

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 August 1985

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. T.M. McRae) presiding.

The Acting Clerk (Mr D.A. Bridges) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.10 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.36 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

ABSENCE OF CLERK

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, owing to his absence on duty at the Australian Constitutional Convention, the Clerk will not be able to attend the House today. Pursuant to Standing Order 30, his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant. I have appointed the Second Clerk Assistant to carry out the duties of the Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

[Sitting suspended from 12.37 to 2.30 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

**PETITIONS: TEACHER POLICY ON
HOMOSEXUALITY**

Petitions signed by 163 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the South Australian Institute of Teachers policy on homosexuality within State schools were presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon, Mrs Appleby, and Messrs Ashenden, Baker, and Groom.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHRISTIES NORTH KINDERGARTEN

A petition signed by 164 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the retention of a full-time teacher aide at Christies Beach North Kindergarten was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PORT AUGUSTA BOTANIC GARDEN

Petitions signed by 370 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta were presented by the Hons Jennifer Adamson and D.J. Hopgood.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD BUS
SERVICE**

A petition signed by 242 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Transport Authority to provide a bus service along Port Wakefield Road was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: SOUTH DOWNS PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Education to provide security installations in the canteen and sports stores at South Downs Primary School was presented by the Hon. T.H. Hemmings.

Petition received.

**PETITION: HOMOSEXUAL INFLUENCES AT
SCHOOL**

A petition signed by 375 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Equal Opportunity Act to protect children from homosexual influences at school was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: COORONG BEACH

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the entire Coorong beach remain open to vehicles and the public and that all tracks are maintained in good order was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY SERVICES AGENCIES

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to subsidise charges to voluntary service agencies and to keep any price increases within the parameters of wage indexation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 223 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 138 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on preschool education were presented by the Hons D.C. Brown, B.C. Eastick, and Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: FLAGSTAFF HILL AND SOUTH ROADS

A petition signed by 364 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to upgrade

the bridge and intersection of Flagstaff Hill and South Roads was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: CRAIGBURN FARM LAND

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to purchase Craighburn farm land, north of Sturt River, and retain it as open space was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNSWORN STATEMENT

A petition signed by 86 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

A petition signed by 512 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide an immediate commitment to the redevelopment, stage II, of the Pinnaroo Area School was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE SERVICE STATION

A petition signed by 672 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to grant the Shell Service Station on the corner of Lonsdale and Ramrod Roads, Hallett Cove, unrestricted trading hours was presented by Mr Mathwin.

Petition received.

PETITION: HARDYS ROAD

A petition signed by one resident of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prevent Hardys Road, Torrensville, from being used by through traffic was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the laying on of papers, I think it would probably be wise to indicate which Ministers will be taking questions addressed to absent Ministers. The Deputy Premier will take questions that otherwise would be directed to the Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Recreation and Sport, and the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Premier will take questions directed to the Attorney-General in another place. The Minister of Lands will take questions directed to the Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

State Theatre Company—Report, 1983-84.

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. D.J. Hoggood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—Advertisements of Appeals and Stays of Operations.

Industrial Relations Advisory Council Report, 1983-84. Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972—Regulations—Asbestos Removal.

Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975—Regulations—Appeal Tribunal Forms.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hoggood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Adelaide Railway Station Development Act, 1984—Regulations—Office Building.

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—

Erection of Classroom—Aldinga Primary School.

Redevelopment—Elizabeth Downs.

Erection of Activities Room, Cleve Area School.

Erection of Tank, Happy Valley Reservoir.

Borrow Pit Operation (3).

Erection of Building, E. & W.S. Department—Murray Bridge.

Relocation, Irrigation Pumps—Hundred of Murtho.

Redevelopment of Balaklava Police Station.

Erection of Garden Shed—Carrick Hill.

Erection of Depot Extensions at Dry Creek.

Erection of Control Buildings, Wasleys Meter Station.

Relocation of Victor Harbor Primary School.

Development of Residential Allotments—Waikerie.

Land Division—Glossop.

Erection of Classroom—Murray Bridge Regional Education Office.

Development, Greenwood Park, Barmera.

Land Division—Loxton West.

Erection of Storage Shed—Murray Bridge.

O'Sullivan Beach Boat Ramp.

Erection of Tank and Pumping Station, Hundred of Noarlunga.

Erection of Tank, Hundred of Noarlunga.

Redevelopment—Porter Bay Marina.

Urban Land Trust Act, 1981—Regulations—Compulsory Land Purchase.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Lands—

Crown Lands Act, 1929—Statement of Land Resumed, 1984-85.

Pastoral Act, 1936—Hundred of Arkaba—Portion of Travelling Stock Reserve Resumed.

Valuation of Land Act, 1971—Regulations—Valuation Reviewer Panels.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Harbors Act, 1936—Regulations—Wharfage Rates.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

By Command—

Australian Agricultural Council—

Resolutions of the 120th (Special) Meeting, Canberra, 27 September 1984.

Resolutions of the 121st Meeting, Melbourne, 11 February 1985.

Pursuant to Statute—

Education Act, 1972—Regulations—Qualifications of Teachers.

Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—

River Fishery—Fees.

Marine Scale Fishery—Fees.

Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Fees.

Western Zone Abalone Fishery—Fees.

Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Fees.

Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Fees—Number of Pots.

Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—Fees.

Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—Fees.

Miscellaneous Fishery—Fees.

General Fees.

Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Fees.

Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Fees.

- Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Boat Registration Fees, Number of Pots.
 Spencer Gulf Experimental Crab Fishery.
 Gulf St Vincent Experimental Crab Fishery.
 West Coast Experimental Crab Fishery.
 Venus Bay Netting.
- Kindergarten Union of South Australia—Report, 1983-84.
- Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946—Regulations—Extension of Metropolitan Area Milk Prices.
- Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1984.
- Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation—Report, 1983-84.
- South Australian College of Advanced Education—Report, 1984.
 Statute Amendment.
- South Australian Institute of Technology—Report, 1983.
- Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia—Report, 1984.
- Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935—Regulations—Advertising.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Pursuant to Statute—
 Building Act, 1970—Regulations—Sliding Doors.
 Abortions Notified in South Australia—Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on—Report, 1984.
 Dentists Act, 1984—Dental Board, Election of.
 Food and Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—Alcoholic Beverages, Dye in Antibiotics for Animals, Storage of Poisons.
 Health Act, 1935—Regulations—Disinfection of Second-hand Clothing.
 Highways Department—Properties, Approval to Lease, 1984-85.
 Local Government Finance Authority Act, 1983—Regulations—Institute of Municipal Management Inc.—Pest Plant Control Boards.
 Medical Practitioners Act, 1983—Regulations—Qualifications.
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Regulations—Fares.
 Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—Learner and Probationary Drivers, Number Plates, Cost of.
 Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Bus Maintenance Scheme, Tyres and Wheels.
 Traffic Prohibition—
 East Torrens.
 Enfield (Windsor Gardens).
 Summertown.
 Tea Tree Gully (2).
 Corporation By-laws—Elizabeth—No. 4—Bees.
 Happy Valley—No. 42—Keeping of Dogs.
 Mount Gambier—No. 39—Heavy Vehicles on Roads.
 No. 50—Carinya Gardens Cemetery.
 District Council By-laws—Willunga—
 No. 37—Controlling the Foreshore and Various Amendments.
 No. 38—Amendment to Existing By-laws.
- By the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Grafter)—
Pursuant to Statute—
 Schedules of Alterations made by Statute Revision, Commissioner of—
 South Australian Health Commission Act.
 Offenders Probation Act.
 Summary Offenders Act.
 Correctional Services Act.
 Associations Incorporation Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.
 Bail Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966—Regulations—Aboriginal Births and Deaths.
 Builders Licensing Board—Report, 1983-84.
 Building Societies Act, 1975—Regulations—Powers of Inspection.
 Classification of Films for Public Exhibition Act, 1971—Regulations—Fees for Cinema Classification.
 Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982—Regulations—Exemption.
 Consumer Credit Act, 1972—Regulations—Delegation of Power.
 Co-operatives Act, 1983—General Regulations, 1985.
 Friendly Societies Act, 1919—
 Manchester Unity-Hibernian Friendly Society—Amendment of General Laws.
- Lifeplan Community Services—Alterations to General Laws.
 Land and Business Agents Act, 1973—Regulations—Crown Lease Transactions, Hotel Brokers.
 Liquor Licensing Act, 1985—General Regulations, 1985.
 Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—Regulations—Bailiff's Fees.
 National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act, 1984—Regulations—State Provisions.
 Prices Act, 1948—Regulations—School Uniforms and Bread.
 Summary Offences Act, 1953—Summary Offences Application.
 Trade Standards Act—
 Report on, 1982-83.
 Report on, 1983-84.
 Regulations—General Regulations.
 Trustee Act, 1936—Regulations—First National Limited.
- By the Deputy Premier, for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—
Pursuant to Statute—
 Stony Point (Liquids Project) Indenture—Port Bonython Power Requirements—Deed.
- By the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—
Pursuant to Statute—
 Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936—Capital Recoveries.
 Sewerage Act, 1929—Regulations—Fees.
- By the Minister of Transport, for the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—
Pursuant to Statute—
 Racing Act, 1976—Greyhound Racing Rules—Sire Registration.
 Rules of Trotting—
 Fees.
 Sires Stakes.
 Stable Return.
 Studmates Advertising.
 Trainer Prizemoney for Placegetters.
 Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981—Regulations—Prize Fund.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

- Adelaide Convention Centre—Furniture, Fittings and Equipment,
 - Port Augusta College of Technical and Further Education—Redevelopment,
 - Regency Park Community College—Extensions,
 - Salisbury Heights Primary School, Stage II—Redevelopment,
 - South Australian Maritime Museum (Building Works).
- Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Dr G. DUNCAN

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD** (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: My statement relates to a matter given considerable prominence in the printed media over the past couple of days. Earlier today the Attorney-General and the Commissioner of Police announced arrangements for further investigations into the allegations concerning the homicide of the late Dr G. Duncan. The Deputy Crown Solicitor (Mr M. Bowering) and the Deputy Commissioner of Police (Mr R.E. Killmier) will co-operate to oversee any inquiries or investigations with reference to public statements recently made. The Assistant Commis-

sioner, Crime (Mr K.P.E. Harvey), will co-ordinate a task force headed by Detective Superintendent R.G. Lean whose purpose will be to take statements from any person who wishes to come forward. Additionally, Mr Bowering will make available independent facilities for the taking of statements from persons wishing to provide information to the Crown Law Office.

The Deputy Crown Solicitor will be available to provide advice to the investigating team. Mr O'Shea has been invited to contact Mr Bowering to provide a comprehensive statement of his allegations. The overall purpose is to collate and evaluate information with a view to advising the Attorney-General, who will decide whether further action is warranted. The Deputy Commissioner of Police is the spokesman for the police activity in this matter.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXATION

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier say in what areas the Government is considering taxation relief and whether the Government will make it retrospective to 1 July? During the past 2½ years *per capita* State taxation in South Australia has increased 50.2 per cent, despite the Premier's election promise not to increase existing taxes or introduce new taxes. It has been the highest growth of any State during this period, and it has been a major contributor for the last financial year to Adelaide's CPI which, at 7.4 per cent, was the highest of the capital cities in Australia. For these reasons it was entirely inappropriate, as well as unprecedented, for the Government to advise His Excellency the Governor—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is out of order on two bases: first, he has exceeded relevance; and, secondly, in referring to advice given to His Excellency he is clearly out of order, and he is to withdraw that remark immediately.

Mr OLSEN: I seek your ruling, Sir. It is a statement of fact that His Excellency the Governor's speech today referred to certain matters, clearly on the advice of his Ministers, his Government. That is unprecedented, in that His Excellency's speech to Parliament today referred to the Government's tax increases.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. Does the honourable member wish to dissent from my ruling as to the second part of the matter?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member seeking clarification?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that the question must be restricted to Government policy. It must not refer to discussions between the Government and His Excellency the Governor and, to the extent that it has, I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I withdraw that comment and say that media reports today have referred to the Governor's Speech to the Parliament on Government policy. Those reports state:

... in Parliament today the Government's tax rises in 1983 were very necessary and responsible.

In fact they were not. Tax relief is long overdue, because last financial year the Premier collected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: It is a statement of fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to resume his seat. Again, in explaining his question, he has

exceeded relevance and is debating the issue. I ask him to come to the point.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I can well understand the sensitivity of the Government on taxation. The fact is—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a clear reflection on the Chair, and I direct that the honourable gentleman withdraw it.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I withdraw. The media has reported that the Government has collected at least \$40 million more in taxes in the last financial year than it had budgeted for and, because the Premier has been making statements about taxation relief for a long time (without much action I might add), he must make taxation relief retrospective until 1 July and tell South Australians now in what areas it will be given so that the 50.2 per cent that has been slugged to householders, small and big business alike in South Australia can clearly identify where taxation relief will be forthcoming.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is that relief will be given in a range of areas, particularly in those areas that will aid the economic recovery that is taking place in South Australia.

Mr Olsen: When?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All the details will be revealed when I make a full statement on the matter. In answering the Leader of the Opposition's statement, let me just correct a misunderstanding that he is attempting to foist upon the public of South Australia on this question of taxation. It is certainly true that our tax receipts in 1984-85 have increased and that they have increased more than we had expected in our Budget. I guess that we can be excused for being a bit conservative about our estimate of economic recovery. Our receipts have increased to the extent that they have not because the rates have been increased: indeed, there were no rate increases.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Premier to resume his seat. That is the sixth occasion on which the honourable Leader of the Opposition has interjected during the reply. I call him to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is a complete misunderstanding of the difference between tax receipts—that is, the revenue receipts of the Government—and the rate at which revenue is levied. I repeat: in the 1984-85 Budget we did not increase those rates. We have come in better than budget—and it is the first time it has happened for many years, and certainly it never occurred under the previous Government—because of the recovery which is pulsing through this economy and which members opposite are seeking to destroy. They see that their one sleazy hope to grab office in this State is somehow to call to a halt the economic recovery of South Australia. They are doing their best, but they are not going to succeed.

So, let me repeat: our tax revenue base relates to economic activity—the stronger the recovery in the economy, the better we do. In fact, the very table that the Leader of the Opposition has put up in some faint-hearted refutation of the fact that South Australia was doing well, in an urgent desire to try to save Queensland—this great light on the hill for the conservative forces, but which is under massive recession at the moment—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members opposite just do not want to hear.

The SPEAKER: Order! During the last session I referred to the unprecedented way in which members of the House were, in effect, barracking, so that individual members in combination with others formed a barrage of interjections.

Given those circumstances, the Chair has no alternative but to call to order individuals and to then proceed to deal with them as the occasion arises, and that will be done. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Confidence is up in South Australia because of the economic recovery that is taking place. It is down in Queensland, because at the moment Queensland is in a state of recession, and confrontation tactics on the industrial front and a whole lot of other matters are in fact exacerbating the problems that Queensland has. That will not happen here in South Australia. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This hopeless rabble just does not want to hear, but I guess it is more important that the public gets the message. However, I will treat the Parliament with courtesy, even if members opposite are not prepared to do so. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has said that he will support any changes—any reduction in taxes—that the Government makes to our tax base, and I am very glad indeed to hear it. It is about the only thing that the Leader is supporting in this State at the moment. It is about time that he got his act together and, instead of trying to seize power on the basis of undermining our economy, did something about increasing confidence in it.

BRITISH ECONOMIC POLICIES

Mr TRAINER: It is with pleasure that I direct the first question to the new Deputy Premier. On the basis that the Deputy Premier would be aware that the Opposition Leader has recently been in Britain seeking economic coaching from the British Government, does the Deputy Premier consider that British economic policies have any part to play in South Australia's economic recovery?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, I would suggest that running to Margaret Thatcher for economic advice is a little akin to running to the South African Government for advice on race relations.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Except as it arises out of the complete economic bankruptcy of the Leader of the Opposition, I fail to see why the Liberal Party in this State or in any other part of Australia would want to run to Margaret Thatcher for economic advice. For some years the United Kingdom has been the sick economy of Western Europe and we only have to look at the economic indicators to get some idea of that. Growth is so much slower in the UK than in Australia.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to resume his seat. In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition persists in defying the Chair, I have no alternative but to warn him. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Unemployment in the UK is running at a tragic 13 per cent—some three million people—and despite all the monetarist rhetoric that we have heard from over there—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We will talk about privatisation in a moment.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Premier to resume his seat. I have been forced to take the quite unprecedented step on the first day of session of warning the Leader of the Opposition. I ask all honourable members to bear in mind that warning. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Despite all the monetarist rhetoric that we have heard from the United Kingdom,

inflation there is again above 8 per cent. In a sense, I understand why the Liberal Leader in this State is prepared to go anywhere in order to get economic advice, because it is clear that he cannot generate it for himself. We do not know who is the economic spokesman for the Liberal Party in this State. Either he is being sat on by the Leader of the Opposition or he shares the Leader's lack of constructive ideas and suggestions in this field. The Leader of the Opposition decided that he would not take on a specific portfolio for himself so that he would be free to float around and poke his nose into other areas. This is the action man—free to float! So, it is important that the Liberal Party go on record as to what it wants to do in relation to economic ideas. Its latest idea is privatisation, which will apparently save us on the information of these strange advisers who apparently would be brought from the United Kingdom.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Selling things such as the State Transport Authority Roadliner Service, the Central Linen Service and the cake stall at the Adelaide Railway Station will somehow solve economic problems! If it were as easy as that I guess that we would all be millionaires. The Leader is on record as saying that privatisation would be complex and fairly unpredictable, but I suggest that unpredictability is the last thing that this State wants. It is certainly not something that has been given to this State by this Government. We have a strong economic record.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: All the Deputy Leader of the Opposition needs to do (and obviously he does not do it as often as he should) is talk to business leaders in this community. They will give him an idea of the return of confidence that has occurred in this State over the past three years. That confidence would be set at risk by the unpredictability—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Some members opposite are desperate to get a word in because of the unpredictability of their future membership of the Liberal front bench. As the Premier has just indicated, building approvals are running at a record in this State. There are encouraging signs as to the living costs of South Australians. Of course, we increasingly hear news of new projects that are being initiated in South Australia. Yesterday, there was a report on the giant \$220 million seafront plan and there is the \$1.8 million tavern plan for the city, as well as many other projects that have been announced. These are the sorts of projects that unpredictability will tend to undermine.

I join with the Premier in suggesting that this is part of a deliberate tactic of members opposite. They should drop this nonsense of privatisation and get on to the real issues that face the people of this State. Occasionally, privatisation does not suit members opposite either. This Government has been involved in one or two examples of privatisation: we privatised part of the north-south transport corridor, for very good reason, and the honourable member who sits and looks at me from the other side of the Chamber (the member for Davenport) announced his opposition to that piece of privatisation.

The Opposition is very selective in the way it approaches such matters. We have a privatisation policy on the part of the Liberal Party which seems to be on loan; we have economic advice on loan; and we have television ads on loan, borrowed from the Victorian Liberals in their campaign. The Liberal Party even has a campaign director on loan.

This is clearly an Opposition without substance or vision, and it has nothing to offer the people of South Australia.

HINDLEY STREET HOTEL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Government investigating serious allegations made against a senior public servant by the licensee of a city hotel? If not, will the Government do so? The licensee of the Rio International Hotel in Hindley Street has complained to me (and I understand also to the Premier and some sections of the media) about incidents which allegedly took place at his hotel in the early hours of last Saturday morning. The allegations followed a decision by the licensee to refuse admission to the hotel of a group of people whom he considered to be well below the legal drinking age and also to be of unkempt appearance. I will quote a letter from the licensee (I understand a similar letter has been sent to certain people in the media), as follows:

A group of people—three males and a female, all adults—sitting inside the bistro area had objected to my decision to bar admission to these young people. Their objection had turned to outright rudeness and hostility when my staff and I again refused the young group entry. Members of the adult group in the bistro claimed they were with the Department of Labour—

which, as we know, is now under new management—

One, a blond-haired male in his mid twenties, produced an ID card which was thrust under my nose. This person told me I should start expecting trouble. I was accused by this group of being a little Hitler.

Just to refresh your memory, Mr Speaker, that refers to the proprietor of the hotel.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is no doubt about the quality of interjection we hear from the honourable member sitting opposite. It is about as puerile as one can imagine.

Mr Ferguson: That wasn't a very good answer, either.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Not to put too fine a point on it, it was a damn sight better than the interjection. The letter goes on to state:

They became so hostile that I refused to serve them. It was then an elderly gentleman with the group pushed a card at me that bore the name 'Phillip Bentley, Deputy Director, Department of Labour, Office of the Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour'. He said to me, 'I hope your books are in order because you are going to be in the—'

then there is a four-letter word which my modesty precludes me from reading to the House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a joke, and the public servant involved could find himself in a situation if the allegations are true.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Kavel to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The letter continues: 'I'm going to send people in here to go through with a fine tooth comb.' He then left.

I understand that yesterday the person referred to denied that he had ever been involved in these alleged incidents. However, I have now been informed that he has admitted that he was at the premises, that he did present his card to the licensee, and that he did give certain advice, although he is denying other allegations made by the licensee.

In whatever form that advice was given, it appears to have been completely improper for a very senior public servant, with no jurisdiction in matters associated with the licensing laws, to involve himself in any way like this. The allegation is that the licensee was incited to commit the criminal offence of allowing under age drinking. This is a

most serious matter which must be investigated by the Government.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a pretty grubby question from a fairly grubby person. I suppose it sets the tone for what we are going to hear over the next few weeks in Parliament. I hope that backbench members opposite, particularly those in marginal seats, take note of the way in which their front bench handles these matters. Copies of the letter in question were sent to the Minister of Labour, the Leader of the Opposition (whose coyness I notice prevented him asking the question about this matter of public interest and moment, asked here under the guise of parliamentary privilege) and to me. This is a grubby exercise on the part of the Opposition.

Serious allegations have been made by the licensee of the hotel involved in a letter publicised obviously to try to get the widest circulation without the individual, the subject of these allegations, being given an opportunity to respond. I happen to know that he has responded to members opposite, but that did not stop the Deputy Leader raising this matter in this Chamber in the hope that he could generate some sort of aggro against a particular public servant. Of all the matters that concern a State facing an election and a Government's policy for the next four years it seems that this is the best that the Deputy Leader can produce with the aid and connivance of the Leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the member for Coles. I hope that other honourable members are taking note because the Chair will not tolerate the disgraceful behaviour that has been shown so far this day. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That behaviour—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader for his disgraceful reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is quite consistent—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is not usual to bring up points of order in writing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to bear some minor respect for the office of Speaker rather than the holder of that office.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have the highest respect for the office of Speaker. My interjection was, 'Are you going to do anything about it?' and was directed to the Premier and not to you, Sir. I do not want you to think for a moment that I was reflecting on the Chair. My question was directed to the Premier, asking will he investigate what the Opposition thinks is disgraceful conduct. The Premier, in seeking to lambast me, was not answering the question and my simple interjection was, 'Are you going to do anything about it?' I was not referring to you, Sir, and if you drew that imputation you were in error, as I was addressing my remark to the Premier asking him whether he is doing anything about this disgraceful situation.

The SPEAKER: I maintain the warning. I indicate, as I have previously, that I will not continue to tolerate the behaviour that has gone on today. Honourable members are well aware that, because of the failure of the Standing Orders Committee to meet, and because of other factors beyond my control, it is extremely difficult for me to control answers given by Ministers. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At one stage the Deputy Leader claimed that members on this side were being puerile about this matter and that it was not a joke when in fact he used phrases in his snide question such as, 'a word from the letter which my modesty prevents me from using'. In saying things like that, what is he doing but making a farce and a joke about a trivial matter on which we have spent far too

much time already? I suggest that the Opposition addresses itself to matters of the day of importance and stops delving around in this way.

I am advised that, in fact, the public servant the subject of these allegations made by the licensee of a hotel in Hindley Street has responded by demanding an apology and retraction through his legal adviser. He will, I understand, take legal action if that proves necessary. These matters were pointed out to Opposition members, but they could not resist using the forum of this House in a cowardly way to bring a person's name into the public forum in the hope that they could get away with besmirching it in some way. I would suggest that the parties involved in this affair be allowed to sort it out. It will be appropriately sorted out by the proper processes and not by the carry-on of the Opposition in this place.

STA FARES

Mrs APPLEBY: Is the Minister of Transport yet in a position to say whether the present level of public transport fares is shortly to be increased? In the *News* today the member for Davenport is quoted as saying that fares are due to rise again. I suspect that it would be the Minister's belief that any announcement should come from a source other than the member mentioned.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. It gives me an early opportunity to refute the claims by the member for Davenport made both in the early *News* and on the radio. I make quite clear that there will not be any increase in transport fares this year. I said that here previously in the last session, when the same honourable gentleman, the member for Davenport, asked me a question, but I have been here long enough to not take a great deal of notice of what he says until I have checked it out. I have had this matter checked out. In the calculations that the honourable member used to justify his suggestion that the fares rise by 25 per cent, he does not understand the difference between cash accounting and accrual accounting. He relied on the figure of \$83.5 million, which had not been formally presented to the Board or to Treasury at that time, so whoever is the source of his information within the department should let the honourable member know the difference between cash accounting and accrual accounting.

When my colleague the Minister for Marine stated publicly that the cash budget for the year would be \$74.9 million, that was a cash amount. The honourable member knows, as he was a member of a Cabinet, that in addition to that cash allocation funds are included in the round sum to allow for increases in salaries. That figure was \$2.5 million. So, the cash figure for the STA for this financial year is \$77.48 million—very recent figures. The figures were obtained just a little later than the honourable member received his information, but nevertheless they are very accurate. The honourable member is not comparing apples with apples but rather cash accounting with accrual accounting. The \$83.5 million, takes into account non cash items such as depreciation of \$5 million, \$3 million amortisation and \$390 000 to \$400 000 taken into account for long service leave, sick leave and so on.

The basis of the honourable member's statement was that there was a blow-out of \$8.5 million. In fact, the STA has underspent its cash account by \$3.055 million. There is no case to be put for the increase in the fares for which the member for Davenport has called. I make one final point. It seems very interesting indeed that we have the Leader of the Opposition calling for tax cuts whilst one of his chief lieutenants is asking for an increase in fares. The Opposition

ought to get its act together. I know that the member for Davenport does not understand the difference between cash and accrual accounting. I doubt whether his Leader does either, otherwise he would not have given responsibility to the member for Light to be shadow Treasurer.

Dr G. DUNCAN

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Premier dissociate his Government from the disgraceful attack made yesterday by the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, on the former Police Commissioner, Mr Salisbury, over the Duncan case and ask Mr Dunstan to refrain from any further public comment not based on fact on the case?

In yesterday's *News* Mr Dunstan was quoted as saying that he was not satisfied with the police handling of the case and he accused the former Police Commissioner, Mr Salisbury, of having made a mistake in the investigation in accepting the resignation of three vice squad officers. Typically, that was the complete opposite of what Mr Dunstan said at the time. I quote another statement in the *News* made by Mr Dunstan on 25 October 1972. He then said that he was satisfied that everything possible had been done to solve the Duncan death. He went on to state:

I think the result shows that the South Australian Police Force did make a meticulous investigation.

Mr Dunstan cannot have it both ways, and obviously what he is now doing is using the revival of the Duncan case to pursue his vendetta against Mr Salisbury. His comments yesterday were totally—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been more than tolerant. I ask the member for Torrens to cease debating the matter and to proceed with the question.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I call upon the Premier to dissociate his Government from Mr Dunstan's statements and to tell him to refrain from further public comment on this matter if it is merely intended to denigrate Mr Salisbury.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not followed this issue in detail, but I understand that Mr Dunstan's comments were in response to some rough things that Commissioner Salisbury said in an interview. That is how it has been reported to me. I do not want to get involved in this debate. We can talk of vendettas: the name 'Dunstan' crops up and all members of the Opposition gather round—all those tired old hacks of former days who had to sit confronting a very successful Government of those years. They are still trying to work out their spleen and somehow get back at him. They will bring up his name whenever they can.

On this matter the Government has already said that the matters will be investigated and if (as must be the case, as the honourable member has asked a question on it and obviously has detailed knowledge) he would like to come forward and add his bit of special information to that investigation, well and good. I would be happy to see that happen.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat and call the member for Torrens to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As part of this continuing debate, another former Commissioner, Mr McKinna, has bought into the argument through a statement in the *News* about Mr Dunstan's cover-up and stated that he had done that by suppressing the secret Scotland Yard report. All I can say is that it is allegation and counter allegation. It is well worth remembering that the Tonkin Government—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —came into office with the intention, if not publicly stated then certainly implied, that one of their first acts would be to revive the case and release the report. One might recall that in the years of 1979-80 they worked to try to hound Don Dunstan out of this State, including a scurrilous motion and debate in this place as I recall based around a book that was published that they wanted to get the maximum out of, but despite all that background the Government of Premier Tonkin, with Attorney-General Griffin and including, for a brief time, a member who is now Leader of the Opposition and was then in charge of the Police, did not release that report.

I have not read the report and my Government has not until now had to consider whether or not it should be released, but the Dunstan, Corcoran and Tonkin Governments—and some tired hacks of the Tonkin Government who sit opposite—saw fit not to release the report. I ask: what has changed? If things have changed as a result of the O'Shea statement and other comments they will be investigated and pursued. The Attorney-General has already said that. In fact, my Deputy read a statement indicating what action was being taken by the Crown Solicitor and by the Commissioner of Police in pursuit of that.

WASLEYS TO ADELAIDE GAS PIPELINE

Mr MAYES: First, I congratulate the former Minister for Environment and Planning on his appointment as Deputy Premier. Can he report to the House progress on the Wasleys to Adelaide gas pipeline? There has been a great deal of speculation in the media recently about the progress of this pipeline. The Minister could probably enlighten the House quite considerably on what progress has been made.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are several alternative routes for the Wasleys to Adelaide pipeline in the vicinity of the Port Adelaide estuary. As is often the case in these matters, the less environmentally sensitive options are also more expensive because the pipeline traverses along the route. Therefore, it has obviously been necessary to subject the proposition and the various options to the closest environmental scrutiny. An environmental impact statement has been prepared and will be carefully assessed by my officers before any recommendations are made to my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy as to the Government's preferred option for the route of that pipe. I do not know that I can really add anything more in detail to that, except that I will certainly undertake to keep the House informed of progress on this matter. We will certainly be assessing very closely the environmental impact of all the options available to us.

SPEAKER'S POSITION

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Speaker, in view of the uncertainty surrounding your position as Speaker following the Government's decision to relocate the East End Market to the Samcor paddocks, will you tell the House whether it is your intention to resign the Speaker's Chair? Despite assurances given—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Devonport.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate the protection on your behalf, Sir. Despite assurances given by you to your electors before the last election and by both the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning, who is now Deputy Premier, that a Labor Government would retain the Samcor paddocks as open space, it has now been decided

to relocate the East End Market to this site. What is more, I understand that as the local member you were not even consulted before this decision was announced last week. In a statement in the *News* on 20 October last year you were quoted as saying, as Speaker:

If Labor's word is not good enough, how dare I even stand for the electorate?

In the *News* last Thursday you said that you stood by that statement. In view of the fact that your statements have encouraged speculation that you will vacate the Speaker's Chair because this Government has repudiated an unequivocal assurance given to you and in doing so has treated you with complete contempt, is it your intention, as indicated in newspaper comments of last year and restated only a week ago, and to which I have already referred, now to resign your position?

The SPEAKER: Order! No, it is not my intention to resign my position. I have ascertained that the *Advertiser* newspaper incorrectly reported the site of the proposed new location of the new East End Wholesale Market as being Samcor paddocks, Pooraka, when in fact what it meant was the Samcor paddocks off Diagonal Road. That being some three miles removed, the rest of the explanation becomes irrelevant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I gave the honourable gentleman my full protection so he could explore the matter in detail.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I find the answer incredible.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a reflection on the Chair. I want to make it quite clear that there was an unfortunate breakdown in communication, whereas—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That is what we say—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to complete my answer, if I may. There was an unfortunate breakdown in communication and it appears as though the *Advertiser* reporters have got their paddocks about three miles out of kilter. In those circumstances the matter becomes totally irrelevant and I can assure the honourable gentleman that, God willing, I will not be resigning the Chair and that I will continue to represent Playford.

ADELAIDE COST OF LIVING

Mr GROOM: Will the Premier explain the way in which State Government policies have contributed to the cost of living fall in Adelaide in the past year? It was reported in yesterday's *News* that the cost of living fell \$22 a week in Adelaide in the past year. This newspaper report was based on a *Bulletin* survey poll conducted amongst a wide cross-section of the community right throughout Australia in all States.

Some 2 161 people aged 14 and over were surveyed. The purpose of the survey was to detect the average cost of living for a four person family of two adults and two children. The survey showed that the average cost of living throughout Australia for a family of four was \$327 a week. Adelaide recorded a \$22 a week drop in the past 12 months, so Adelaide was \$297 a week average. Brisbane recorded a rise of \$6 a week during the past 12 months to \$319 a week. Hobart was also up \$8 a week to \$309 a week average. Sydney was \$344, which was a drop of \$2 compared with the previous 12 months; Victoria was up \$13 a week to \$330 and Perth was up \$4 to \$323. It is quite clear from this survey that South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is debating the matter.

Mr GROOM: The result of the survey shows that in South Australia the cost of living fell by some \$22 a week during the past year.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Those findings that the honourable member has placed before the House come as no surprise, because they conform with other surveys.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For instance, I refer honourable members to the Australian Consumer Association's magazine *Choice*, which recently conducted another of its periodic surveys into food and grocery costs in capital cities and some country cities throughout Australia. Of all the capital cities, Adelaide remains the cheapest by quite a considerable amount. In fact, during the previous year, again under our Government (and two or three years ago it was at the top of the tree), the survey showed that it was the cheapest of all places. I think in the last one it was shaded by Toowoomba, the regional town in Queensland.

If one went to other capitals one saw the same sort of experience reflected in those actual costs, as the honourable member has outlined. Equally, the last published of the *Advertiser's* periodic Jones family surveys—and I have not seen one recently—showed that under this Government there was a real and significant increase in the standard of living and in the disposable income of that family. Of course, that is consistent with a number of things that have occurred in relation to accessibility of housing, cost of housing and so on, all against the background of quite large pressures on demand.

As to the consumer price index, it should be remembered that, as a measure of change that is taking place, the increase above the average which is reflected in the 12-monthly figures occurred mainly around the last quarter of last year, and is still working its way into the system. In fact, our March quarter was on average with the rest of Australia, and there are no major discrepancies between the CPI for Adelaides and those for the rest of the States. But in those surveys that look at the actual costs of living for people, in relation to housing, clothing, groceries, their food, and so on, as well as utility costs, such as power, Adelaide prices compare very favourably indeed and in fact in a number of those respects are considerably below costs in other capital cities.

That is not a bad record, and it is one that we intend to maintain. However, it is amazing that, listening to the outpourings of the Opposition, one would believe that in some way we are the inflation capital of a high cost State. That is absolutely not true. In fact, the Opposition is preying on the fact that people are not able to make those direct interstate and international comparisons. However, anyone who is in a position to do so never fails to remark on the comparative advantages of South Australia.

As to the question of whether we are too highly taxed as part of this context, let me remind the House again that, in terms of *per capita* taxation, we are something like 30 per cent lower than New South Wales, 30 per cent lower than Victoria, about 12 per cent lower than Western Australia, marginally above Queensland, and we are well below the national average. We are not a high tax State, and under my Government we certainly will remain in that low tax bracket, while at the same time ensuring that we have adequate revenue to provide the services that people in this State expect, although without the State tottering on the edge of bankruptcy as occurred under the previous Government.

LIVESTOCK LOADING

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport consider introducing a transport policy of volume load-

ing of livestock trucks rather than there being a weight limit? According to an *On Land* report dated 4 July 1985, the New South Wales meat industry authority and the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture support the return of volume livestock loading in that State. Further in that article it is proposed that livestock crates for these purposes be measured and then registered. Under the scheme cattle trucks might then exceed the current maximum weight limits, but would not approach the loads carried on some grain trucks. It is further understood that timber trucks in most States of Australia, if not all, are already exempt from the maximum weight limits. Further, it is considered that the implementation of this measure would substantially remove the impact of the extreme fuel prices that we are experiencing at the moment, and indeed reduce the impact on primary producers generally and those in the distant pastoral regions of our State in particular.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I can inform the member for Alexandra that, over the past fortnight, I have felt that I am suffering from what we might call an information overload, as I have sought to catch up with the very many components of the transport industry in South Australia. The honourable member has raised the matter of live weight livestock transport as against volume. This is a matter that CTAC (Commercial Transport Advisory Committee) and the Road Traffic Board are currently considering. As Minister of Transport I have not had the opportunity to provide any input for that. However, as a result of the honourable member's question I will ascertain the current position and the recommendations that might flow to me as Minister, and through me to the Government, and bring back a report for the honourable member.

GRANGE RAILWAY STATION

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether a decision has been made by the State Transport Authority on the relocation of the Grange railway station? The moving of the railway station at Grange so that it does not block Military Road is a matter that for many years has concerned my constituents. In recent years there has been a general agreement that the station should be relocated: the only problem was who should pay for the relocation. At one stage the STA was willing to build a new station, but it wanted the Henley and Grange council to demolish the old one. I understand that the State Transport Authority and the council are now deep in discussion again on this matter. I hope that the Minister can spell out what is happening.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am pleased to be able to give the honourable member some information which I expect will be favourably received. A decision has been reached by the State Transport Authority which should benefit not only the honourable member but the residents of Henley and Grange. The authority has agreed not only to relocate the station to a site east of Military Road but to remove the old station and generally reinstate the area. I understand that the aim is to have the work completed before 9 February next year. The council will not be asked to bear any of the cost involved in demolition or reinstatement. I think that that is an important fact that the honourable member was seeking. I also want to add that the authority is to introduce new timetables for a large part of Adelaide on 9 February next year and for that reason it has been decided to switch to the relocated station by that date.

NATIONAL WAGE RISE

Mr BECKER: In view of the importance of continuing wage restraint in manufacturing industries in particular, will

the Premier say whether the South Australian Government will make a submission to the September national wage case seeking a discount on the next national wage rise for the inflationary effect of the devaluation of the dollar and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter is being negotiated at the moment between the Federal Government and the ACTU in the context of the prices and incomes accord. I think it is absolutely vital that this matter be dealt with in terms of the accord, because there is no question that, without the accord and its operation from the time of the election of the Federal Government in March 1983, we would not have been able to experience the economic recovery that has taken place.

There is no question that in some industries there would have been major problems and major economic pressures and disruptions. The fact is that this is the first time, probably in Australian history, that we have experienced a dramatic and sustained growth pattern such as that occurring at the moment without the sort of wage inflation pressures that usually accompany it. It is quite unique.

I think far too little regard is had for the reason for it. It is due to the extremely responsible approach taken by the ACTU and the negotiations between the ACTU and the Federal Government which have resulted in a prices and incomes accord that has had widespread support from employer organisations and employers in this country as well. I do not think anyone, whether it be the State Government, the State Opposition, or anyone else who may want to get their oar in or get their name in the paper should interfere in a disruptive way with that process. Obviously, we are certainly looking closely at the development of these discussions between the Federal Government and the trade union movement, and we will do our best to ensure that there is wage stability and that inflation forces are kept to a minimum. But at this stage it is premature to make any pronouncements. It is very easy and very cheap to do so, but when one actually has the responsibility of preserving what is an essential and very fragile element in our economic recovery, one realises that those people not centrally involved should not be having their say until it is appropriate for them to do so.

LIBERAL PARTY POLICIES

Mr MAYES: Can the Deputy Premier advise the House on the likely effect on State Government programmes should a Federal Liberal Government take office and implement the proposals outlined recently by the Federal President of the Liberal Party? I refer to an article in today's *Advertiser* and to statements made by John Valder, Federal President of the Liberal Party. The article, headed 'Liberals' Valder may be in strife again', states:

The Liberal Party's controversial new Federal President, Mr John Valder, appears to have landed in hot water again—

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is asking for a solution to a hypothetical question, and, as such, it should be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. I have considered, first, whether the question is relevant to the Minister's responsibility; and secondly, the hypothetical nature of the question. I therefore ask the honourable member to recast the question, if he can, so that it falls within Standing Orders; otherwise, I shall have to disallow it totally.

Mr MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will recast the question. Can the Deputy Premier advise the House on the impact on State programs should a policy be adopted that would lead to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall have to rule the question out of order. The honourable member for Flinders.

SIMS FARM

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the South Australian Government will honour an undertaking given by the Minister of Agriculture, as a Minister of the Crown, that, if five meetings that he designated gave an undertaking that Eyre Peninsula farmers would forgo new research on Eyre Peninsula, he would transfer Sims farm to the Minister of Education without charge, immediately. On 1 July this year, the Minister of Agriculture gave an undertaking that, if five meetings (three regional meetings of the Eyre Peninsula Agricultural Bureau conference and two meetings of the United Farmers and Stockowners) gave the undertaking to which I have referred, Sims farm would be transferred to the Minister of Education immediately.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter was further considered by Cabinet on Monday on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture, and Cabinet has authorised the Minister to enter into further discussions on the matter. On the outcome of those discussions, further advice will be available to Parliament.

FORESTRY RESERVE

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr GUNN: Yes.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I realise that, in asking for the suspension of Standing Orders, I can only debate the reasons for such suspension. My substantive motion relates to a proclamation (tabled on 16 May) concerning part of a forestry reserve, known as forest reserves in section 665, hundred of Adelaide, County of Adelaide, the area affected being Hawthorndene and Coromandel Valley. Under the Forestry Act, until 1981 there was not so great a difficulty for a member trying to have clarified a proclamation such as this because the Act, until then, provided that, so long as notice of motion had been given for disallowance of the proclamation, the right of the private member was preserved. However, in 1981 new provisions of the Forestry Act were enacted, as follows:

(3) the Governor may, by subsequent proclamation, vary or revoke a proclamation under subsection (1).

The intention of the proclamation to which I refer is to revoke a proclamation in relation to a forest reserve. Section 3(4) of the Act now provides that 'a copy of the proclamation and a statement of the reasons for the proclamation shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament'. Section 4(5) provides:

A proclamation to which subsection (4) applies shall not have effect—

(a) until fourteen sitting days of each House of Parliament have elapsed after a copy of the proclamation is laid before each House; and

(b) if, within those fourteen sitting days a motion for a disallowance of the proclamation is moved—

that is the vital point: 'is moved' as against a notice of motion—

in either House of Parliament—unless and until that motion is defeated or withdrawn, or lapses.

When Parliament passed that law, it ignored the limitations of a private member to take action if it was considered that a proclamation should not go ahead and, consequently, the member could be denied the right to debate the matter. For example, if 14 sitting days are taken up by the debate on the Address in Reply or the Supplementary Estimates (as happened last year), the 14 sitting days could expire before a member could move a motion in the time allocated for private members' business because private members' business cannot be dealt with until after the conclusion of the Address in Reply debate. On average, the maximum amount of time for private members' business is 13 days each year, and usually the time allotted is about 10 days.

This proclamation seeks to alter or revoke a forest reserve proclamation. In particular, the forest reserve falls within an urban community. As yet, I do not know why the Government wishes to revoke the proclamation order, and I cannot debate that matter at this stage. However, it would be of concern to my constituents, and that is one of the reasons why I am trying to get the matter debated now. Some members of the community, which has a forest within its area, see the forest as a frightening enemy waiting to explode and cause destruction by fire. Others see it as an aesthetic beauty, while yet others see it as a great place in which young people can play.

Be that as it may, by bringing on a proclamation on 16 May, on the last sitting day of the Parliament, it is possible, because of the proceedings of Parliament, for a member to be denied the right to move a motion on the issue, or debate it, through the normal channels because such action may be precluded by the Address in Reply debate. Again, the same thing may happen at the end of the Parliamentary session if the Government cuts off the time for private members' business too early and Parliament continues for a couple of weeks. I ask the Government for the opportunity now to debate the necessity or otherwise of this proclamation. If the Government cannot do that, the least I ask is that some ministerial statement be given as to why it wishes to take this course. I ask that the Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion to debate this proclamation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion, and request the support of the House in this matter. The honourable member has just referred to a clear statement from the Government. Whilst he has been addressing the House I have had the opportunity to talk to the Minister of Lands, who has undertaken to give such a clear statement to the House by way of ministerial statement next Tuesday. The forms of the House will then be available to the honourable member, should he wish to make use of them, in the light of that statement. I see no reason to proceed with this matter today and I ask honourable members to join me in opposing the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, S.G. Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Klunder, Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Chapman, Eastick, Ingerson, Lewis, and Wilson. Noes—Messrs M.J. Brown and Craf-ter, Ms Lenehan, and Messrs Payne and Slater.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO STEAMTOWN PETERBOROUGH RAILWAY PRESERVATION SOCIETY INCORPORATED

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the Select Committee appointed by this House on 14 April 1984 have power to continue its sittings during the session and that the time for bringing up its report be extended until Wednesday 11 September.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEES OF PARLIAMENT

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

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Select Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of Parliament and the Joint Select Committee on the Administration of Parliament have power to continue their sittings during the session.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Eastick, Ferguson, Gunn, and Trainer.

Library: The Speaker, Mr Eastick, Ms Lenehan, and Mr Meier.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs D.C. Brown, Ferguson, Mathwin, and Plunkett.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That a committee consisting of Messrs Bannon, Hopgood, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech on opening Parliament and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the adjournment debate because I recently attended the opening of the new water reticulation and desalination plant at Coober Pedy. It was an occasion to which I was looking forward because people in that part of my district have had to pay excessively high water charges in the past. For many years there had not been an adequate water supply and this was something to which they had looked forward to for a long time.

Having been involved in that project since its inception by taking various members of the Progress and Miners Association to meet Ministers, I was looking forward to this important and unique occasion. Indeed, it was one of the best CEP schemes that I had seen. However, the unfortunate thing was that I was invited by the community—the Progress Association—to attend the official opening by the then Deputy Premier (Hon. J.D. Wright). In due course, we arrived in the town and went to the opening. After a wait,

the ceremony got under way and, in the course of his speech, the then Deputy Premier saw fit to attack the Liberal Party and to make charges about the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, he grossly misrepresented our position. It was outrageous behaviour because his claims were so untrue. The interesting thing was the reaction of the community who were very hostile to what the Deputy Premier said. He implied that if Mr Olsen were Premier the project would not have gone ahead. He led the people to believe that the Liberal Party would not spend CEP funds.

The former Deputy Premier, Hon. J.D. Wright, knew that that was not correct, because the Liberal Government in Tasmania and the National Party Government in Queensland availed themselves of those funds. It would have been irresponsible and foolish for them not to do so. If the Federal Government is still spending money in that way when we assume office of course a Liberal Government will spend that money because there are many other projects of this nature that ought to be funded in my electorate and other electorates.

I was delighted that money was provided for the projects in Coffin Bay and Coober Pedy. I approached the Minister of Water Resources, Mr Slater, and asked him to make the necessary arrangements to establish that project west of Ceduna. Unfortunately, that did not take place.

To prove what I say about my involvement in this matter, about which I was gravely misrepresented in what was said because I was involved in it from the very outset, I will read some letters to the House. On 10 February 1983 I received a letter from Mr Eric Malliotis, Chairman of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association in which he said:

If you could please arrange a meeting with the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Local Government for me I would be glad to come to Adelaide to discuss the above project with them.

On 24 February I made arrangements for Mr Malliotis and me to see Mr Williams of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and to have discussions relating to the feasibility of the project. Later that day I took Mr Malliotis to see the then Minister of Local Government, Hon. T.H. Hemmings, and the Assistant Director of his Department, Mr Lewis, because before they could borrow money to have a feasibility study carried out, they needed the permission of the Minister of Local Government. Following that interview permission was granted.

I received a further letter from the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association dated 20 June 1983, which states:

As you know, for the past six months, extensive inquiries were made regarding the water supply in Coober Pedy. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I am sending to the Minister of Water Resources. . . I hope you will be able to arrange a meeting with the Minister in due course for me to come to Adelaide for final discussion with him and the E&WS Director. We have to date all possible information regarding costing of the project. On behalf of the Committee I wish to extend our gratitude for your support on this project.

I was able to make those arrangements, and, on 30 August 1983, a meeting was arranged between the then Deputy Premier, Hon. J.D. Wright, the Minister of Local Government, Hon. G.F. Keneally, Hon. J.W. Slater and Hon. T.H. Hemmings, who met Mr Malliotis, Secretary of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association and Mr Highett. I was represented by the Hon. Peter Dunn MLC because I was overseas at the time. I was advised by my colleague that the deputation was well accepted and that Mr Wright, in particular, was sympathetic.

I wrote to Mr Malliotis on 19 September 1983, after I returned from overseas and after being briefed by my colleague on what had taken place. That letter states:

I have had discussions with the Hon. Peter Dunn, MLC, who went along with you and the deputation in connection with your

water scheme. Peter Dunn said you presented your case very well. He has now taken a personal interest in the matter as well. We are looking forward to the response from the Minister.

The scheme was eventually approved for CEP funding. We all know that the scheme has been completed and that people are having reticulated water connected to their premises. I am delighted about that, and so are my colleagues. To infer that I did not support this scheme, or that under a Liberal Government it would not have gone ahead, is absolute nonsense. I was surprised that the then Deputy Premier, Hon. J.D. Wright, would make such a comment, because it was uncharacteristic of him. In previous dealings with him I had always found him to be a reasonable person.

I was absolutely aghast at having to sit and listen to the speech on the same platform. On these occasions one does not get the right of reply, and I do not blame anyone for that. This is the first opportunity that I have had to put the record straight. It ill behoves Labor Party Ministers to go around the country so misrepresenting the Opposition's stance on this matter and on others.

I hope that I have set the record clear because when we are the Government, if the Commonwealth Government is still funding CEP projects, we will certainly make use of those funds. I have a number of projects in my electorate that ought to be funded. I repeat: spending money on water reticulation schemes is creating projects that will be of lasting benefit. They are the sorts of projects that ought to be funded rather than minor matters.

It has become very apparent over the past few weeks that the Labor Party Government will misrepresent on every possible occasion the policy of the Liberal Party. I have been amazed at how ignorant of the facts it is or that it has embarked on a campaign of total misrepresentation about privatisation, deregulation and responsible funding. We recognise that the Government does not have an unlimited amount of money, but if we are to be in a position to fund those necessary projects it has to be a matter of priorities. It is the role of the Government to determine those priorities, not to indicate that members opposite should not approach Ministers with matters of concern to their electorates.

The misrepresentation in relation to privatisation and deregulation has been scurrilous. It ill behoves the present Deputy Premier (the member for Baudin) to carry on in that vein. I was surprised today that Government Ministers were so economically barren in their approach that they had to refer vaguely to the policies of the Thatcher Government. They ought to know that we are discussing South Australia and the responsibility that the State Government has. Members opposite ridiculed the Tonkin Government when it set about getting rid of red tape. Belatedly, at the eleventh hour, they are picking up that programme. There are pages of regulation and proclamations in other areas of Government red tape that ought to be got rid of.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I raise a matter that has been of considerable concern to me over many years. It does not only involve constituents within my electorate, but it could be seen as a problem to do with the health of people in South Australia. I refer specifically to a matter that relates to the quality of the water in the waterway at West Lakes. As members on both sides would be aware, ever since I came to this place I have continually raised matters that I believe are pertinent to constituents within my electorate—Football Park, the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, the Hawkesbury Reserve, the extension of West Lakes Boulevard, or the relocation of Allied Engineering—all matters that have been controversial over a

number of years. I am proud to say that, with the assistance of this Government, all those matters, with the exception of West Lakes Boulevard, which is programmed for the next financial year, I understand, have satisfactorily been resolved.

It is with some disappointment that I have to raise this matter here today in terms of the criticism that has been levelled at me by the Manager of the company that is developing that area. The matter in question is the influx of stormwater drainage into the waterway at West Lakes after heavy rains. I have taken on this matter over some years. Many of us will recall that in 1983, after we had floods, a considerable amount of water went down the Port Road, in particular, from Hindmarsh right through the stormwater drains to Port Adelaide, flowing into the waterway at West Lakes.

Soon after that, there was a scare in the waterway at West Lakes, and fish were found dead. As a consequence, I received numerous representations in my office from local residents expressing concern about the reasons why the fish had died. As a result I wrote to the Minister at the time and received on 12 May a letter from the Minister of Fisheries regarding the toxic algae in the lake. He stated:

Monitoring of the level of toxic algae is continuing and it is difficult to speculate on when the population will be down to a safe level, although it may only be a matter of days. When a clearance can be given, wide publicity will be undertaken.

Meanwhile normal recreational use of waters can continue and the only advice is to avoid consumption of marine life taken upstream of the Torrens Island Power Station.

He goes on to say (and this is very important):

... waters which can be land-locked, even temporarily, are prone to sudden environmental changes that affect marine life. In this case the population of the poisonous algae *goniaulax*, along with other algal species, increased rapidly when recent rains washed debris into West Lakes and raised the nutrient level.

I distributed that information throughout my electorate to those people affected in and around the waterway. Recently I was in contact with the local Messenger Press and was talking to a reporter. I said that I was pursuing an issue involving the waterway and that representations had been made to me that boards be placed in the vicinity of the five stormwater inlets into that waterway, it being feared that these areas may pose a problem to health after an influx of stormwater from those drains. That article appeared in the *Messenger* on 24 July, under the heading 'Protest at lake pollution', and stated:

West Lakes residents want Woodville Council to erect signs to warn people that lake water is a health hazard after heavy rains.

The article continued:

A councillor, in a recent council report, stated that people could run the risk of ecoli, salmonella or hepatitis infection from swimming in the lake.

I was very concerned about that, and I wrote to the Minister on three occasions about this issue. I am concerned that there may be a problem to public health with an influx of stormwater into the waterway and around that specific area. That was all I was alluding to in relation to my request.

It was disappointing to see that Mr Brian Martin (Managing Director of Delfin Property Management), in an article in yesterday's *Weekly Times*, implied criticism of my actions. I regret that he has taken that course of action, I regret very much indeed that he has chosen to make that statement because, accompanying his letter to the Editor, is a report which states:

Water in West Lakes is contaminated near stormwater drains after heavy rains, and Woodville council should erect signs to warn the public of possible health risks. These are the major findings of a report by the local board of health, tabled at the last meeting of Woodville council. Council made no decision on the report. Called the 'Inland Water Quality Report', it was compiled amid calls by West Lakes residents for council to erect warning signs that the water was a health hazard at times.

As I have said, Mr Brian Martin, Managing Director of the Delfin Property Group, implied criticism of my actions.

However, it is interesting to read the last paragraph of his letter to the Editor in which he said, 'I consider the West Lakes waterway to be extremely safer. I intend personally to continue to use it and swim in it, and I suggest that other people should have no hesitation in doing the same, the only qualification being that for one or two days after heavy rain, I would not swim in inshore waters of the gulf; I would treat West Lakes similarly.' That is all I was talking about. However, it has concerned me sufficiently last week and again today to speak to the Minister in an effort to try to sort out this problem. It is one on which I have very strong feelings in terms of the question of public health.

In previous correspondence that I have had from the Minister, the question has been raised where there have been large influxes of stormwater drainage into that waterway and where it has been recommended that people not use shellfish in and around the vicinity of those areas. The Minister himself, going back to 21 December 1983, said in part (and because of time I cannot quote it all):

It may be prudent not to swim in the waters of the lake in the vicinity of stormwater outlets for some days following times of substantial stormwater intake.

I believe that, the sooner the representatives of Delfin management, the Woodville council and I meet with the Minister and a representative of the Department of Health to clear up this matter once and for all, the better it will be for everyone concerned down there.

However, I make no apology for raising this matter in a public forum because, as has been my wont ever since I have been in Parliament, it is my intention to keep my constituents informed at all times, irrespective of how controversial those matters may be.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to bring to the attention of this House a situation as it applies to the Government and the way in which it is running scared at present. Probably people can understand that because it is leading into an election, perhaps at the end of this year but certainly by the beginning of next year. It is interesting to see some sections of the media saying that their Leader, their Premier, Mr Bannon, has not done anything wrong. I suppose I could agree with that in one sense by saying that he has done everything wrong since he took over. I will explain that a bit because I think that as Leader the Premier is responsible for what his Government is doing.

His Government has a very, very poor record. If one looks at agriculture, the rural sector, the sector of which we have heard a lot of late, both at State and Federal levels, one sees what the Premier's spokesman, the Hon. Mr Blevins, the Minister of Agriculture, did. He got stuck into those farmers. He had no compassion for them at a time when those farmers were looking to the Government for, at the very least, some sort of communication, preferably some sort of assistance, although they are not looking for hand-outs.

The Hon. H. Allison: He told them off.

Mr MEIER: He told them off in no uncertain terms. Wherever I go in my electorate people still say to me that they cannot get over the way in which Mr Blevins attacked them at their march earlier this year. Why should they have been subjected to such an attack? He is one spokesperson for the Government. However, we have in the Chamber the Deputy Premier and Minister for Environment and Planning, so I mention the vegetation botch up, or shall I

say the vegetation clearance controls. This problem has been going on year after year.

The Hon. H. Allison: *Blue Hills!*

Mr MEIER: It is a bit like *Blue Hills*. I suppose it would be competing on the stakes for the length of running time. Unfortunately, this matter is serious. Farmers who have problems with vegetation clearance are fed up to the hilt. They cannot wait for the change of Government. The only positive thing I can give to some of my constituents is to say that possibly the Government might try to come up with something. However, everything that has been suggested by various committees has been knocked on the head by the Minister for Environment and Planning. I tell them that when the Liberal Party gains Government later this year we will at least be able to resolve that situation. Then, my constituents will be able to get on to their land because our policy, which has already been enunciated by the shadow Minister of Agriculture, is a clear, concise and common-sense approach. Those two Ministers are botching things up.

We heard the member for Eyre give a little dissertation on the water reticulation scheme in his electorate. Certain accusations were made implying that apparently he was not doing the right thing trying to promote the water scheme. What a joke! His constituents have merely to read *Hansard* to see that time after time Mr Gunn, as their member, has continually pushed for water reticulation schemes in his area. I, too, have endeavoured to do similar things, not so much in the House but through written correspondence and deputations. However, we have got nowhere.

It is very disturbing for communities such as Watervale, Balgowan, Moorowie and Hardwicke Bay not to have any reticulated water and for the Government to say to them, 'Look, if you want it, you pay for it.' What sort of payment are we looking at—hundreds of thousands of dollars. Of course, they cannot afford it—not only in those areas but in newly developing areas such as Two Wells, and even in settled areas such as Virginia.

My continual representations are met, in most cases, with 'No'. I see that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee is in the Chamber, so I mention an exception—the new Dublin pipeline. I give credit where credit is due, because at least that project will help certain members of the public, although it is recognised to be mainly for live sheep export. Then, we saw the new Minister appointed. I daresay that the member for Hartley was bitterly disappointed, as were a few others who were unable to reach Ministerial status.

Although we could debate that matter we could also ask why the Government has taken Ministers out of the Lower House and put them into the Upper House, which is a negative and a bad move. Be that as it may, the Hon. Barbara Wiese has become, amongst other things, Minister of Youth Affairs. What a start! I was amazed that the Premier did not sack her within one week of her appointment because she used a youth convention not to put Government policy, as she may have done, but to attack the Opposition policy on youth. I have been to many functions at which Ministers of this Government have spoken. Whether or not we have agreed with what they have said,

we have accepted it. However, I have never heard a Minister attack Opposition policies publicly at such a function. Here was a new Minister who decided to use her power—

Mr Trainer: You haven't got any policies.

Mr MEIER: It shows how out of date the honourable member is. The poor old Government does not even realise that the Liberal Party has released its youth policy. Its members are so self-centred that they think that they are destined to lead. We will be happy to provide the Government with a copy of our youth policy. It is time that the Government woke up, because it is so far in the dungeons. I realise that many Government members are worried stiff and think that, if they can hang on for a few more weeks in their electorate, they will still be there. However, I have counted up the number of members who will not be with us after the next election, and it is quite a few.

We could go on. The Government is running scared. We should not forget that Mr Bannon, as Premier, is running scared because his Ministers have been mucking things up, probably through no fault of their own. The Government's policies and the way it is going about things indicate it does not know how to run this State. I was amused to hear earlier statements today trying to put forward positive things for South Australia. Unfortunately, South Australia is losing and has been losing for a long time—over 2½ years—since this Government came to power.

We should not forget that South Australia is becoming the highest tax State in Australia, when previously it was the lowest tax State. I hope that the people of South Australia will not forget that.

Earlier it was mentioned that privatisation was a part of the Liberal Party's platform and policy in certain areas. It is, but it is very disturbing that certain Government industries are using privatisation to rally their members to vote against the Liberal Party. I cite as an example the printing industry. Mr Acting Speaker, you will be aware of this industry. A rumour went around that the Government Printer was fifth on the hit list of the group that was to be privatised by the Liberal Government. I told the person who reported that to me that I had never heard that, but would check it for him. I checked it out and no-one in the Liberal Party—neither our Leader nor anyone else—had even thought of it. The rumourmongering is becoming very disturbing.

I hope that Government members do their best to ensure that nothing along those lines occurs again. The person who reported that to me said that he believed that originally the Government Printer was No. 14 on the hit list but had been brought forward to No. 5. That matter proved to be completely untrue. It was also reported to me that at every election that comes up the Labor Party and its supporters go around trying to scaremonger and say, 'Do you know what will happen if a Liberal Government gets in? You will lose your job because it will privatise you.' They are not saying that, if there is privatisation, those employees will become part of the company and will seek to gain. The truth is being completely distorted. I hope that South Australians will realise the scaremongering that is occurring.

Motion carried.

At 4.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 6 August at 2 p.m.