area, or on a public street, road or footpath within its area generally, must—

(i) be placed in a manner, and subject to conditions, specified by the by-law;

and

(ii) comply with such standards (if any) as are specified by the by-law;

(b) prohibit the placing of moveable signs (or moveable signs of a specified class) on a specified public street, road or footpath within its area, or on a public street, road or footpath within a specified part of its area.

(2a) A council must not make a by-law under subsection (2) *(b)* unless it is satisfied—

(a) that the prohibition is reasonably necessary to protect public safety;

or

(b) that the prohibition is reasonably necessary to protect or enhance the amenity of a particular locality.

(2b) A by-law under subsection (2) *(b)* cannot operate in relation to—

(a) a sign designed to direct people to the open inspection of any land or building that is available for purchase or lease;

or

(b) a sign of a prescribed class.

This clause has been canvassed in second reading speeches by the members for Light and for Fisher. As I said in my summing up, it is a sensible and sensitive compromise to the issue of moveable signs. I think that every member would agree that in these fairly tough economic times it is important for businesses to be able to advertise their services through the use of moveable signs. However, there is also a responsibility on the community to ensure that particularly the elderly, the infirm and people with young children have access to and use of footpaths in a safe way.

I draw members' attention to new subsection (2a), which provides that a council must not make one of these by-laws to prohibit moveable signs unless it is satisfied that the prohibition is reasonable, and is reasonably necessary to protect public safety. I think that is probably the overriding concern. It is also important that the council have some ability to discriminate or ascertain whether it will totally detract from the amenity of a particular locality. New subsection (2b) goes further to state that the by-law cannot operate in relation to a sign designed to direct people to the open inspection of any land or building that is available for purchase or lease. I take the member for Fisher's point that that is one of his concerns. It has been very clearly spelt out that real estate agents' open inspection signs for real estate will be totally exempt from this Act. The new section, which provides for a sign of a prescribed class, refers to newspaper hoardings—the sort of signs newsagents use every day in their business. Again the member for Light referred to that, and it is certainly covered.

The last point I want to make is that, although there was a concern that some councils might have a small rush of blood to the head and race out and prohibit all signs, this clause clearly does not give them that power. I remind all members that these regulations or by-laws will come before the Parliament, and there will be a four month period in which the community will certainly have an opportunity to voice any concerns it may have about the prohibition of any moveable sign under the Act. Ultimately, the Parliament will have the power either to support the council or to make its own decision on the matter. So, we do have some safeguards built in.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Very briefly, I accept the explanation that has been given, and again, without issuing a threat to local government, *per se*, I make the point that this section really puts it on notice to approach this whole matter in a sensible and practical manner. The provision is there for the committees of the House to look at the measure. It is certainly not outside the scope of the Parliament at a later stage and of its own motion to make quite clear what was the expressed intent in this place and, having had discussions with the Local Government Association's senior executive on this matter within the past fortnight, I believe that they are of the view that commonsense by individual councils will prevail.

Mr SUCH: Was the matter of political advertising considered in the discussions with the Local Government Association which led to this improvement, and does the Minister foresee any difficulty in terms of consistency and a reasonable approach to political advertising during the lead-up to election campaigns?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will address myself to the member for Light first. I totally agree with him; I think this really does give clear signals to local government authorities that they now have this power to prohibit, but it must be used wisely and sensitively and it must not be used in any kind of draconian fashion. I totally agree with the honourable member's comments and thank him for them.

With respect to the question from the member for Fisher, as members know, this is not my primary area of responsibility in terms of my portfolio, so I am not aware of any direct discussion with the LGA or any addressing of the issues of political advertising. Given that most of us in the political arena use signs that are not generally moveable on the footpath, but are generally attached to such things as Stobie poles, fences or whatever, and that there are a number of rules under which we must operate, such as getting permission from public authorities to put signs up on fences of publicly owned areas, I would have thought that, really, councils treated political signs in the same way as they would treat other signs.

In fact, if the sign is not causing any kind of danger to the public—in other words, it is not placed where people cannot get past or where they may well be in danger of harming themselves (and, given that it is not destroying the amenity—in other words, the sign is not so enormous or of such poor taste that it would be destroying the amenity), I think that the placement of the signs would follow that principle, particularly in the case of the member for Fisher. I acknowledge that some direction

needs to be given because of the main pathway to his office. I know where the honourable member's office is and I have visited his office, so I am aware of the issue and the problem relating to him.

I should have thought that, under this clause, councils would need to adopt a commonsense approach. I would not see a problem because, as I read this clause, the sign that the member for Fisher is talking about (his own sign) would be quite legal within the framework of the clause. Certainly, knowing the member for Fisher to be a perfectly reasonable and responsible person, I know he would not be sitting the sign in the middle of a footpath in such a way as to cause danger or harm to anyone. As he has read out what is on the signs, I do not believe for a moment that it would be causing offence to anyone.

Certainly, it should not be detracting from the amenity; after all, it is advertising a service. It is part of the democracy in which we live. So, as far as the Government is concerned in terms of this clause, I certainly do not see any problem. Again, if at a future date a council wanted to be very difficult with another member in terms of the advertising of the political service that was being offered, I believe that the Parliament would have the ultimate say in the matter, as I have said in my brief description of the clause.

Mr MEIER: The Minister has certainly covered most of the signs that come to mind. I wonder, however, whether she is aware of the attitudes of councils or local governments in the discussions with regard to garage sale signs. I have some concern in view of clause 15 (2) *(a)*, which provides that a council may impose conditions on the use of signs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: A colleague of mine is saying that that has been amended, but I do not have a copy of the amendment in front of me: can the Minister give an assurance that councils would not get to the stage where they might specify that the sign be of a professional nature, that it be of a certain size limit, or that the writing cannot be a professional freehand style?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I refer the honourable member to new subsection (2) *(a)*, which provides that the council may direct that any moveable sign placed on a specific public street, road or footpath within its area, on a public street, road or footpath within a specified part of its area, etc., must be placed in a manner and subject to conditions specified by the by-law and also comply with such standards as are specified by the by-law, which it then goes on to state. This actually says that one cannot go around putting a 10 metre sign in a way that would obstruct traffic, for example. The whole intent of this and the discussions with local government have revolved around having a reasonable and commonsense approach. Because members in another place were concerned that that may not eventuate, we worked through and had an agreement with local government on those amendments, as the member for Light has said.

I refer the honourable member to new subsection (2a), whereby a council cannot make a by-law under this section unless it is satisfied 'that the prohibition is reasonably necessary to protect public safety' in terms of a garage sign. The same principle would apply as applies to a sign advertising a business or something else, for example, a sign showing where people might need to go for a fun run or another kind of purpose. It also says that they can only prohibit if it is 'reasonably necessary to protect or enhance the amenity of a particular locality'.

Most of these signs are up only on the day of the garage sale. I had a garage sale and my children put up two signs that they made themselves. It was a big family occurrence where everyone was involved. Unless someone is doing something like breaking the law by having a garage sale every day where they want to act as a trader, and that is picked up under other legislation, I do not believe that councils will try to act under this provision in respect of most garage sales. I do not think they have the power to say, 'You cannot put up a garage sale sign.' I do not believe that that will happen, provided people are sensible and not putting up huge signs that are an eyesore or a danger to the public. They are the only two conditions councils can invoke under this provision.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (16 to 22) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Debate resumed (on motion).

(Continued from page 290.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Foundation South Australia, in my opinion, has a case to answer to this Parliament in respect of two consultancies in the past 12 months or so, one for $36 000 and one for $63 000 in 1989-90, and that now amounts to $99 000. I would like to know the details of those consultancies and I cannot understand why the Deputy Premier has not answered this question. I am more concerned about the huge disparity in the interest earned by Foundation South Australia over the two years ending 30 June 1990 and 30 June 1991.

In one period the foundation had an income of about $6 million and earned $246 000 interest, and in another period it earned $5.852 million in income, yet the interest was $521 000. That does not appear to me to be an over generous rate of interest and I would like to know when Foundation South Australia receives its money from the Government, because there were accumulated surpluses in 1990 of $2.6 million and in 1991 of $1.5 million.

It is interesting to note that one of the members of the board of Foundation South Australia had consultancies with the Department of Housing and Construction over a four-year period amounting to $195 930, and the breakdown is as follows:

1988-89—$27 500
1989-90—$38 213
1990-91—$46 007
1991-92—$84 210

Someone has done extremely well in working for the Government and serving on that board. The other issue I wish to raise relates to the lowering of moral standards in our community, particularly in our suburbs. In all the time I have been in Parliament I have complained about massage parlours and brothels in residential areas, and

only a few weeks ago I received a telephone call from a friend who lives in a beautiful street in the western suburbs. He said, 'Can you give us a hand? We've had this. People have moved into the house across the road and we suspect they're running a brothel. Once upon a time it was a quiet residential street, but now there are several cars parked in the street every day and night. People knock on the wrong door and the women in the area are becoming annoyed and are quite frightened by the activities and actions of some of the people visiting the street.'

He said on one occasion a car pulled up in front of his house when he was at home not feeling well and on sick leave. Again, the street was full of cars and a car pulled up in front of his house. He saw someone go into the premises that he suspected were a brothel. Some time later the person came back and went to the boot of his car, took some things out and sat in the car. My friend was wondering what was going on and went down to the letterbox to see. The person in the car was masturbating. He mentioned that to other neighbours and was told it was not an uncommon occurrence.

If this is the behaviour of some people in this city, particularly in our suburban areas, I wonder what is happening in terms of law and order and this type of behaviour in our community. However, I was particularly pleased to read in the *Advertiser* on 17 June the front page headline 'Police net 172 in city vice crackdown'. The article, by police reporter Nigel Hunt, states:

> A record number of people have been arrested for vice-related offences in a crack-down on prostitution in Adelaide. Senior police have revealed that an ongoing operation—codenamed Patriot—has resulted in 172 people being arrested and charged with 198 vice-related offences this financial year.

I complained to the local council and the officer said, 'We don't like having to handle these problems.' I said, 'I've contacted Darlington police because I want something done about it and I want you to do something about it as soon as possible.' Therefore, I was pleased when this article came out because the location of the brothel is mentioned in the map printed in the paper, although I will not mention the locality here. It means that the Darlington police did take action and I believe that the council took action as well.

The person who contacted me has said there has been little activity in the street of late, but that does not mean that it is the end of the story at all, because this is the normal practice: everything goes quiet for a while and little by little it starts up again. It is disappointing and disturbing, as my friend pointed out, to look at a certain *Advertiser* column to see advertisements for call girls, prostitutes and massage parlours, etc.

So, what is going on is openly advertised in our major newspaper. What concerns me is some of the allegations in this article concerning young people being involved in brothels; that some of these prostitutes have come from Sydney; and the type of people who are involved. The police allege that there are 33 brothels and up to 60 escort agencies throughout the metropolitan area, with 200 prostitutes working in brothels and another 400 in agencies. We want these brothels out of the metropolitan area, out of residential streets. We want them out of the streets in my electorate and, if they must continue, if there is a need for this profession within our community, they ought to be located in a commercial area.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise very reluctantly to raise a very serious matter with this House, that is, the problems at Clare High School. I do not think it is the best course of action for any honourable member to stand in his or her place and talk on issues like this, but I feel that I have no choice. I appreciated the time I spent with the Minister on this issue, but the problem is continuing. I asked a question during Question Time. I have exhausted all avenues open to me to see justice done, but to no avail. I now lay it all before the House. There have been problems relating to staff divisions at Clare High School for the past four years. I was elected in July 1990 and first contacted by an anxious parent in September of that year. I made inquiries and soon learnt about the complexity and seriousness of the problems. I approached the District Superintendent, Mr Budarick, and asked whether he could assist. He said that he would take the matter up with his superior, and I am confident that he did. Nothing was done and no action was taken.

The situation deteriorated, and I was being flooded with mail from concerned constituents, mainly parents. Most of the parents had sons at the school. There were serious accusations and allegations about vindictive behaviour towards students, especially in the schoolyard, including allegations of brutality by students, lack of staff supervision, etc. This continued, and the underlying problem was a serious division in staff. It was alleged that the then principal played favourites with staff and had a group of close associates. I also had representations from past staff members who had left Clare High School against their will. Nothing was happening.

It was last August when I first discussed this with the Minister of Education. I also met with Mr Budarick again and letters were exchanged. The Minister was very sympathetic, but again nothing happened. Letters from parents kept coming in, and one student withdrew from the school and took up a correspondence course at home in Clare, yet still no questions were asked. It was a disgrace. The situation was serious, and I arranged a meeting with the Minister, Mr Budarick and me on location in Eudunda on 5 April this year.

I told the Minister about the near revolt situation, and Mr Budarick confirmed that serious problems existed. I also highlighted to the Minister that the chain of command was all blocked up, and advised him to initiate action from the top level. Nothing happened. Alarmed at the rapidly rising discontent, I again met with the Minister and told him of the pending school council meeting that was likely to initiate some direct action. The Minister asked me to urge restraint, which I did. However, three days later (on 28 May) the school council met and passed a motion of no confidence in the principal, Ms Barbara Carver, who chose to leave the school immediately.

An acting principal, Ms Sandra Windsor, was put in her place, and an inquiry was set up. Things began to quieten down and the wounds began to heal. It was, indeed, the calm before the storm. The inquiry recommendations were released and the school returned

to a worse situation than before. A feeling of disbelief was everywhere. How could anyone get it so wrong? First, the school council was admonished for acting in haste and for taking short cuts to the usual practice, and I found that most ridiculous considering the history that I have just related. Secondly, Mr Budarick was rebuked for talking out of turn. He was a victim of both sides. Thirdly, and most importantly, a male year 12 teacher was removed from the school and replaced by a junior teacher who lasted only two days. The school has been in uproar since. I wish to point out that I have not been to the school since Ms Carver left but I have been flooded with letters and calls from constituents frustrated with a situation that is totally out of control.

I had a meeting with Mr Budarick and discussions with the school council Chairman, Mr Kym Bache. I have also had private appointments with some teachers. I do not hold Ms Windsor responsible; in fact, it is generally agreed that she is doing a good job in the face of great adversity. Some 30 parents had a meeting and voted unanimously that further action was warranted. The school prefects also had a meeting. Apparently, the students were in a rebellious mood, and the relief teacher had been the victim of this. The teacher's removal is seen by the school community as a tit for tat situation for the inquiry's findings. The previous principal is now perceived to be absolved of blame. I have been contacted voluntarily by parents from Ms Carver's previous schools at Kadina, Woomera and Port Pirie, and they were aware of this 'style of management' and share the school council's concerns. Apparently, the staff is divided 18 to six, the six being close associates of the past principal.

I was quite disturbed to learn that Ms Madeleine Hedges of Eastern Area Office was appointed to head up the inquiry, as I know that she was a well-known associate of the former principal. She was her direct line manager, and I am told that they have previously worked together at Eastern Area Office. Ms Hedges interviewed me and I was given the impression that there would be no raking over of the past and that we must look ahead. Parents were told the same thing. However, the report did rake over the past and did not look to the future. The past now has to be fully investigated to see who and where the victims are and how and why all this happened.

Some parents have removed their children, all boys, from the school, and no questions were asked. I know for a fact that letters were written in mid-1990 about, the gravity of the problem at Clare High School. Why was a completely neutral person not appointed, someone impartial from outside the school, to head up the inquiry? I share the concern of the Clare community that the school council was rebuked when taking last resort action.

Was the teacher, who was removed, disciplined over this or any other issue, and why was that teacher removed now, 12 weeks before the year 12 final examinations? This is possibly the biggest mistake. Since he was removed, he has not gone to Balaklava as was decided, but has remained in Clare on stress leave, so his reinstatement at Clare High School would not upset staffing at Balaklava. I am of the opinion that the inquiry was a complete whitewash and all but completely ignored the real problem. Words such as 'inside job' and 'female mafia', terms that I would never use, are being bandied about by frustrated school councillors, students, parents and the general community.

The department has no choice but to implement a full ministerial inquiry or, at least, a high level inquiry into the whole affair, to give everyone the opportunity to have their say in full without interference or intimidation. I am told that teachers at the school are presently gagged. In the meantime, the teacher ought to be reinstated at the school, at least until the end of the year. The Minister is aware that I have tried to solve this problem through the correct channels. I am frustrated by this whole issue, which has been going on for the whole of my 2½ year political career.

The questions that need to be asked are: why did the department not act on the Clare High School problems before this? Why was the key year 12 teacher removed now? Why was he removed from the school, if not for disciplinary reasons, at such a critical time for year 12 students? Why was an obviously unsuitable replacement chosen for that teacher, who resigned after two days?

Is the department satisfied with the year 12 results at Clare High School in 1991 and previous years? Why was Ms Madeleine Hedges chosen to head the inquiry, as she was known to be a close associate of the previous principal? Why were parents who went to the inquiry told that there would be no muckraking and to look forward, when the results of the inquiry were all backward looking? Will the department implement urgent damage control measures, that is, engage a counsellor to be situated at the Clare High School to work with staff, many of whom have been traumatised by the whole deplorable situation? Will it offer counselling to all present staff and staff who have left Clare High School in the past four years, and allow all teachers access to their files and, if requested, grant them the right to appeal decisions if they feel they are being dealt an injustice? The burning question still remains: why did the department not act before all this? It would have saved so much hurt and public embarrassment. The students of Clare High School are the victims, and this whole situation has to be resolved urgently.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am of the opinion that, now the State's only newspaper has abrogated its duty as a journal of record, it behoves us as the people's House to take up that responsibility to ensure, as it were, that we become a repository of how things really are. I refer yet again to the story in the *Advertiser* of Friday 14 August. I will remind the House of that infamous headline which read 'Bank's secret dossiers' with a subheading 'Personal files kept on MPs, judges and police.'

Since the Ombudsman's Report and the relevant publicity on the matter, perhaps it is time to look at the incident afresh and place on the public record the whole sorry saga so that at least history will be well equipped to judge the guilty and the innocent in this whole affair. I have said always in the past that I accept political bias. My Party has never been a favourite of the *Advertiser*. It has never been a favourite of the media generally—there

tends to be an inbuilt preference to the more conservative Parties. That applies not only here in Australia but in Europe, the UK and the United States. If I accept political bias, it is also quite proper for me to accept and demand fair reporting, because the two go together. The old *Advertiser* used to have that political bias, which I accept, but it also had fair reporting.

Let us look back at what has happened. Mr Rex Jory's role is irrelevant. It is irrelevant where the State Bank obtained that information. In effect, Mr Jory was just a minor player. Joan Hall's involvement is also irrelevant. Again, she is a minor player in the whole scheme of things. But let us refer to the headline which states that not only was a file kept on you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker and the member for Victoria but also judges, police, senior public servants and influential people.

The article states that the files related to individuals' financial affairs, assets, friends, beliefs and personal habits, and whether they would be a threat to the State Bank's operation. Obviously all the *Advertiser* had in that regard were those three files on you, Sir, the Speaker and the member for Victoria. Each of you made a comment concerning that matter. You said that you thought there was nothing illegal but that it was immature and a sorry aspect of what the *Advertiser* was all about. The *Advertiser* had nothing else but those three files. It had nothing at all on judges, police, public servants or influential people, but it still ran the story.

When one looks at the Ombudsman's Report, in which Mr Biganovsky provided information to the Speaker and the President, the questionnaire from David Hellaby went to the State Bank on 13 August—one day before. A whole series of questions was put to the State Bank. I will not read all of them, but they questioned how the bank justified obtaining confidential information from Government departments on people who were not clients of the bank or its subsidiaries; and whether the bank would surrender its files to the individuals concerned and apologise to them for the invasion of privacy. That is strange, coming from the *Advertiser*, referring to invasion of privacy. A series of questions went to the State Bank on Thursday 13 August. There was no time for the bank to be able to give that information to the *Advertiser*, even if it had it. In fact, Sir, if you recall from the Ombudsman's Report, it took approximately seven hours for the bank to locate the files that it had on you, but that did not stop the *Advertiser*.

The story appeared on the following day. In fact, it stated that the State Bank was doing that, not that the *Advertiser* had asked questions of the State Bank. It had made up the questions and decided that, because it had asked the questions, the State Bank was actually doing such things. Both you and I have read the report, Sir—and even the member for Coles has read the report—but there was no attempt by the *Advertiser* in effect to wait for the State Bank to come up with that information. The *Advertiser* posed a question and that was its justification. It asked a question and, therefore, assumed that the State Bank was guilty. Of course, that falls right into its current practice, because it is hell-bent on keeping anti-State Bank stories right at the forefront of its news. Anti-State Bank stories are anti-Bannon Government stories. It works on the simple logic that, if the two go together, the end result will be what Mr Peter Wylie wants to achieve, that is, for the Government to fall at the next election and the Opposition to take over the Treasury benches.

Mr Ferguson: Guilt by association.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, it is guilt by association. The reason I have raised this yet again is that it is the first time that we have been able to prove conclusively that the *Advertiser* has lied to the public of South Australia.

Mr McKee: What, again?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Gilles asks, 'Again?' We have all suspected that the *Advertiser*, time and again, has lied, distorted the truth, and has done anything it can to put out a story which it feels will achieve something to ensure that we on this side of the House will lose the next election. However, this is the first time that we have been able to catch it out conclusively. To its credit, the Liberal Party has played no part in this whatsoever, and I congratulate its members on that. They have not seized on the issue to make political mileage. In fact, some members of the Liberal Party have been quite happy that we have been able to highlight this problem with the *Advertiser* because, as I have said previously to its members, maybe in the short term the *Advertiser* is working for you, but there is an old proverb: if you catch a tiger by the tail, one day you might want to get off, and you cannot! The member for Coles seems to find this amazing. If she finds this amazing she honestly believes in fairies!

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Coles is not contesting the next election. She will be able to write to the *Advertiser* as I will. I place on the record that the *Advertiser* lied, it practised deceit on this issue and it deserves to be condemned. I am raising this matter not only to condemn the *Advertiser* but also to put it on the public record so that at least the readers of *Hansard* know exactly what the *Advertiser* is on about.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In the Address in Reply debate I raised the issue of the deplorable condition of the Wilpena Station buildings and the fact that they have been allowed to fall into such a sorry state of disrepair that their future is threatened. I am very pleased that the Minister responsible for the National Parks and Wildlife Service is on the bench and can hear directly what I have to say about this situation. I propose to use references from relevant Government documents to demonstrate the importance of those buildings, their history and the undertakings given by the Government and agreed to by the developer in respect of those buildings. I will demonstrate that those undertakings have not been adhered to.

The following statement is made on page 49 at paragraph 151 of the proposed Wilpena Station Resort, Flinders Ranges National Park draft amendment to the Flinders Ranges National Park Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Michael Williams and Associates in July 1988:

Wilpena Station is one of the most historically significant pastoral sites in South Australia. The homestead and associated outbuildings comprise the most complete group of buildings extant, illustrating continuity of station life over the last 130 years. The whole of Wilpena Station is listed in the State Heritage Register.

The authors of the statement continue:

Because of its history of nearly 130 years of uninterrupted service and relative completeness in site layout, these buildings represent a particularly outstanding example of pastoral adaptations in the Flinders Ranges . . . Wilpena Station belongs to a history of pastoral development in the Flinders Ranges that began more than 130 years ago when the first outstations were being established in South Australia. The period is characterised by a succession of economic, technological and social adaptations in which self sufficiency and innovation played decisive roles in the success of individual stations. Almost all significant stations with a comparable history are now in ruins. Preserved at Wilpena however is the most complete group of buildings surviving in South Australia in an authentic pastoral landscape. Wilpena Station is therefore one of the most significant sites in South Australia because it has one of the most continuous and best preserved histories of use in a remote setting.

That was the case when Michael Williams and Associates prepared its report in July 1988. As I demonstrated in my Address in Reply speech, that is no longer the case. If the Minister has not visited the site recently, and if she is not able to visit the site immediately she might like to take advice from locals who are familiar with what is happening at the site despite the fact that access is forbidden by Government regulation.

Those who care about the site are aware that the salt damp in many of the walls of the main homestead has now risen to roof level. White ants have eaten almost of the kitchen timbers and many of the upright supports of the building. I am advised that in some cases it is only the paintwork that is holding together the vestiges of shapes of the timber uprights in the building.

The background of this is known to the House but some of it bears repeating. Wilpena Station was declared a national pleasure resort in 1945. In 1985, the Wilpena Station lease was purchased by the Minister for Environment and Planning for the Department of Environment and Planning. In 1988 Wilpena Station became part of the Flinders Ranges National Park. As such, it has since been managed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Part of that station was separated from the national park for lease by the Government to Ophix Development. That lease was signed in January 1989 and then, in November 1990, the Minister introduced a Bill into the House to put in statutory form the provisions of that lease.

The draft amendment to the Flinders Ranges National Park Management Plan, which I mentioned earlier, at page 182 states:

Since the homestead and its outbuildings were vacated in 1985, deterioration of the building fabric and materials has obviously occurred to every structure. White ant infestation is present in many timber pieces in each of the residential buildings as well as the stable, and other outbuildings. In some instances, the state of decay is advanced.

I want to make clear that before the lease was signed with Ophix there was some deterioration and decay. Nevertheless, it was clearly stated that repairs and restoration should occur forthwith. In 1988, Danvers Architects was commissioned to undertake a conservation study of Wilpena Station as a basis for a conservation policy. That conservation study stated:

By reason of the heritage significance of the site, recommendations for restoration and/or reconstruction work as well as those pertaining to adaptations or interpretations were required to comply with the Australian ACOMOS charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance, namely, the Burra charter.

The Danvers report produced invaluable historical data and identified critical areas of deterioration, particularly in the outbuildings. The draft document by Michael Williams and Associates goes on to describe in considerable detail what restoration work would and should be undertaken by the developers, Ophix Finance Corporation Pty Limited. For members who are interested, a full description of their proposal appears on page 144, paragraph 320, of the document. The appalling thing is that those undertakings have not been fulfilled, neither have the Minister's statutory obligations under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Under division 5—Objectives of Management—at paragraph 37(b) it is stated:

The Minister, the Chief Executive Officer and the Director must have regard to the preservation of historic sites, objects and structures of historic or scientific interest within reserves.

Anyone who examines that site will see that there has been negligence of such an order that it amounts to vandalism by default. Those buildings are not being destroyed by human impact and by destructive acts: they are being destroyed by wanton and utter negligence by the Minister, by the Director and by Ophix Limited.

Under the lease signed by the Government and Ophix (clause 10) there is provision for cancellation of the lease in respect of default by the lessee. It is clear to anyone who examines that site that Ophix Limited has defaulted on its obligations under the lease. I ask the Minister when she will act and cancel the lease, ensuring that these irresponsible developers who have failed to fulfil virtually all their principal obligations in respect of the lease, particularly that to obtain finance and proceed with the project, are to be ruled out. When will she ensure that this occurs? It is now nearly two years since the Act was passed and it is nearly four years since the lease was signed. In the meantime, a precious part of the State's heritage is being allowed to rot.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is rare in this House, or indeed in the history of politics as I know it, that one gets the opportunity to pay tribute to a political opponent. However, I thought I would take this opportunity to mention that, over the many years that I have known this gentleman, I have had great admiration for the work that he has done for his side of politics. I first met Mr Bob Randall in 1979 when I was preselected for the Labor Party. I worked very hard to defeat him in 1979, but he was working very well within the district of Henley Beach and he beat me on that occasion. I believe that I was the first to congratulate him. I picked up the phone when I knew what the numbers were and extended my congratulations to him, because he was a political opponent who was prepared to work hard and put in a fair fight.

In the 10 years that I have represented that seat, Mr Bob Randall, in a sense, has been my opposite number. I might even say that he has been harassing me because he has had the energy to fight for the Party in which he believes in that area. Not only that but during all elections that were held over those 10 years—Federal, State and local government—he was able to manage the numbers, to provide the energy, to have people giving out the 'how to vote' cards, to send in the press releases to the local press, to knock on doors and to attend local meetings. I have nothing but admiration for the way in which he has carried out his job. I am not an admirer of his political Party, but I have to admire the way he has carried out those duties.

It came to me as a great surprise that the Liberal Party in the Henley Beach area, under the new flag of the seat of Colton, combined to defeat him in preselection for that seat. To add to my surprise, the person who defeated him for preselection was a gentleman who has never been in Henley Beach; he has never put a foot in Henley Beach, he has never attended a community meeting in Henley Beach, he has been nowhere near Henley Beach and, since he has been preselected, he has not been sighted in Henley Beach. That gentleman comes from the eastern suburbs. I understand that he has a rather large fine house in Burnside and he has spent most of his latter years in that district. In fact, someone was unkind enough to call him an eastern suburbs carpetbagger. Perhaps that is being unkind to the said gentleman because, as far as I know, he has always conducted himself in a perfect way. However, he has come from the eastern suburbs.

I took a great deal of interest in the fact that Mr Bob Randall was unable to get preselection for this area, because I believe that he deserved it. Not only do I believe that he deserved it but Liberal supporters in Henley Beach believe that he should have gained preselection. I have been getting phone calls not from Labor Party people but from Liberal Party people who were incensed not only at the fact that he did not get preselection but at the way that it was done.

In the *Advertiser* of 17 February this year, there was a report on page 1 that Mr Condous, or supporters of Mr Condous, actually stacked the Colton branch. Not only did he stack the Colton branch but the people who were recruited to that branch did not come from Henley Beach. Some of them lived 15 kilometres away from Henley Beach. I find that absolutely disgraceful. But give Mr Condous his due: he was quite truthful about it. In fact, he said to the Maitland branch of the Liberal Party gathering on Friday 13 March:

> I know that we're going to get on all right tonight . . . because . . . I'm meeting the people and a lot of you are experienced in stacking hay and I'm experienced in stacking branches.

He was making absolutely crystal clear how it was done. That was recorded on the SAS7 News on Friday 13 March 1992. The *Advertiser* of 17 February 1992, on page 1, stated:

> Adelaide's Lord Mayor, Mr Steve Condous, has recruited 72 loyal supporters to join the Liberal Party, boosting his chances of winning a seat in State Parliament. The Liberal Party's Colton branch has doubled in size with the influx of Condous supporters, who include prominent Greek developers and members of Mr Condous's family. Some of the newcomers live up to 15 km away from the western suburban Colton electorate where Mr Condous is seeking preselection.

Far be it from me to be critical of Liberal Party preselection, but how could somebody who lives 15 km away from Henley Beach have any real interest in what is happening in the Henley Beach location? Mr Randall, who is the Mayor of the Henley and Grange council, has put in a tremendous amount of work there. He is probably one of the most conscientious of mayors whom I have seen in the western suburbs. He is a friend of the member for Albert Park. I really cannot see the justice in what has happened in that seat.

There is a rumour that Mr Randall may stand as an Independent. I understand that he lacks finance and would not mind getting a bit of support from those disaffected Liberal Party supporters who have been phoning my office complaining about the way that he has been displaced. It might not be a bad idea for those Liberal Party supporters to read my speech in *Hansard*, because they might like to get behind him just in case he takes the opportunity to stand as an Independent. Mr Condous was able to gather people from a large area of metropolitan Adelaide. Further, the *Advertiser* reports:

> Two prominent Adelaide property owners and well-known Condous supporters, Mr Vince Oberdan and Mr Zisis Ginos, confirmed yesterday they had recently joined the Colton branch of the Party.

Property developers are suddenly taking an interest in political happenings in Henley Beach and getting right behind Mr Condous in order to defeat a very popular Mayor in Henley and Grange. Further, it has been suggested that Mr Gerry Karidis, another prominent Adelaide developer, who happens to support both sides—

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to address two matters of great concern in my electorate of Morphett. The first is in relation to education and the other is an environmental matter. The first matter relates to the appointment of a principal at the Glenelg Primary School. This school has had an extraordinarily raw deal from this Government over the past nine years, and it may interest members to know that over the past nine years we have had eight different principals administering the school. I would like to ask how many members in this Chamber can tell me of any school that has had to put up with eight different principals over nine years. It is an appalling situation and one which shows a total disinterest on the part of the department. I have raised the matter with the Minister, who is investigating it at the moment, but it is intolerable for the school community.

I would like to put on the record the sequence of events in this matter. I will not name the principals on the record; it is not relevant to name them, and I will refer to them by the letters A, B, C and D. One of them retired through sickness and there was no fault on his part, but the sequence of events that that set in train is something that does not do the Education Department any credit at all. In 1985 we had principal A, who was there for the first six weeks of term 1, having been there the previous year as well.

Principal B took over when A went on sick leave; principal C then came in because B was on long service leave, and that was all in 1985. In 1986, principal B was put in charge because A was out on sick leave. In 1987, principal D was appointed to the school and in 1988 principal D commenced the year but, as the year progressed, D went off on sick leave and principal B was reinstated. Later in the year, principal E came along and later again in that year principal F was appointed to the school.

Principal F stayed on in the school in 1989. In 1991 principal F was still there for the first term but in the second term principal F went off on long service leave and principal G was brought in. Principal G then pressed on, and before the year was out principal H came along and joined the staff. In 1992 principal H continued on in his place while principal F went on long service leave and it is now recorded that in 1993 principal F is due to return to the school but at the moment we still have principal H there.

To make it more difficult, the Education Department has now announced that it will give the school council three principals from which to choose as the next principal at the school for a five year term. It means, however, that under the present system the present principal, who is an acting principal of this school but a permanent principal of another school, will not be allowed to apply for the job. This means that next year, if the Education Department gets its way, a principal will be selected out of one of those new principals, meaning that next year we will have principal I. Therefore, within nine years we will have had nine different principals at the Glenelg Primary School.

It is a totally intolerable position and something that should never have been allowed to develop. The Education Department and the Minister should have grasped this matter immediately. A precedent was established in Nairne when, on another occasion on which a school was put in this position, the Minister used his administrative fiat and appointed an acting principal for a five year term. On behalf of the school council at Glenelg, I request that the Government do exactly the same here and that the Minister endorse the principal and, if he is not prepared to do that, at least allow this acting principal to put up his name with the other three and open the position to advertisement so that the person concerned can at least take his chances and give the school an opportunity to have continuity with the present incumbent in the position.

The other matter I would like to raise this afternoon is the Glenelg development, and I am pleased that the Minister for Environment and Planning is in the Chamber. I hope she takes my remarks to Cabinet early in September when it considers the Glenelg ferry proposal, and the Patawalonga proposal which is now in its final stages of preparation and will shortly go to Cabinet. When the Premier announced initially that this project was to be put on the discussion drawing board in Glenelg, one of the carrots it dangled was that the existing boat ramp and trailer park would be incorporated in the new project.

If it had not done that, it would not have received the initial support from the boating community. So, having been offered a facility that would be comparable with the one it was giving up, the boating community at least allowed the project to proceed to the planning stage. But, as the planning stage proceeded, the prospects of a boat ramp and a parking facility of equivalent size to that which the district has had in the past diminished until suddenly it became too difficult and to incorporate it meant cutting into too much of the marina spaces or areas of hard standing.

Consequently, when the final plan came out, it was a little two-lane launching ramp with a minimal number of car parking spaces, certainly nothing comparable to what the boating community had given up. Then, the developers and the Government came up with a scheme to supplement this by putting a launching ramp at the northern end of Patawalonga Lake near Africaine Road. It now has a plan for a launching ramp there with a car park cutting into the E&WS property on to the western side of the Patawalonga frontage and in what really is quite a dangerous area where cars will be parked, with trailers backing across the road and boats being launched into the Patawalonga at the north end. By launching there, it means that the boats must traverse the Patawalonga and go under the King Street bridge (if they can fit), through the lock gate and then out to sea.

It is an absolute administrative folly; a planning folly, it is stupid and, if any Government allows that to proceed, it has rocks in its head. It might be some way of placating some of the difficulties in the plan and allow the Government to say, 'We are at least accommodating the boaties,' but it is just so impracticable as to be laughable. Not only will they have to go through the lock gates but also there will be additional expenses for those boaties to go through the lock gates and up to the parking position.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What's your solution?

Mr OSWALD: The solution is clear. It is still possible at this late stage to redesign the interior—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Listen to me, Minister. It is possible to redesign the interior layout of the marina and change the shape of the marina pens and the hard standing to incorporate car parking space of equivalent size to what is there now and also to create a launching ramp on the site. I have discussed the matter with the Government representative on the steering committee down there.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Which one?

Mr OSWALD: Chris Kauffman, who feels it is still worthy of further development. My concern is that if it is not recorded on the plans before they go to Cabinet, and if Cabinet enshrines in principle the plans that will still include what I consider a ludicrous launching ramp at the top end of the Patawalonga, suddenly it will become the official position. It is not too late yet to incorporate that launching ramp and an equivalent size car parking facility within the existing development. We do not change the shell of the marina—all we do is rearrange the interior of the marina.

If the Government does that, it will get one large burr out from underneath its saddle cloth and placate the

boating community and, to some extent, the local member. If we are to have a project down there, we must have something for the boaties of a size equivalent to that which they have enjoyed in the past. That is a promise that I believe must be kept.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Earlier today I asked a question of the Minister of Housing and Construction, making him aware of the strong opposition from housing subcontractors, the Housing Industry Association and home builders generally in South Australia about the difficulties that will be experienced as a result of the independent contractors legislation that was forced through Federal Parliament earlier this year. Last night I had the opportunity to be present at a well attended meeting at the Dom Polski Centre organised by the Housing Industry Association.

I am not in a position to say how many people were there, because I am not sure how many the facility holds. Those of us who have been to the centre before realise that it is a large venue, and it was almost packed to capacity. The anger and concern being expressed by subcontractors, particularly through the Housing Industry Association, about the legislation was made very clear last night. The legislation opens the door for building unions to force builders to replace subcontractors with employees under a building award. Legal opinion from three separate sources has confirmed the Housing Industry Association's worst fears about the legislation, namely, that it has the potential to deliver control of the industry into the hands of trade unions because the contractor legislation will:

1. Allow the Industrial Relations Commission to interfere with subcontractors' business.
2. Force subcontractors into award arrangements.
3. Give unions control of an independent contractor's day-to-day business.
4. Push up housing costs for the ordinary Australian, reduce the number of homes built and cut back the amount of work.
5. Take away subcontractors' independence.

Recognising these five points, is it any wonder that subcontractors in South Australia are concerned about the legislation? I do not need to tell the House that Australia's home building industry is world class because of the productivity achieved by subcontractors in the main and by the building industry in South Australia.

On the other hand, Australia's commercial building industry is one of the most inefficient because of the control by building unions. I know that the Housing Industry Association has been heartened by the overwhelming support that members have expressed and is eager that members continue to participate in the campaign that has been established to ensure that building unions are kept out of the housing industry and individual businesses.

I support the campaign organised by the association in Australia. The association is not taking sides between builders and subcontractors and, when we recognise that the association has about 5 000 subcontractor members around Australia, we realise how important it is that those people be represented. The people of South Australia need to realise that, if the unions get control of home building sites, housing costs will leap by about $15 000 a house.

I do not believe that any member of this House could support such a move. As I said earlier, the housing industry in this State is world class because of the productivity achieved by subcontractors. On the other hand, the commercial building industry is one of the most inefficient because of the controls by building unions. Not one of us would want the Housing Industry Association not to support subcontractors; not one of us would want the housing industry in this State to get into the same situation as the commercial industry.

I again urge the Minister to make the strongest representation to his Federal colleague. He has given an assurance to the House today that he will make contact with his Federal colleague the Minister for Industrial Relations and make him aware of the strong opposition to this legislation from this State. I reiterate my concern which I believe is the concern of all members on this side of the House and, I hope, the concern of all members of Parliament in South Australia.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I have some concern that sometimes in this world I cannot find what I would like to find. My grievance would be that in the electorate I represent no money has been made available through the Commonwealth grants that have just been announced—not one cent—even though one of those councils has a massive debt because of a bushfire. Not one cent was given in all the grants to any of those councils except Noarlunga, where I pick up only two or three houses in the hills face zone. I find that unacceptable. That is all I wish to say.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Appropriation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I wish to address my question to the Minister of Finance. I raised a question during my contribution to the debate and expected the Minister to respond during the Committee stage. My question related to the extent to which departments are allowed to retain their own revenue. I thought I had made the point very vigorously that there had been a complete change of policy in relation to the control of revenue by the Government. Previously, as everyone would be aware, the major revenue earned from departments was paid into Consolidated Account, the supply moneys were actually related to the expenditure items and there was no offset from the revenue items. In other words, the $200 million less required by this Supply Bill is a product of the Government's completely changing its policy in relation to the amount of money that can be retained by departments.

We do not know which departments are affected, and we do not know how much money is involved. We have no idea whatsoever whether this means a blow-out in expenditure this year in comparison to last year. I did expect that the Minister of Finance would be in the

Chamber to answer those questions. I wish to have some response to my important and fundamental questions.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will certainly convey to the Minister of Finance the honourable member's questions, and I am sure that he will provide the honourable member with a response and reply to those questions as soon as possible.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I must express my extreme dissatisfaction with the way in which this Government is running this place. We are talking about a very important change in policy, and I am pleased that the Minister of Finance is here to respond to my the questions. If he managed to take them down, I am sure he can provide a response.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The principal question that was asked by the member for Mitcham was in the form of a challenge.

Mr S.J. Baker: It was a very reasonable request.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not suggesting it wasn't. The member for Mitcham said:

> I challenge the Minister of Finance, during his response and in the Committee stage of this Bill—and it is unusual for the Assembly to consider questions on supply, but on this occasion we will make an exception—to reveal which departments are allowed to keep their revenue and on what basis this revenue retention has been determined.
>
> Are we now going to a full user-pays system? Are the taxes and charges that are collected by all departments able to be retained by those departments, or are some of them still going into consolidated revenue?

The response to that series of questions is that all departments, with the exception of the police, the Auditor-General and the legislature, will be operating on the deposit account system. All fees for service will be retained by the departments. The amount of appropriation to departments has been adjusted on the basis of their capacity to raise revenue at the existing fee levels. Taxation revenue and fines imposed by courts are unaffected by this change and will continue to be credited directly to Consolidated Account.

I believe that the member for Mitcham was attempting to create the impression that departments will become wayward in their pursuit of fee income. However, fees are established by Cabinet, as are any amendments to them. Certainly, if that was a fear in the mind of the member for Mitcham, it is unjustified. The total level and extent of fees will continue to remain with the Government.

The expenditure implications of the deposit accounts have been ignored by the member for Mitcham. The deposit accounts provide incentives for departments to save in anticipation of future plans. Previously, any unspent funds remaining at 30 June were returned to Treasury, which acted, as we all know, to encourage a spend-up prior to 30 June. Under the deposit account arrangements, any remaining funds as at 30 June will be retained by the department, encouraging longer-term planning and providing the departments with future benefits for responsible financial management.

I think the member for Mitcham would agree that that is a highly desirable change. It makes the whole business of Government a lot tidier, in particular and, sensibly, it encourages departments not to have an end-of-year spend-up. In no way can it be suggested that it is a full user-pays system. I hope that I have put the mind of the member for Mitcham at rest, and I hope that my explanation is accepted and the Government is, indeed, congratulated on going in the main to deposit accounts.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will certainly not congratulate the Government—that would be quite unusual for me—unless it has actually achieved some breakthrough such as a great improvement to our industrial relations system. The Minister of Finance has given a general explanation as to what has occurred. I am still unsure what policy guidelines have been laid down, and he has mentioned the departments that will not be able to retain their revenue. I was interested to see that the Police Department was amongst those listed.

This is my third opportunity to ask a question, so it is my last. I was particularly interested in two matters, the first being the extent to which this change of policy had affected the Supply requirement; are we talking about $200 million or $300 million less as a result of that revenue transfer? Secondly, how will this flow into the forthcoming State budget?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It has no effect on the Supply requirement and certainly has no effect on the budget.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It has no effect on the principle underpinning the budget or underpinning Supply. In my view, it is merely a way of arranging money that is a lot more sensible than occurred previously, and that has been my view for a long time.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 25 August at 2 p.m.