HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 November 1986

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The motion that the Leader of the Opposition intends to move is the same as the motion of which I have given notice, and for that reason I will stand aside and allow the Leader to come first. I do not wish to continue with my Notice of Motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to indicate whether or not he intends to proceed with his motion. If he does not intend to proceed, after indicating that, he should immediately resume his seat.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Thank you, Sir—I will say it again: I do not intend to proceed with my Notice of Motion.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is as simple as it is significant. It simply seeks to reflect the significant community outrage over the proposal to introduce on-the-spot fines for marijuana possession. It simply seeks to ensure that the significant opposition within this Parliament to that measure is allowed to be truly and fairly reflected in the vote of this House and another place. It simply seeks to ensure that the significant potential for harm to be done, particularly to young South Australians, by relaxing laws relating to marijuana is avoided.

I have not the slightest doubt that, if all members of this Parliament are allowed to vote in the way their conscience dictates, this Bill will pass. It is a matter which spills across Party lines. I put it forward in the hope that it will continue to receive some bipartisan support in the Parliament. In that spirit, I will not return the abuse to which the Liberal Party has been subjected by the Premier and the Minister of Health over this matter.

We have done nothing more than the Minister of State Development and Technology, the member for Playford, the member for Price, and possibly the member for Gilles. We have looked at the measure particularly from the point of view of how it will affect young South Australians. We have come to the conclusion, as a result, that we must do everything within our power to ensure that young South Australians are not encouraged to believe that the use of marijuana is not harmful. It is as simple as that.

Let us not detract one iota from the Controlled Substances Act, which in every other aspect is good legislation and for which the Liberal Party has commended the Government. The Liberal Party, particularly through the shadow Attorney-General, has also made its own constructive contribution to this measure by proposing a range of increased penalties which the Government accepted. In the continuing debate on the question of on-the-spot fines, the proponents for change have rested their case heavily on the Sackville royal commission. However, there have been more contemporary findings, based on more comprehensive evidence and investigation.

I refer in particular to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs, headed by Mr Justice Williams. This report was made public in 1980. It was a commission appointed by the Commonwealth and the State Governments of Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, and Tasmania. It had the advantage of reviewing much of the information and evidence upon which the Sackville commission based its findings. Mr Justice Williams made the following comments about the Sackville report:

> Many difficulties would arise as a consequence of adopting the approach of the South Australian Commission. The criminal law will not be greatly removed from the scene because the exception in favour of personal use is rather narrow. It will therefore be necessary for policing of cannabis use to continue, not only in relation to the prohibited oil, but also in relation to cannabis leaf and resin. There would be considerable problems arising in deciding whether the cultivator was cultivating plants for his personal use or the personal use of any other member of his household over the age of 18 years who was not producing cannabis for his personal use.
>
> What is the limit of personal use? Will people desirous of making money and not averse to cannabis use, but who do not use cannabis themselves, take advantage of a provision such as this to produce cannabis for secret sale to other persons? Even if there is an effort to maintain by Government a policy of discouraging cannabis use, it is difficult to see how this can be effected when youth and immature people see their neighbours growing and using cannabis. This commission does not believe that the policy of partial prohibition will significantly reduce the black market in cannabis products or the amount of public money presently spent on police activity.

These comments by an eminent Royal Commissioner effectively repudiate every reason put forward in support of introducing on-the-spot fines for marijuana possession.

The Government has claimed such a move would: allow a redevelopment of police resources to pursue traffickers in harder drugs; streamline the administration of the law; discourage a black market; and not encourage more people to try marijuana. Mr Justice Williams found exactly the opposite on each of these basic points. As a preliminary to its recommendations, the royal commission made the following conclusions; that cannabis is a drug with a capacity to cause harm; that cannabis will always remain an intoxicating drug; that time may show that the harmful effect on the user and on the community are greater or less than present research has thus far established.

Accordingly, Mr Justice Williams recommended that no relaxation of the present Australian prohibition on cannabis be made for 10 years from the commencement of the operation of drug information centres which the Commissioner recommended should be established; and that, at the expiration of the 10 years, the legal prohibition against cannabis be reviewed by the Commonwealth and State Governments acting in concert.

We are still five years away from the deadline set by Mr Justice Williams for that review. The intent of the Williams recommendation was taken up at last year's Drug Summit. There was an agreement that on this matter the States should act uniformly. There was an agreement not to relax the laws relating to marijuana—an agreement between the Prime Minister and all the State Premiers. Unfortunately, our Premier decided to break away from that national approach. He has given no good or sound reason for doing so.

During the whole course of this debate, those Government members who support the introduction of on-the-spot fines for personal possession of marijuana have failed—conspicuously and comprehensively—to produce any evidence to justify their point of view. Apart from the Minister responsible for the Bill, only two other Government mem-

bers spoke to it during the debate in this House, and one of them opposed the measure that is now under further consideration. In another place, no Government member other than the Minister of Health spoke to the Bill.

Liberal members, on the other hand, have accepted their responsibility to justify their point of view with detailed argument, as have all the other non-government members. The weight of that argument is, without doubt, on the side of those who believe that nothing should be done to relax the laws relating to marijuana possession because of the harm that this drug can do.

I refer, for example, to a recent study by the United States National Institute of Drug Abuse, which found as follows: 28 per cent of people who smoke pot daily turn to harder drugs such as heroin and cocaine; marijuana is about five times more addictive than alcohol; one gram of marijuana has 50 per cent more cancer causing substances than one gram of cigarette tobacco; women who smoke marijuana during pregnancy are five times more likely to have babies with facial disfiguration than women who do not; short-term memory impairment and slowness of learning; impaired immune response; interference with ovulation and prenatal development; and decreased sperm count and sperm mobility.

The findings of more recent research have been published in the July issue of the *Medical Journal of Australia*. This research was undertaken by the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University. It examined the toxicological properties and epidemiological aspects of cannabis. Regarding acute effects on the brain, the following finding was made:

> Besides giving rise to acute and transient mental disturbances such as temporal disorganisation of the patient, cannabis can produce flashbacks. Such adverse mental reactions raise the question of the long-term psychotogenic potential of the drug.

Regarding driving impairment, the following finding was made:

> Driving skills and performance are impaired by cannabis. There is no test available to document the driving impairment that is caused by cannabis by the measurement of THC levels in plasma. The drug leaves the central compartment and reaches concentrations of a few nanograms per millilitre within an hour, and this is insufficient to establish actual intoxication with certainty.

Just departing from these findings for a moment to further consider this question that driving, alcohol and marijuana when combined are a lethal cocktail for drivers, it is believed that marijuana accelerates by four times the effects of drinking. Yet there is no test available for marijuana in South Australia, and the police have no power to test for drugs, which is a very dangerous and inadequate situation.

Returning to the research findings from Columbia University, in relation to the effects of marijuana on respiratory and cardiac function, they state:

> Experimentally, marijuana smoke induces malignant transformation in lung explants and impairs the bactericidal activity of lung macrophages to a greater extent than does tobacco smoke.

Regarding reproductive function, the findings state:

> In experimental animals, exposure to cannabis has been associated with disruptive effects on all phases of gonadal and reproductive function by the direct action of the drug . . . In humans, marijuana smoking has also be associated with an increased prevalence of abnormal sperm cells.

In relation to long-term effects on brain and behaviour they state:

> The increased incidence of mental illness that is caused by the use of cannabis has been reported consistently over the past 2 000 years throughout the historical and medical literature.
>
> Cannabis intoxication has the most serious adverse effects in adolescents (12-18 year olds) who are attempting to structure their personalities. The amount of evidence that is available on the negative impact of cannabis on mental health is growing and should be a matter of serious concern.

I now refer to cannabis addiction and dependence. They state:

> The addictive, dependence producing potential of cannabis is still debated, and many people readily assume that cannabis is not an addictive drug and that the question of dependence has been settled negatively. This position should be revised in view of the older historical reports and recent scientific observations that cannabis is dependence producing and has a significant potential for abuse.
>
> It is on the basis of such reports that cannabis was classified, by the League of Nations and the United Nations Conventions of 1923 and 1960, respectively, among the dependence producing drugs which were to be restricted to medical and scientific purposes.

In one of its conclusions, this research also warned:

> The popular classification of cannabis as a 'soft' drug is misleading in view of the acute and chronic adverse effects that are associated with its use.

Even more recent research is available in Australia on the potential harm that marijuana can cause. Only yesterday, the results were revealed of a study by researchers at Melbourne University. It found that users of marijuana suffered minor but permanent brain damage—that they took longer to learn new information and showed evidence of impaired memory compared with non-users. One of the researchers, Ms Rosemary Lyndall, said that the study cast doubt on claims by those in favour of legalising marijuana that the active ingredient of cannabis, THC, had not been clearly shown to produce any long-term ill-effects.

Compounding the concern which this study must cause are the emerging facts about the increasing potency of marijuana. These facts must force a rethink of the popular notion that there are soft drugs and hard drugs—that some drugs are less harmful than others. This notion ignores drug potency and ignores the fact that some forms of marijuana can now be as potent as hashish; and the penalties under the Government's policy also ignore this. They seek to encompass substances which could vary by as much as 300 times in their potency.

The drug problem needs to be seen in a much wider perspective than soft and hard. Of more relevance are potency, frequency of use, the physical and mental health of the user and whether or not one drug is being used alone or in conjunction with other substances or alcohol. Seen in this way, the Australian problem relates much more to multi drug use than it does to soft or hard drugs. Accepted in this way, there can be only one conclusion—that any move to make the use of marijuana lawful must be harmful to the community generally because of its potential to significantly increase not only the use of that drug but others as well.

The supporters of on-the-spot fines rest much of their case on the contention that it will not increase the use of marijuana. But that is not what the Sackville commission found. It stated, at page 309 of its report, that there would be an increase in use of marijuana in any relaxation of penalties for private use and that such an increase 'is likely to include a higher rate of intensive or otherwise irresponsible use.' On this point as well, Mr Justice Williams had this to say:

> There are a lot of persons in the community who generally obey laws without having to reach a conclusion that the law is good rather than bad. There are a lot of persons who obey laws even though they do not accept that the law is a good law.
>
> These people would correctly interpret a relaxation of the prohibition of cannabis as an approval of its use, except under special circumstances. On the other hand, among people in the community who are not disposed to obey a law unless positively satisfied that it is a good law, there will remain a number who are never to be satisfied until all restrictions and prohibitions on the drug are removed.

I share this concern about, if you like, the 'hole in the dyke', the likelihood that, if on-the-spot fines for marijuana were

introduced, the pressure would continue to remove all restrictions relating to the personal use of marijuana within our community.

Those who advocate relaxation have the responsibility to justify it. They have failed to do so. On the other hand, the evidence against any relaxation continues to mount. Notwithstanding this, in the end, all members of Parliament have a duty to represent the view of their electors. And on this issue I suggest that the matter is not in doubt. There is overwhelming community opposition. It is not based on irrational or emotional response. Rather, it reflects calm, cool concerned assessment of the drug scene.

There has not been an issue since the dismissal of Police Commissioner Harold Salisbury which has stirred up the community so much. Those who deny or decry these concerns do the general community an insult, as the member for Mawson does by interjecting. They are concerns which are deeply, widely and genuinely held within the community. They have not been suddenly whipped up. Proposals to effectively decriminalise personal use of marijuana have been mounted in South Australia for almost a decade. The reasons remain strong and substantial for resisting any relaxation.

They include: the continuing evidence that marijuana is harmful; the likelihood that *de facto* decriminalisation will encourage more use of marijuana, particularly by young people; the difficulties in policing the law, meaning that more police resources, rather than less, with be required to administer this law. For these simple but sound reasons I urge the House to support this Bill, which has a simple clause.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 45 of the Act relating to the introduction of expiation fees for cannabis offences in South Australia.

I urge Government members to support the repeal of clause 8 of the Controlled Substances Act recently passed in this Parliament. I urge them to join the Liberal Party, the National Party, the independent members, parents, primary school principals and teachers, church leaders, service organisations—the vast majority of South Australians—to prevent the introduction of on-the-spot fines for possession of marijuana in South Australia.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the likely social and economic impact of electronic gaming devices (including Club Keno and poker machines) on the community.

(Continued from 21 August. Page 542.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Last weekend I had an opportunity to visit two of the licensed clubs in Sydney. I was advised that, of the people attending those licensed clubs which have electronic gaming devices, approximately 18 per cent play those electronic devices or use them as entertainment. The 1986 Annual Report of the Manly/Warringah Rugby League Club lists a number of sport and recreation organisations attached to that club's operations. I think that it is significant to note that the licensed clubs in New South Wales play a very important community role and benefit the community: facilities provided for the members are sponsored and supported very strongly by the amount of money invested in electronic gaming devices.

The Manly/Warringah League Club for the financial year ended 30 June 1986 had a total income of $8.5 million: and $6.2 million was net profit from the poker machine trade. The club paid $1.8 million in wages; $2 million in rates, taxes, insurance and licence fees; $750 000 for free entertainment for members; $62 000 to the football club; $400 000 to assist the rugby league; and $288 000 in income taxes.

That club has within its premises a baseball club with a men's competition every Saturday; a cricket team, in the local hard wicket competition; a pigeon club flying every week during the season; a squash club—and I do not know how many people enter the club and play squash on Saturday afternoons as they have superb squash courts; tennis club; Tai Chi club, which meets every Tuesday and Thursday; a chess club, which meets weekly; snooker is played every Monday night; ladies bowls and darts are played every Monday night; ladies and gents mixed bowls and darts club; euchre; bridge; art classes; toastmasters; theatrical society; ladies golf; men's golf; swimming club; camera club; darts club; fishing club; stamp club; debating club; jazz ballet; and yoga classes. That gives some idea of the involvement available for members.

The same club provided 15 scholarships to high schools and technical colleges last financial year. They were quite significant scholarships valued at $800 each in some instances and $400 each in others. The support that these clubs give the community and their members for a very small annual membership fee results in the average worker who is a member participating in benefits not provided by any club in this State. I find it difficult to understand how those who oppose the calling of an inquiry into the economic and social impact of electronic gaming devices can sustain their argument when one can see advantages for workers in this State.

I also visited the Harbord Diggers Memorial Club, an RSL club, as a comparison—I thought that I would go from a football club to an RSL club. Again, I found the same level of participation and support. That club has about half the turnover of the league club, but again it has a huge volume of sporting, recreation and entertainment activities. It is these facilities that are provided in many instances free of cost that are the benefits to members. I also visited the North Sydney Leagues club. It was the first time that I had an opportunity in the past few years to visit these clubs. In Sydney I found the TAB had established agencies in various licensed clubs. At the North Sydney Leagues club there was one machine in operation as the TAB agency which was well set up in a large lounge with a large TV screen giving a direct telecast of Melbourne and Sydney races; instant betting figures and odds were also displayed. It was conducted in a very cosy and comfortable atmosphere.

So, if the TAB fears any problems as far as the poker machines or electronic gaming devices in South Australia are concerned, I think it should look very closely at establishing agencies in our large licensed clubs. I am quite sure that during the football season, for a start, league football clubs in South Australia could be the first area for the TAB to look at. But, certainly, there was no betting shop atmosphere such as that which existed at Port Pirie and so on in years gone by in South Australia. So, certainly there would be advantages for both the clubs and the TAB to have a look at these sorts of ventures. As I said, of the total number of people attending licensed clubs, only 18 per cent use the poker machines as entertainment; the rest are participating in many other avenues in the operation of the clubs.

Again, allegations and statements have been made that if we have poker machines the public at large will invest all their money and it will all go down the drain. I have some

statistics that prove that that is incorrect. Touche Ross and Company has undertaken a considerable amount of research for the licensed clubs in South Australia. It has discovered that in New South Wales in 1984-85 the average weekly per capita income before tax was $182.31, and the weekly per capita expenditure on poker machines was $1.06. The poker machine expenditure as a percentage of average weekly per capita income before tax was 0.58. In the Australian Capital Territory, the weekly per capita poker machine expenditure was 88c, and as a percentage it was 0.37.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: To make any allegations of any skimming off or creaming off is a reflection on all licensed clubs, and a reflection on the New South Wales Government; it is a very serious allegation. The only way that the honourable member could ever sustain such a statement would be to support the call for an inquiry, so that we can establish an inquiry and we can go there and—

Mr Ferguson: Just read the Victorian Royal Commission findings.

Mr BECKER: I do not have to do that—I have already done it. I suggest to the honourable member that he look at the committee of inquiry that was set up in the Australian Capital Territory by the Federal Labor Government and find out what the findings were. The Hawke Labor Government set up that inquiry, and it has supported the licensed clubs in the Australian Capital Territory. I have already said that the inquiry in Victoria was unfair, because the whole thing was damaged by the appearance of a chap by the name of Vibert, who was a pretty unsavoury sort of character. So the whole thing was clouded; there was all sorts of innuendo. So far as the Victorian inquiry is concerned, I cannot accept it, and I would not place any credence on it at all. It became so emotional that rational discussion went out the window. But, of course, that is what one finds that the churches hang their hat on—anything but the truth. So, do not come that argument with me—you will not get anywhere whatsoever.

Based on the figures for expenditure on gambling, Touche Ross has found that in New South Wales for the financial year 1984-85 the per capita investment on gambling was $97.08. These are interesting figures. In New South Wales, per person $18.13 was spent on the TAB; $3.95 on the on-course totalizator; and $4.57 with bookmakers. The total amount spent on racing was $26.65. In relation to gaming, the amount per capita spent on the State lottery was $1.85; and $3.51 was spent on the instant lottery. We must remember that apart from the Lotteries Commission we have all these little instant cash tickets that one can buy around the city at 25c a time, for which there is no accountability, and one has no idea to what extent the community is being ripped off in that regard.

One large promoter hoped to turn over $1 million this year. This is in relation to instant cash tickets for which there is no accountability. It is the biggest ripoff going on in the community today, and no-one is doing a damn thing about it. For lotto, the real per capita expenditure per annum in New South Wales is $9.09; for pools it is 52c; and for poker machines it is $55.46, and that comes out at $1.06, as I said, weekly expenditure. The total for gaming in New South Wales is an average of $70.45.

In South Australia the average citizen spends $10.36 on the TAB; $2.35 on the on-course totalizator; $3.55 on bookmakers; with a total racing expenditure of $16.48. In South Australia, on lotteries, through the South Australian Lotteries Commission, the expenditure is 49c. On X-Lotto the sum is $6.64; on instant money it is $3.44; on pools it is 40c; but for bingo and small lotteries—this is really the one—the expenditure is $10.21 a head. As I have said, that area, plus the instant money games, needs to be closely looked at in regard to accountability. The total gaming expenditure is $21.18, and total gambling in South Australia is $37.66.

Therefore, to say that there is not support for the use of poker machines in South Australia is false. A survey was undertaken in the metropolitan area by McGregor Harrison in January 1986 indicating strong support for poker machines in South Australian licensed clubs. Another survey was undertaken in the country in July and when the figures are put together—and one would expect to get a conservative vote in the country—the Statewide result was that 55.4 per cent agreed with the establishment of poker machines in South Australia, 33.6 per cent disagreed, and 11 per did not know. If one divides the 11 per cent who do not know one can assume that close to 60 per cent of the people in South Australia would support the establishment of electronic gaming devices-club—keno or poker machines—in South Australia.

It is interesting to note that those who are opposed to it use the Bjelke-Petersen mentality that 33 per cent comprise the majority. It is not: they are totally in the minority in this case. The figures of which members should be aware, and certainly members in marginal seats, in the metropolitan area, are that in the 18 to 24 years age group, 82.9 per cent agreed with poker machines for South Australia. Almost 83 per cent of the population aged 18 to 24 support this move while 11.4 per cent disagree and 5.7 per cent do not know. The 18 to 24 year old residents in, for instance, the district of the member for Semaphore support the introduction of poker machines to licensed clubs in South Australia.

In the country, 75 per cent of people aged 18 to 24 support poker machines, 22 per cent disagree and 3 per cent do not know. That proves conclusively that there is a considerable amount of support within the community. We certainly know that the people who are retired and who travel frequently from this State to Queensland through New South Wales visit licensed clubs on their way and participate in the use of electronic gaming devices.

The Government is committed in some respects to supporting poker machines for the casino. It would be a tragedy if the casino operator was allowed to be the sole operator of poker machines in South Australia. It would be totally unfair: it would be a bitter blow to the licensed club industry, which presently has a limited ability to provide employment.

Given the opportunity to expand its operations, as occurs in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory, one would find a whole new area of employment opportunities opening up, and sport and recreation development would take off, especially in country regions. We must create the opportunity for development and for the growth of tourism, which is labour intensive. It may be ironic that licensed clubs and gambling should be used to provide those facilities, but this has occurred in New South Wales and, although these devices may have had a chequered career in that State, members have an opportunity here to establish an inquiry and use their talents and spare time to thoroughly investigate this issue.

As I indicated to the member for Semaphore recently, I hope that the select committee will be large and incorporate one or two Independent members so that it has a good cross-section of representation from this Parliament. In South Australia we have the unique opportunity to thoroughly discuss the issues before bringing in legislation. If legislation is considered, an economic impact statement should be the

first step. This is a good means of having a rational look at the establishment of electronic gaming devices and poker machines in South Australia, and I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING LOAN INTEREST RATES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its incompetence in failing to take appropriate action to reduce housing loan interest rates.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 989.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I am disappointed about the inaccuracy of the predictions made in the Federal budget and earlier this year by Westpac (a bank I have come to respect over many years) and other economists that interest rates, particularly housing loan interest rates, would fall in South Australia. The actions taken by the Federal Government before and since the Keating budget have made it extremely difficult for financial institutions in this country to reduce interest rates to such a level as would benefit younger people. I know that this matter is a disappointment to some members of the Government as well. However, very little is being done about it. Until interest rates fall, stimulation of the housing industry, and the building of new homes will be extremely difficult. That, in itself, restricts the opportunity to create further employment.

On 28 October the *Australian* informed us that the deteriorating trade deficit and depreciation of the Australian dollar helped swell the country's foreign debt to $90 billion at the end of June. That figure drives the nail into the coffin as far as a prompt economic recovery in this country is concerned. The Federal and State Governments have the solution, that is, to reduce the amount of money they take from the community and reduce the huge level of borrowings. We have seen this occur with the South Australian Financing Authority, and, even though it has been overseas and borrowed some money at cheap rates, it is not game to bring that money back to South Australia because of the huge commitment in repaying such moneys.

In eight or nine years time the day of reckoning must come for South Australia. This system of continuous borrowing is never ending, removing any incentives to provide housing accommodation in Australia. The great Australian dream is slowly sinking with the performance of the Federal Government and the so-called economic recovery has been so slow and so dogged with problems that I believe prompt action must be taken to get things moving in respect of housing interest rates. I do not support deregulation of the 13.5 per cent interest rate—that has to remain. I am told that the banks will lose money, but I do not think they are losing too much, if any, because they receive substantial sums and pay only 3.75 per cent interest, or less. A lot of money is held in banks upon which no interest is paid.

The solution is in the hands of the Reserve Bank as well as the Federal Government and the State Government. The message should be broadcast that what is happening is absolute economic suicide. I believe that this Parliament should take the initiative and advise the Federal Government that we are not happy that 400 000 people are living in portable homes in Australia; that a record number of South Australians (about 40 000) are on the Housing Trust waiting list, that rents are still increasing at unprecedented levels, and that people who are unable to meet commercial rental commitments continuously seek support from the Emergency Housing Office and the Department for Community Welfare. In other words, people have become dependent upon handouts from State Government coffers to keep meeting their rental payments, and some South Australian Housing Trust tenants are in arears in their rents, but this applies more so in the private market.

The Government is not doing anything about the problem. Until we can reduce interest rates and we can build affordable accommodation, there will be a whole new generation of people who are dependent on the commercial and Government sectors to provide cheap rental accommodation, and then the Government will have to subsidise these people because they cannot afford even the cheap rents. It is absolute economic suicide, and it is soul destroying for the people concerned as well as the housing industry. All we can do is continuously reiterate to Governments that they must reduce interest rates and that their priority must be to reduce housing loan interest rates.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I second the motion, as it raises a very important issue about which we should all be concerned. It is one of the issues creating problems for Governments and private individuals in the housing area. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HOME OWNERSHIP

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Lenehan:

That this House congratulates the Government and the South Australian Housing Trust, in conjunction with all participating lending institutions, for developing mechanisms by which low and middle income earners are able to achieve their aspirations for home ownership.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1223.)

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I wish to continue my remarks from 25 September. I am quite sure, given the speech we have just heard from the member for Hanson, that he will certainly support this motion.

On 25 September I outlined in some detail exactly what the Home Trust Shared Ownership scheme is all about. In fact, I incorporated into *Hansard* a table showing the weekly outgoings of a participant who would be involved in this scheme where the house price would be $60 000. To refresh members' memories, I highlight very quickly a number of points that it is important to make with respect to this scheme. Members would be aware that it is a most innovative scheme. In fact, this is the first time that such a scheme has been implemented anywhere in Australia. I am told that trust tenants are indicating a good deal of interest, and I point out that the scheme is available only to people who pay the full rent for a trust home outside the inner metropolitan area. The scheme provides an opportunity for such tenants to buy a share of their trust home starting with a minimum of 25 per cent.

In my last address I referred to the conditions that would apply and the benefits, and I reiterate that one of the benefits is that, in encouraging trust tenants to purchase a share in the ownership of their home, we are giving people an opportunity to participate in home ownership which has previously been denied to them. I would also like to point out that this scheme will provide increased revenue for the trust to continue its building program, which, as the member for Hanson has pointed out, is vital if we are to do something about reducing the waiting list of about 40 000 applications and 100 000 tenants.

Once again, I congratulate the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. Terry Hemmings) and the Government for introducing this scheme. It will certainly benefit people in my district. I am delighted that such a scheme has been introduced. I refer also to that part of my motion calling for congratulations for all participating authorities because, if the lending institutions of South Australia had not been prepared to cooperate in the way in which they have with the Housing Trust and the Government, I put to the House that such a scheme would never have got off the ground.

In my last speech I notified my intention of raising some of the points of difference between the housing policies of the Labor Party and those of the Opposition Liberal Party—and I refer not only to the differences in State policies. It is absolutely appropriate that I refer to an article in the *News* of 22 May this year under the heading, 'Opposition looks to States on housing'. We must consider this statement and this policy in respect to what has gone before and what the member for Hanson has just said about the crisis in housing that this State is facing. The article states:

> The abolition of the first home owners scheme, the dismantling of Commonwealth welfare housing programs, and the privatisation of many Government housing and construction authorities are some of the features of the draft Opposition housing policy released yesterday.

We are talking of the draft policy released in May of this year. It further states:

> It calls for the Federal Government's withdrawal from its pre-eminent role in housing policy involving a shift in responsibility to the States and a greater role for the private sector. The policy's main features are:

and I would like to quote three of them—

> Axing the first home owners scheme and transferring the funds into general State housing grants while honouring existing commitments under the scheme;

I would like members opposite to perhaps take in the second point which states:

> The sale of public housing to tenants along the lines of the Thatcher Government;

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: It is interesting that the member for Bragg has said, 'Good idea.' The people of South Australia are going to be most interested in the comment of the member for Bragg, because at the last State election they showed what they thought of privatisation *a la* Thatcher. They rejected it out of hand.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: One would think that the member for Bragg is the sidekick in all of this. The policy document's third point states:

> A renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to allow the elimination of tied grants which would mean the end of the present welfare housing programs funded by the grants.

I wonder what the member for Hanson would say about that? It is in black and white. It is the Federal Liberal Party's—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Is the member for Bragg challenging the Federal Liberal Party's draft policy on housing, released to the media on 22 May of this year? I find that very interesting. I must give total support and agreement to the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction, Mr West, who described the draft policy as shallow nonsense. I would describe it in much stronger terms than that: it is irresponsible and takes no account of the poor and needy of this country, and no account of the tremendous advantages that the State and Federal Labor Governments have made.

I want to pick up the point with regard to privatisation of public housing and talk about the scheme which we have introduced— and which is the subject of my motion. I draw very clear distinctions between the Liberal Party's policy at the last State election to sell off the Housing Trust stock at a third of its market value and the Government's policy. I have in front of me the schedule from the ratification of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which I will read to members opposite so that they are clear about the differences. In schedule 1 of the ratification of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement it states:

> All sales of housing shall be at market value or replacement cost at the time of the sale.

Mr Lewis: So it should be.

Ms LENEHAN: You tell your colleagues. Your colleagues want to sell off—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address her remarks to the Chair.

Ms LENEHAN: I was distracted by that leading light of the Opposition, the member for Murray-Mallee. Heaven preserve us! Perhaps he was not part of the State election. Perhaps he did not know what was the Liberal Party's policy in respect of public housing. Perhaps I need to remind him that the trust's policy was to sell off public housing at one-third of the market value—

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: You were not going to promise them. Perhaps they did not exactly say one-third, but it was so heavily discounted that I put it to the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has the floor, and no other member.

Ms LENEHAN: I did listen to the member for Hanson in total silence, but I would not expect the member for Hanson to afford me the same courtesy because members opposite do not have that sort of courtesy.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I can assure the member for Bragg that I need absolutely no help from any member of the Opposition. I am quite capable of making my contribution on my own. I would like to continue quoting from schedule 1, which states:

> All sales of housing shall be at market value or replacement cost at the time of the sale, but not so as to preclude the State if it so wishes from providing a credit to the tenant in recognition of improvements that the tenant has made to the housing.

That seems to me to be an eminently fair and just approach to this whole question of encouraging Housing Trust tenants to purchase their own dwellings. It is a far cry from the 'bargain basement fire sale' policy of the Liberal Party in the last State election, and it is a far cry from the Thatcher policies that the Federal Liberal Government is espousing as part of its platform. I hope that they go to the people with this policy, because the people of Australia will tell them what they told them at the last State election—that they will not have any part of the Thatcher brand of privatisation.

I wish to conclude my remarks by saying that I am sure the member for Hanson will be rushing to support this motion after his contribution in his earlier motion, to which contribution I listened with some intent. I am sure that he will support my motion, which congratulates the Government on the introduction of this very progressive and innovative scheme and in fact congratulates all the participating lending institutions. I commend the motion to the House and request that all members support it.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the Controlled Substances Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Members interjecting:

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

Honourable members: Yes.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion, and I want to mention that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Oh, you want to talk. I do not mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has deferred his speaking rights on this to the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: I have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders so that the House may debate an issue that is of vital importance to the community of South Australia. This is the first and earliest opportunity to debate this measure following the Governor in Executive Council this morning assenting to the Controlled Substances Act Amendment Bill. I have moved this motion because it is quite clear that there is some concern about the manner in which the vote on this Bill was taken and whether in fact that vote reflects the majority view of members of the House of Assembly.

For that reason, and because of the importance of the issue, the Liberal Party has moved this motion, so that we may debate the issue in private members' time, so that the issue may then be debated, and so that we can put it to a vote. This House can then be put to the test, and the conscience issue that the Premier has indicated applies to this measure can then be tested in this House. For that reason I move this procedural motion to give the House of Assembly the opportunity to debate and vote on the measure.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The member for Hartley says that he does not have the Bill. The Bill was tabled one hour ago, and he has had plenty of notice of the matter. I believe that the member for Hartley should be prepared, because we have been debating this issue for some 10 days, and it has been before Parliament for a number of months. In fact, it has been before the community of South Australia for some nine months and overall more than 10 years. However, the member for Hartley says that he must be prepared to debate the Bill. That is absolute nonsense! The member for Hartley either has an opinion or he does not. This is not a complicated measure; it is a simple measure that is designed to stop the introduction of on-the-spot fines for the personal use of marijuana in South Australia. As the Minister of State Development and Technology said so well in this House, it is the virtual *de facto* decriminalisation of marijuana use in South Australia. The Government Bill flies in the face of the drug summit—a drug summit where the Prime Minister and all State Premiers agreed that there would be no relaxation of marijuana laws.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the Leader is debating the substance of his Bill, as I understand it (not having had a chance to inspect it), rather than the reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair must uphold the point of order and caution the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: I was responding specifically to an interjection from the member for Hartley, who said that he was not prepared today for this debate to be continued. The fact is that all members of this House should be well prepared for this debate today. There has been consistent public notice that I intended to introduce this measure before the House so that we could debate the matter and proceed to a vote on it. It is in the interests of the South Australian community that the issue is finalised. It is my view that, if members are given a fair and reasonable opportunity to vote on the clause relating to on-the-spot fines and an opportunity to be in the House and vote on the issue, my Bill will be successful. It is in the interests of South Australia that the issue is tested at the earliest opportunity. Following the Governor's assent this morning, this is the earliest opportunity that this House has had to debate the issue. As we are in private members' time at the moment—not Government time—it is a matter of vital importance to South Australia which should be debated. The suspension of Standing Orders should be agreed to so that we can get on with the job, have a debate on it, take a vote and get on with the issue.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion. I serve notice that, if there is to be a radical departure from the longstanding arrangement between the Government and the Opposition whereby a reasonable adjournment is allowed to that side which is the recipient rather than the proponent of a piece of legislation, the losers will be the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —not the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If the Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It will be no of advantage to private members in this place if we are to lose the time-honoured tradition that those who are the recipients of a measure rather than the proponents of the measure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Here they go again, Sir!—are allowed reasonable time in which to determine their attitude to a measure. There is little doubt that, if we are to drop that convention, they will be the losers, because we have the numbers—and, if necessary, we will use them in relation to that procedural matter. We do not want to go to that. Of course we do not want to go to that, any more than the Leader of the Opposition really wants this motion to be passed this morning, but we are not going to accommodate him.

We will preserve the forms of the House. We will ensure that the long standing conventions of this place are honoured. I want to make one other point, because I am not going to filibuster here at the expense of private members' time. There are private members other than the Leader of the Opposition who have matters they want debated this morning.

I believe that there has been a misunderstanding between the Whips in relation to a procedural matter, and I want to explain it. The Government Whip came to see me earlier

today to say that she had received a request from the Opposition Whip that we facilitate the procedure at midday to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition or, possibly, the member for Davenport (because, at that stage, we did not know who was going to move the motion) should be able to introduce the legislation. I indicated that of course we would facilitate that. We would not want a private member's desires to be frustrated by some sort of procedural matter.

I was informed (and this is the only reason I came into the Chamber) only about 10 minutes ago by the Opposition Whip that that was not his understanding of what he was requesting. He was, indeed, requesting that we facilitate debate today. That was not as it was reported to me by my Whip. I believe that she reported to me faithfully what she understood had been requested of her, so if there has been any misunderstanding in that respect I apologise for any part I have had in it, but the clear request that was put to me was that we use the forms of the House to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition be allowed to introduce his Bill this morning. I indicated clearly that that was the case. At no stage did the Government agree that we should set aside the time-honoured principle—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As do all members, as the Leader needs to know—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to resume his seat. It is most inappropriate for the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier to be directly addressing each other across the floor of the House. The Deputy Premier must direct his remarks to the Chair, and I call the Leader of the Opposition to order and ask him to cease interjecting.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am perfectly happy to comply with that. I simply make—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, I ask you, Mr Speaker, to indicate on what basis you claim the Leader was responding to the Deputy Premier when, in fact, he was relating to the interjections by the member for Mawson.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The only point I make is that I was not aware that I had referred to the Leader in other than the third person, but I certainly accept your direction in this, as in all matters. I want to conclude by reiterating that if there was any misunderstanding on the part of the Opposition Whip, it was not our intention that there should be. We were happy to facilitate that the Leader should be able to introduce his legislation. We were not prepared—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My understanding was that if other matters to be introduced had not been completed before midday it would have been necessary that certain procedures take place so that those further matters could still come on as notices of motion, and we indicated that we were prepared to do that.

If members opposite look at the Notice Paper, it was not clear from the Notice Paper. At no stage did I intend to indicate to the Opposition Whip that the Government would be prepared for the time-honoured tradition of a reasonable adjournment not to be allowed today. I ask members not to facilitate the real desires of the Leader of the Opposition in this matter, but to vote against his motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. For the question say 'Aye', against 'No'. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, M.J. Evans, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Peterson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Tyler.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

STUDY TOUR REPORTS

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

That in the opinion of this House reports of parliamentarians on their study tours must be tabled before Parliament.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1692.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): The sentiments expressed last week in respect of this motion are really beyond dispute. There are two principles: first, the principle of responsibility of parliamentarians and, secondly, their accountability in respect of the use of moneys provided by Parliament for study tour purposes by parliamentarians. In respect of the issue of responsibility, there is no question that parliamentarians hold public office and are on the public payroll.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. What matter are we debating? Is it the original motion of which the member gave notice, or are we debating the amendment to which he alluded? Has he moved such an amendment? If so, is it with the consent of the mover of the motion? If not, who has seconded the amendment?

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is canvassing an amendment which the Chair presumes he will move formally at the end of his contribution.

Mr DUIGAN: There is no question about the fact that, in respect of money available to parliamentarians to undertake study tours, members need to be accountable and responsible for its use. It is necessary, because of the public position that members of Parliament hold, and hopefully because of the esteem in which they are held by the community, that they are willing to account for the tours that they undertake to further their interest in particular policy areas and activities involving the administration of government.

There is a public duty on the part of members of Parliament to acquaint themselves with areas of policy in which they are interested, and that can indeed be enhanced by undertaking tours to other States and countries. It can also be enhanced by attending a variety of conferences at both the national and international level. Therefore, there is absolutely no dispute whatever with the concept of Parliamentarians accepting responsibility for the benefits that are made available to them to undertake their inquiries elsewhere.

There is also no argument with the notion of parliamentarians accounting for the way in which their study tour funds have been expended. Ever since the study tour support has been available that accounting procedure has been in place. The question currently before the House is who ought to be able to have access to the reports that members have been required to present ever since the travel scheme has been operating. There has been a procedure whereby members have presented their reports to the Parliamentary

Library and, as the mover stated in moving his motion last week, the reports address themselves to where members went, what they looked at and, depending on how extensive they want to make their report, they could include a discussion of the issues raised in their investigations.

The public accountability question comes into play in terms of whether or not members of the public and the media, in particular, are able to have access to the reports lodged by members of Parliament in the Parliamentary Library. There has been some obstacle to members of the media having access to those reports. This was demonstrated earlier this year when some members of the media were prevented from gaining access to reports they requested. I believe that it is important that members of the media have access to these reports. There is no desire by any member of either House of this Parliament to act in a way that is secretive, to hide the fact that they have gone on an interstate or overseas tour, or to hide the names of the people they saw on their inquiries.

However, there has been difficulty in the access that journalists are able to have to the library. I am proposing a mechanism whereby accredited representatives of the media will be able to gain access to members' reports. There is no argument about accountability procedures. Members of Parliament are accountable in so many ways: to their electorate, to this House in terms of their behaviour and votes, and to the various communities and supporters they have in their electorate. It is only an extension of that notion of accountability that they must be prepared to provide for the wider community reports on their investigations into matters of public interest about which they have undertaken tours, overseas tours in particular.

It is necessary to find a device whereby members of the media can gain access. Most members, particularly if they have undertaken a tour that is of considerable public importance, would no doubt have prepared and distributed a report. However, if a report has simply been lodged in the library, we have to find a mechanism to gain access to it.

I have taken some advice about the best way of dealing with this matter and it appears to me that what we need to do is assert the principle of members of the media having direct access to our reports. I believe that the amendment I propose will address this issue. In fact, it may be necessary for the Library Committee to determine some access rules and procedural matters as to the mechanism by which the media will have access to the library. However, I am sure that the Library Committee will be more than able to determine that, under some circumstances and for the purposes of these particular reports, the media will be able to be added to the categories of people having access to the library.

I conclude by referring to the contributions that were made last week to this motion. I endorse the general comments expressed by the mover of the motion and by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because they addressed themselves to the notion of responsibility and accountability. To use the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's words, 'It is not unreasonable that we should be accountable for our actions and for the way in which public moneys are expended.'

I support those sentiments, as would every member of this House. My wish is to ensure that the impediment for a member of the media gaining access to the reports in the library is overcome by amending the motion to ensure that accredited representatives of the media have access to these study tour reports. I move:

Leave out 'tabled before Parliament' and insert 'be available for perusal by accredited representatives of the media'.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I ask the House to disagree to the amendment. If the Library Committee wants to make reports available, it can, and I think a direction by this House indicating that those reports be tabled in the Parliament gives the Library Committee an indication that it can make them available to the press. If reports are tabled in Parliament then clearly they are public documents, and should be public documents because public money is being spent. I do not believe that any member of Parliament should be ashamed of his report. I ask members to oppose the amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am not completely sure of the motives of the honourable member who moved the amendment. There is nothing wrong with the amendment, but I do not know what he is trying to achieve. I believe that the reports should be available not only to the media, but also to the public. The media are interested in what is contained in those reports possibly for the purpose of giving some publicity to material which tickles their fancy or maybe to bash politicians over the head as we have seen recently, because they can get some reports with which they find fault. Of course, the media are a very limited cross-section of the community. They filter whatever information the community is able to receive under the terms of this amendment and I would not be too happy about that.

Material is contained in study tour reports which I write to which I would like the public at large to have access without it being filtered through the pen of a journalist. The public are providing the money for these study tours and we are accountable to the public at large. I do not think we are accountable to the public via the pen or whim of a journalist. I think it is far healthier to have these study leave reports tabled in Parliament. If we have nothing to hide, the public could then have access to them along with the journalists. If journalists want to peruse the study leave reports and go about their business, good luck to them but, if the public want to have a look at what their member has been doing while he or she is away (or any other member for that matter), they should also have access to that material.

I do not disagree violently with the honourable member's amendment, except that it is more restrictive than the member for Davenport's proposal, which leads to greater accountability to the people who provide the funds for running this place. Under those circumstances, the amendment improves the present situation where it could be construed that there is a desire to hide the study tour reports, but it is more restrictive than the original proposal and, therefore, I do not think it improves the original motion; in fact, it tends to limit the availability of the study leave reports.

In relation to expense, there is no difference. Whether the study leave report is placed in the library where selected people have access to it, or whether it is placed on the table where the general public can peruse it, they should have the opportunity of doing so. I oppose the amendment and support the original motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs. L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan (teller), M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Tyler.

Noes (17)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J.

Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1693.)

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I will speak briefly to this matter. The honourable member who introduced this legislation seeks to restrict greatly the number of options open to the courts and a very simplistic solution to what is a very complex area of the law, namely, the area of sentencing. Honourable members should examine this measure carefully and, indeed, other simplistic approaches to the sentencing process. Unfortunately, the community in South Australia, as indeed in many other jurisdictions, form judgments that are often based on very little information about the material that has been adduced by a court, the decisions that have been taken with respect to admission and exclusion of evidence and a whole range of other issues that have not been reported publicly for one reason or another. They then form an opinion as to the severity or otherwise of the sentence.

Further, there is, I believe, a lack of understanding in the community of the potential for the rehabilitative process that takes place with each and every offender and how that should take place in the context of our correctional services system in this State and, indeed, in other ancillary services that assist in the rehabilitation process. I accept that rehabilitation is only one of the elements that apply in the sentencing process, but it is one that must never be overlooked. So, I raise those broad issues in the hope that they will assist the debate and the proper resolution of this measure.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

IDENTITY CARD

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

That in the opinion of this House all adult Australians should be issued with a card which clearly identifies them as a person entitled to the great benefits this country makes available to its people.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1694.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I move:

That this debate be further adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey has moved that the debate be further adjourned. Is that motion seconded?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Could I raise a point of order, Sir?

The SPEAKER: Provided that the point of order is of particular relevance.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It is, Sir. I have always believed that before somebody adjourns another member's resolution, especially in private members' time, there should be some indication to the member concerned. I have had no indication in this case. I do not want to do what I did in the past and try to withhold the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The House has just accepted a motion that item No. 9 be further adjourned. I thought I had actually accepted the seconding. If there is some confusion as to whether the motion was seconded, I ask now whether it is was seconded. For the question say 'Aye', against 'No'. The Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

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

That this House considers the Government's planned time of commencement, at the earliest in 1988-89, for the construction of a safer transport route than the existing dangerous northern section of Mount Barker Road is totally unacceptable and therefore calls on the Government to commence work on this project immediately the preferred new route is decided later this year or, alternatively, to immediately have work begun on eliminating the dangerous section at the Devil's Elbow and installing concrete median strip traffic deflector barriers in accident prone areas.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1696.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am pleased to support this motion. The House would no doubt be aware that the safety aspect of Mount Barker Road has been a matter of considerable concern to me over a period. The member for Davenport has had quite a bit to say about the need for pulling off areas for semitrailers, and that matter was discussed in this place in some detail a little while ago. The current motion deals with the wider issues of the dangerous sections of the Devil's Elbow and the need for installation of concrete median strips and deflector barriers, etc. The House would also be aware, from publicity given to the matter in recent times, that the Government has appointed consultants to determine an appropriate route for the new road. We have been hearing a lot lately about three new alternatives currently being looked at.

The alternatives range from something like $100 million to $150 million, with a fourth alternative to upgrade the current road. It is all very well to be talking about those sorts of things which may happen some time in the future. I sincerely hope that one of those alternatives is picked up, that funding can be achieved through the Federal Government (because that is where the funding will have to come from), and that it will be seen as a matter of the highest priority that work commence as soon as possible. I must say that I have a feeling that that funding will be extremely difficult to come by.

As I understand it, over the past two or three years we have been receiving from the Federal Government something like $43 million or $44 million on an annual basis for highway funds for this State. We recognise that if the Government were to adopt alternative A, for example, it would be looking at an expenditure of $150 million, which I guess could be divided up over three years into $50 million per year. I reiterate that I hope that is what will happen. I certainly will do everything I can to ensure that that funding is picked up as a matter of the highest priority, but I cannot in my wildest dreams imagine that it will be.

The fear I have is that we will go through all of this consultative process—a process that I support totally, I might add—with public meetings at which people ask questions and express their views about some of the alternatives being looked at; the decision will be made on the appropriate alternative (whether it be A, B, C or the alternative to upgrade the current road); the consultants will advise the Government of their decision; the Government will then bring down an environmental impact statement on whichever alternative is selected; and then, after all that, the Government will turn around and say, 'Look: it's going to cost perhaps $100 million or $125 million and we're not

going to be able to get the funding for it, so it will be delayed.' I fear that will happen.

Some statistics have been brought out, as a result of the study being carried out by the consultants, that within a few years we will see a massive increase in the volume of traffic using the road, so I sincerely hope that something is done, but I have the fear that it might be further off than we are hearing about at this stage. It is vitally important that we examine the problems currently being experienced on the road. I invited the Minister of Transport to attend a public meeting in the Hills to listen to the views being expressed by a number of my constituents (and, I believe, constituents of the member for Davenport and others) who have some very strong ideas as to what should be done immediately about that road. I have brought a deputation to the Minister and written numerous letters to him, some of which have been replied to; others have merely been acknowledged without further comment.

I suggested that it would be appropriate to come up to the area or, if the Minister was not available, that at least senior officers of the Highways Department should come to listen to some of the views being expressed. The Minister has totally ignored that suggestion: he obviously does not see it as being of any importance at all. So, the next step was to raise the matter during the Estimates Committees, when I asked the Minister whether he would ensure that at each of these public meetings being held senior officers of the Highways Department were present to listen to the points of view expressed and to answer questions.

That happened on the first occasion. An officer from the Highways Department was present, and it was made quite clear at the commencement of the meeting that the main purpose of that meeting was to talk about, and provide the opportunity for questions to be asked about, the three alternatives for a future road. It was also stated that opportunity would be provided, after the other parties consulted had had the opportunity to present evidence, for questions and statements to be made in regard to the current road.

The next meeting was held at Aldgate, and I was particularly concerned on that occasion that no-one was there from the Highways Department. Certainly, the Minister was not there. Another meeting was held last night and, because I was unable to attend that meeting because the House was sitting, I am not sure whether or not a person from the Highways Department attended. I might say that I have discussed this matter with the Minister in the meantime, and he gave me a further assurance that he would ensure that someone would be there from the Highways Department. As I say, I do not know what happened last night as I was not able to attend that meeting, but I hope that that was the case. If it was not, this is a matter that I will take up with the Minister again.

I wholeheartedly support the motion. The Highways Department, as a result of submissions made and deputations taken to the Minister, has come up with a few suggestions, some of which the member for Davenport has referred to here, in regard to improvements that will be carried out this financial year. We have not seen much evidence of that at this stage, but I hope that the Minister will stand by what he said and that we will see this work carried out. It is vitally important, and the statistics on the number of accidents that have occurred in recent times prove that to be the case. I again saw this morning another delay on that road as a result of another accident. We are seeing them on an almost weekly basis at this stage. There are dangers involved every time one uses the road. I noted a most interesting article this week in the RAA magazine, outlining the RAA's concern about the road and its hope that some positive action will be taken. I, too, hope that that will be the case. So, I support the member for Davenport's motion. I hope that something positive will be done, and I urge the House to support the motion.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I thank the member for Heysen for his comments. We might have a slight disagreement as to whether a representative of the Highways Department should be at the meetings, where consultative groups are trying to gauge public feeling, because I feel that it would ruin such meetings if the Highways Department was represented and that in such circumstances the meeting would end up in a bunfight. Apart from that, I appreciate the member for Heysen's support. I was disappointed with the response from the member who spoke on behalf of the Labor Party. It may be that his comments were an attack on me and my thinking and why I moved the motion: that is not true. I have travelled the road all my life, and that is something that the honourable member opposite has seldom done.

Mr Hamilton: By rail.

Mr S.G. EVANS: He may have travelled from the area by rail but he has seldom made the journey by car. I ask the House to support the motion, which indicates that the Government is not doing the right thing by the people living in the Hills and the others who use that road, in respect of the time slot proposed to do the work.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton (teller), Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Tyler.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

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

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

LICENSING COURT

In reply to **Hon. H. ALLISON** (12 August).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Because of the need to deal with transitional provisions under the new Liquor Licensing Act 1985 and a greater than usual number of applications from persons wishing to take advantage of or test provisions of the new Act, some delays occurred in the hearing of applications before the Licensing Court. In addition, there were 21 decisions awaited for cases completed prior to 12 August 1986. However, steps were taken, including the appointment of an acting judge, to exercise the jurisdiction of the Licensing Court for a period. The court list is now as short as possible and only 10 decisions remain outstanding as at 28 October 1986. It is anticipated that all these decisions will be delivered during the coming few weeks.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S LETTER

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table a letter that I have received from the Auditor-General.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TAFE COURSES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Parliament would be aware that technical and further education colleges in South Australia have always offered a substantial program of enrichment courses throughout the State. The community has valued these courses not only because they have contributed to personal enrichment and development but also because for many adults they have been a first introduction to education after a gap of many years. Stream 1000, formerly known as stream 6, students have frequently pursued further vocational studies in TAFE simply because participation in an enrichment course has convinced them that they do have the ability to study and achieve good results.

The Government has persisted with this current system of funding and supporting an enrichment program for some years, but it is clear that it is now becoming somewhat restrictive and inflexible and as such may not provide for the growing demand from the South Australian community to the extent we would like. Colleges have had to cancel some advertised classes because the mix of concession and full fee paying students enrolling has rendered them financially non-viable. Without changes to the fee structure and concession arrangements it has become clear that this problem may persist.

The Government is also concerned that the present system does not take sufficient account of the varying needs of different communities both in metropolitan Adelaide and country centres. Accordingly, the Government has decided to make the following changes which it is anticipated will enable TAFE colleges to expand the number and range of courses it offers:

(1) Instead of there being a standard set of tuition fees for the whole State, each college will prepare its own schedule of fees. These fees will take account of local demand for particular courses, rates charged by non-government providers in the area, and any variations in remuneration to lecturers and tutors.

(2) Students who satisfy the current concession policy requirements will pay 50 per cent of the fee set by each college for the particular class in which they enrol.

(3) Students will pay 25 cents per hour as a contribution towards the general service fee, with concession students paying 50 per cent of that fee.

(4) Music courses will in general become self supporting.

(5) 'Gap' funds (that is, the Government's direct subsidy of $150 000 this year) will be allocated to colleges in proportions consistent with their usual level of participation by concession students and with other disadvantages such as small classes that apply in some country areas.

These changes should lead to circumstances in which all members of the community will be able to enrol in a course of their choice at a reasonable cost, including a 50 per cent reduction in cost for disadvantaged persons including pensioners. Most importantly, the Government has been reviewing adult education provided both by TAFE and other agencies, including non-government and community agencies, and the changes we are proposing for the TAFE element in this important area of education are a first in that review process.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AUDITOR-GENERAL'S LETTER

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I apologise to members, but copies of my statement will be available in a moment and will be distributed in accordance with the practices of the House. I wish to make a statement in relation to a letter presented today by the Auditor-General to the Speaker outlining the reasons for the comments made in his report which was presented to the House on 16 September 1986. I acknowledge at the outset that the Auditor-General is correct, both in his original report and in the letter, about the status of the contract with Superturf Holdings Pty Ltd.

In the Estimates Committee of 2 October 1986, I stated that the contract with Superturf had not been cancelled but had been renegotiated. In doing so, I criticised the Auditor-General's Report for saying that a payment of $100 000 to Superturf was as a result of a claim for cancellation of a contract. I made the statement that the contract had not been cancelled on the advice of the Department of Recreation and Sport. In making the statement, I was not aware of a Cabinet decision of 15 October 1985 which cancelled the contract with Superturf. As a new Minister who was not a member of the Cabinet at that time it was difficult for me to have that knowledge directly.

The confusion about the status of the contract is evident by the *Hansard* record of the Estimates Committee which shows, following my statement, a record of correspondence between the Director and the Auditor-General in response to the particular reference to the Superturf contract in the Auditor-General's Report. The letter from the Director stated that the $100 000 payment did result from the 'cancellation of the earlier contract', and also that the payment was 'toward the cost of a new track'. I believe that the department, in advising me that the contract had not been cancelled, was referring to the fact that a track would be constructed somewhere else, that is, not at Olympic Sportsfield, and that Superturf would receive the contract to undertake that work.

I accept that it is not legally accurate to state that the contract was not cancelled. I have this morning met with the Auditor-General and departmental officers to discuss this issue, and have directed the department to immediately discuss with the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Auditor-General's Office and Treasury the implications of the Cabinet decision of 15 October 1985 and a further Cabinet decision of 23 December 1985, which also made reference to payment for cancellation of contract, and to take any remedial action necessary to clarify the status of payments made to Superturf.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

NURSES DISPUTE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier immediately take over the Government's handling of the nurses dispute from the Ministers of Health and Labour? Unprecedented industrial action is threatened within our public hospital system from tomorrow. This is the result of a dispute over claims formally lodged with the State Government on 3 September 1985—some 14 months ago. The Government, at the last election,

indicated that it would support the nurses claims relating to wages and a career structure.

An honourable member: That's when there was an election on.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, just before the election. Nurses are now complaining that all the Government did last year was attempt to buy their votes. Many also believe that the Minister of Health has deliberately stalled these negotiations either because his failure to contain administrative costs within the Health Commission means that he does not have the funds to pay the nurses, or he is attempting to save funds by stalling the introduction of a new wage structure for nurses. Considering that the Ministers of Health and Labour have had more than a year to deal with this matter, the Premier ought to take over the negotiations in the same way that Mr Cain—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is clearly debating the matter at the moment. I will withdraw leave if he continues in that vein.

Mr OLSEN: The Victorian Premier, Mr Cain, has taken over negotiations in that State to ensure that the Victorian Government honours the commitment it made to nurses before the last election. That should happen here in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not quite sure that I do want to emulate Mr Cain in this matter, because there are some big problems in Victoria which have existed over a number of years; and there have been a lot of disputes and stoppages which have convulsed the health system. It is important to note that that has not occurred here in South Australia. Indeed, the stopwork committee—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I hope that the former Minister of Health does not start interjecting. My gosh, things went very close to the line a number of times under her jurisdiction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already called the Leader of the Opposition to order once today. I now call the Leader of the Opposition to order for disrupting the House a second time.

Hon. J.C. BANNON: There was a stopwork meeting yesterday and, as I understand it, because of what I regard as unreasonable impatience by the nurses, the intent is to have some form of limited industrial action over the next few days. I think that that is a great pity. Let me say, first, that the Government has in no way backed off from its commitment. I am very pleased to hear of this very unusual situation whereby the Opposition is supporting a demand by a trade union for improved wages and working conditions—it is a welcome change, as normally they have denounced such applications. I also point out that there are, indeed, very large cost implications involved—we are talking here of many millions of dollars. We are also talking of trying to institute a system which will be satisfactory and which will not repeat the problems existing in Victoria.

I remind the House that over the past few years there has been a dramatic improvement in nurses' conditions in this State: the introduction of the 38-hour week, moves to college based education and a number of other changes, all quite expensive, but doing a substantial amount to improve the relative status and effectiveness of nurses. So, in fact, we have not had the problems that have occurred in other States, and do not intend to have them. Equally, we cannot be stampeded into making offers that are not sustainable, either in cost or effectiveness terms.

I have complete confidence in the way in which the Minister of Health and the Minister of Labour have handled these negotiations: they have been dealt with in a systematic and careful way. I think that it is a matter of regret that the nurses' sense of frustration and impatience has not allowed them to wait for the appropriate response to their demands. As I have said before, I am glad that what is happening involves a bipartisan spirit. It will certainly increase costs in our hospital system, but I hope that it will also ensure that nurses in this State do enjoy the proper wages, conditions, career structure and education that they deserve.

AGED PERSONS' HOUSING

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House whether the South Australian Housing Trust, now celebrating its fiftieth year of operations, is aware of the urgent need to provide affordable housing for South Australia's ageing population, which I understand is increasing at a faster rate than that of any other State? The latest statistics predict that, while the overall population in the next 25 years is expected to increase by 27 per cent in this country, and therefore in this State, the over-65 age group in that time is expected to increase by 67 per cent and the over-75 age group by a massive 118 per cent. In view of these figures, will the Minister responsible for the Housing Trust tell the House just what is being done to look after our aged senior citizens, and in particular what is being done about providing low rental housing?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The South Australian Housing Trust has for many years been aware of the trend towards an ageing South Australian population. I am pleased to say that it was the first housing authority in Australia to introduce the joint venture scheme. The joint venture program is an outstanding example of ingenuity shown by the trust in solving the problems associated with providing our increasing aged populace with homes. To expand its resources towards meeting the total demand, the trust developed a plan of joint ventures in which outside bodies with an interest in providing aged accommodation were invited to contribute cash, land or other resources to the cottage flat construction program.

This scheme and the more recent Jubilee 150 scheme have been outstanding in respect of the involvement and cooperation of various interested parties. Local Government, hospitals, community groups, churches, service groups and private companies have answered the call, and their contributions have extended the trust's capacity to build retirement accommodation.

Without the joint venture program and the Jubilee 150 schemes, many retirement centres could not have been built within available financial resources. As part of the Jubilee 150 scheme, the trust aimed to secure 1 000 aged cottage flats for this Jubilee year under what is called the Jubilee 150 Homes Project. In fact, the completed and committed total is nearing the 2 000 mark. Up to the end of June this year, 6 215 cottage flats have been built by the Housing Trust, which includes those I have mentioned previously. My answer to the member for Bright is that the South Australian Housing Trust is aware of the problem of providing our senior citizens with low rental accommodation and is doing something really worthwhile about it.

PROSTITUTION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Premier aware of moves within his Government to drop the private mem-

ber's Bill to legalise prostitution and, if so, does he support these moves?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member seeking leave to make an explanation of his question?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I was just pausing to heed the mirth of members on the Government side. I certainly seek leave to briefly explain the question. The mirth of Government members is rather surprising when—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will either proceed with his explanation or have leave withdrawn and resume his seat.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the last thing I want, Sir; I will proceed. Members of the Opposition were told that the Hon. Carolyn Pickles wished to wind up the debate in the Upper House yesterday and they were prepared to carry on with the debate, only to be told that there was a change in plan, and a Government member adjourned the debate. The supporters who have been present and heard every word in this debate where absent from the Gallery, and it is believed that there are moves afoot within the Government to have the Bill delayed and, in fact, for it to drop off the Notice Paper.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the Government uses private members to promote legislation for itself: in fact, Murray De Laine, the member for—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must restrict himself to the explanation of his question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: To explain the question further, I would invite members to read a letter written by the member for Price to that well-known publication by the Festival of Light, *Focus*, which indicates that the Prostitution Bill is a *de facto* Government Bill. Under these circumstances, is the Premier aware of these moves to drop the Bill and does he support them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Bill is not a *de facto* Government Bill: the only thing the Government has done in relation to that Bill is produce a paper which was prepared by the Attorney-General's Department on the question. I point out that this matter also was the subject of intensive investigation by a select committee of this House in which members opposite participated in 1981. It was introduced and proceeded no further on that occasion. It is a private member's Bill. I suggest that, in terms of the intention of the mover to pursue it, those questions would best be addressed to the sponsor of the private member's Bill in another place.

CRACK

Mr RANN: Is the Minister of Emergency Services aware of any information provided by the Leader of the Opposition to the Commissioner of Police which has led to the detection of crack in South Australia? On 24 September 1986, during Question Time, the Leader of the Opposition accused the Minister of misleading the House about the presence of the drug crack in this State. On the previous day the Minister informed the House that there had been no reports of crack in South Australia to the police or health authorities.

It has been put to me that papers tabled from the Commissioner of Police clearly demonstrated that the Minister had not misled the House. The Commissioner of Police said that the police had not seized any of the illicit drug commonly known as crack, and no person had been charged with any offence involving the sale, possession or use of crack. This is in direct contrast to the Leader of the Opposition's allegations that crack had been detected and a woman charged with its possession. More than five weeks ago the Minister invited the Leader of the Opposition to put any information he had on the matter before the Commissioner of Police for urgent investigation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member's recollection is correct in this matter. I was accused of misleading the House. The Leader returned to the attack and, as I recall, I was so impolite as to suggest that he put up or shut up. I know that the Leader did telephone the Commissioner of Police. However, he was unable to put any information before the Commissioner which would have been of any assistance at all in detecting the presence of that pernicious substance in this State. As I understand it, the conversation consisted of the Leader attempting to get some assurance from the Commissioner that, in fact, his officers had investigated this whole matter very thoroughly.

The Leader has not been able to substantiate the claims that he made in this place and as such he should withdraw the accusations against me that I in any way misled this House. Those people who in the last week or so have been increasingly alarmed at the behaviour of the Leader over drugs generally, at his campaign of hypocrisy and untruths in relation to the amendments to the Controlled Substances Bill and the Government's—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —and the Government's record—

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it proper under Standing Orders for the Deputy Premier to impute improper motives on a member or to reflect upon a member in the way that he did?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member on the receiving end of the alleged imputations objects, it is within the rights of that member to take objection, but not the member for Davenport. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I was talking about the Leader's behaviour in the past few days. My attention has been drawn to two comments in the media which I think are particularly pertinent to this matter, especially because, of course, there are certain elements of the media who apparently have been only too willing to associate themselves with the Leader's campaign. I refer first, Sir, to the Atchison cartoon in yesterday's *Advertiser* depicting a beleaguered Opposition Leader with his back to the wall, wondering whether he had in fact received some sort of windfall in relation to the events of the last week or so—and I think that was a very telling comment on the part of that cartoonist.

And then again today this matter was referred to in the *Advertiser* editorial (of which I took particular note and copied the words), which accused the Opposition of 'embarking on a hollow and irresponsible political exercise and a campaign of misinformation'. That is exactly what has been going on from the Leader and from his cohorts in the last week or so. It is not for me to give political advice to the Leader, but I would simply point out that in my judgment he has further eroded his very fragile credibility. Sir, I am still awaiting an apology, but I am not holding my breath.

MARIJUANA

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier say by what date the Government intends that the police will be able to issue on-the-spot fines for personal possession of marijuana?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No decision has been made on the proclamation date of the Act that has been passed by this Parliament.

EIS PROCEDURES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether the Government intends to release the report of its review of environmental impact statement procedures, and is the Minister aware of claims made yesterday by the Hon. Mr Elliott in another place alleging that the Government is delaying release of the report to advantage the Jubilee Point developers?

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member that she cannot refer to remarks that may have been made in the other place.

Ms GAYLER: Remarks made publicly, Sir—that the Government is delaying release of the report to advantage the Jubilee Point developers, and can the Minister confirm or deny the Australian Democrats' scurrilous allegations?

The SPEAKER: Order! That last remark was out of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Mr Elliott has illustrated his lack of knowledge of the planning process in this State by the comment he has made. In any development control applications the law to be applied is the law at the time of the application, and the EIS process to which that project is subject is, of course, the EIS procedure which has been a feature of the planning system of this State for many years—indeed ever since the Planning Act was introduced.

Indeed, you cannot simply change the rules halfway through. So, whatever might be in the report to which Mr Elliott refers, it could not in any way affect the assessment of the EIS for Jubilee Point, even if it were true (which it is not) that the Government wanted to change the rules in some way in the interests of that project.

The Government's responsibilities are quite clear in this matter. Through the South Australian Planning Commission it has a responsibility as an arbiter—as an umpire—and that is a role that has to be discharged fairly and impartially, and it will be and has been. As to the release of the report, yes, there is a report and it has been available to me. It will be released as soon as it is possible to do so. Of course, I will be referring it to my colleagues for their comments as a matter of courtesy before it is made available to the public in general. Mr Elliott really needs to rein in his impatience a little.

LAND VALUATIONS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier immediately order a full and independent inquiry into the determination of land values by the Valuer-General this financial year? There is now clear evidence that the administration of land valuations this financial year is completely out of control and may have forced many thousands of people throughout South Australia to pay much more than is justified in council and sewerage rates.

This situation has been highlighted by information received today from the Gumeracha council which shows that more than 10 per cent of land valuations have been successfully appealed against over the past three months. This is causing serious problems for the council, which had to set a rate based on the Valuer-General's original assessment and which now cannot alter that rate to cover reduced income from the reassessed valuations. As a result, this one council has already lost thousands of dollars in rate revenue this financial year.

Many other councils in the city and country have had similar experiences. My colleagues and I have a long list of anomalies that have occurred in valuations this year, and I know that the Government has been inundated with complaints. It was only a couple of days ago that a constituent of mine from Magill reported to me that a house which last year was valued at $76 000 was valued this year at twice that amount.

They relate to examples of unrealistically high valuations throughout the State and clear inequities in the assessment of similar properties in the same area. Because water and sewerage rates, as well as council rates, are based on these valuations, they have already been a financial bonanza for the State Government at the expense of taxpayers. It appears that many valuations this year have been made without any proper checking of movements in property values. It has been suggested that desk bound bureaucrats working from maps have been making assessments without any appreciation whatsoever of the properties or areas they are making a valuation of. The situation indicates mismanagement that calls for urgent action.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think one of the reasons these questions are being raised is the move away from the five year cycle on which properties have normally been valued to an annual valuation which is updated under a computerised system. For the first time people are actually seeing what you might call realistic market values attaching to their properties, rather than estimates. The whole of the State, comprising 625 000 properties, is being revalued every year on the basis of current market value.

We are in a period of transition from that old system to a contemporary valuation. This means that in some cases values have gone down, but it is worth remembering that the last two or three years have seen a great increase in property values generally in this State, based on a boom that we have had in housing and land transactions: we have been through some very good years and people's property values have increased quite markedly.

There is a levelling off in that now. In fact, for every increased valuation one could probably find others that have either remained static or fallen. We have adjusted the land tax to take account of that. As to a bonanza, that is not true. Water and sewerage still cost more to deliver than the actual price, and it is subsidised from general revenue. There are ways in which we could get over it, and one would be to cut out the country subsidy on rates. However, we do not intend to do that, and I do not think that members intend us to do so, either. I can assure members that there is no bonanza. We still have a recurrent deficit which is subsidised from general revenue for our water and sewerage services.

ATLAS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport, in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Department of Services and Supply, which includes the Government Printing Division, provide up-to-date figures on sales of the *Atlas of South Australia* which went on full public sale on Monday? I ask the Minister this question because the Government

Printing Division was responsible for this fine production. It has been put to me by leaders in the South Australian graphic arts world that this atlas would be one of the best productions that South Australia has ever seen. The topography, illustrations, binding and general presentation are certainly excellent, and the atlas will soon become a collector's item. It has been further put to me that this publication can be compared with any production from a limited edition in either England or America. I understand that the public response has been positive, and I would appreciate any figures that the Minister can provide.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question today. All members are well aware of the honourable member's fervent interest in having all possible printing work done in Australia and his desire to arrest the drift of printing work offshore. The publication of this atlas at Netley by our Government Printing Division work force has been a prime example of what can be done here in Adelaide without the need to go to Singapore, Hong Kong or Japan, thus undercutting local employment in our printing industry. The Government Printer (Mr Don Woolman) has a tremendous success on his hands with this most prestigious production, as my colleague has already mentioned.

Before I reply to the honourable member's question in detail, I should first explain the background of the sales program. The atlas was launched by the Premier in September and went on limited sale, the prices being $195 for the limited edition, which was bound in leather, and $55 for the standard edition. Some copies were sold at the launch itself and some were sold through channel 7, with whom special arrangements had been made. Other copies went out in response to mail orders lodged by means of a publisher's circular. However, the atlas did not go on public sale until Monday of this week. Until last evening, the Government Printer told me that, of the standard edition of 7 500 copies, 4 478 had already been sold and, of the 200 limited editions, 134 had been sold.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I point out in reply to the consistent interjections from the other side that these figures are an update on those that were given to Parliament a few weeks ago. If honourable members would be patient and listen to the information that other members require, it would help us all. In addition, the Government Printer has arranged sets of loose pages of the atlas for schools at the lower price of $22, and of these 600 have been sold. I suspect that the printer rather hopes that this avenue will close off, as he will soon be looking to bind these sets to meet the demand for the standard edition.

I would like to make just two more points in reply to the honourable member's question. Hopeful purchasers who feel that they can safely wait until the atlas comes out in paperback or appears at a discount price on the remainder list will be waiting a long time. The atlas will not be discounted and, given its size and for understandable reasons, it will not be produced in any cheap or nasty form.

If the standard edition sells out, say within the next two or three months, the Government Printer will seriously consider publishing a second edition. It could take him several months to get in stocks of suitable paper and then a few more months to put the reprint together. Given the widespread public acceptance, the almost universally favourable reviews and the advent of Christmas, I would say that a reprint next year of this handsome and historic Jubilee publication is the probability rather than a possibility.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S LETTER

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of today's letter from the Auditor-General to the Speaker, will the Minister of Recreation and Sport apologise to the Auditor-General? I am not surprised that the Speaker did not read into the record the letter from the Auditor-General, because it is critical of the Minister on two points.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair, because the Chair was under no obligation to follow the course mentioned by the honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I can say that I am surprised that you, Mr Speaker, did not read it into the record, as is the normal practice.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the normal practice, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is a statement of fact, Sir.

The SPEAKER: It may be a statement of belief on the part of the honourable member; it is not the view of the Chair. However, I give the honourable member leave to continue his explanation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank you, Mr Speaker. The Minister has mentioned the matter of the contract for resurfacing the Olympic Sports Field track, and what is particularly concerning about this matter is that the Auditor-General has pointed out that the Government may be liable for further compensation in addition to the $100 000 already paid. The second point the Auditor-General has made relates to statements the Minister made to his Estimates Committee on 2 October when he claimed that the Auditor had made incorrect statements about the Aquatic Centre.

The Minister claimed that remarks made by the Auditor-General had not only upset the Secretary of the Public Works Standing Committee but also the Chairman of that committee and its members. However, the Auditor-General's letter today points out:

> It is perhaps relevant to note that concerns raised in that report have now been addressed in amending legislation and in an administrative circular to heads of Government agencies.

In view of his letter, the Auditor-General is owed an apology from the Minister, and I ask him to make it immediately.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: My answer is: I have already. I do not need the member for Light to remind me of my responsibilities. I have done so. In relation to the second part of his question, I think that the member for Light should take up the matter with his colleagues who were then on the Public Works Standing Committee. Those members on this side of the House who were on that committee know full well that the committee had already planned and sought amendments in relation to its Act as it applied, and therefore those comments stand correct, as I understand it. I know that I have the support of my colleagues who were members of the Public Works Standing Committee in 1985 in saying that. However, those comments are not relevant to the issue on which I addressed the House in my ministerial statement.

WEST LAKES WATERWAY

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Marine advise my constituents and me when the Corporation of the City of Woodville will take complete control of all activities within the waters of West Lakes waterway? Since 1981 three public meetings have been held in the western suburbs of my electorate regarding the need for enabling powers for the police and the local council to control unruly behaviour in and around the West Lakes waterway. Subsequently, on 18

April 1985, by-laws 25 and 52 were gazetted, and they provide enabling powers for the council to control streets, roads, footways, bridges, jetties, piers, and public places within the Woodville council boundary and, in particular, the West Lakes waterway.

On 4 November I received a note via my secretary from a constituent, as follows:

She and her husband previously resided at Kidman Park and moved over the island approximately 9 months ago. Last weekend I think she got her first real 'dose' of vandalism—pot plants thrown in the lake and a condor canoe stolen. She told me she has spoken to youths who have been trespassing across the front of her property but they don't seem to give a care. They have reported matters to the police but get the impression that police feel there is nothing they can do—it is just the youth of today! She mentioned that access is gained to private walkways via the reserve.

The second letter I received was dated 5 November 1986. I will not read it all, because of the time involved and the fact that my colleagues would like to ask further questions. However, the letter speaks of the ratbag element in and around the West Lakes waterway and over the bridges, and refers to verbal and physical abuse, rock and sand throwing being on the increase for a number of years, and that excessive drinking and bottle smashing occurs frequently. The letter then goes on:

On Sunday (2 November 1986), a youth openly urinated from the footbridge into the lake and on the passing *Platypus* tourist launch. Last summer I observed a small boy have his bicycle snatched from him and thrown into the lake. Vandalism such as the destruction of trees and shrubs, streetlighting, and graffiti are often a legacy of the gangs' visits. Our greatest concern is that our lifestyle has been severely disrupted and in fact, my wife is frightened to venture out alone across the park (adjacent to the bridge) to her mother's house, some 300 metres away. Also, my son and daughter are reluctant to use a park that is at our doorstep whilst the gangs are on the footbridge.

Another point of concern is the fact that two teenagers who were involved in the burglary of our house some months ago are frequent visitors to the bridge, are often seen wandering around the streets and are usually the chief troublemakers on the footbridge. I can appreciate the difficulty you, the police and local government have in overcoming the situation on bridges around West Lakes. Nevertheless, as a concerned citizen, I believe something should be done to at least tone down the problem existing on the bridges and surrounds.

On 13 May this year I received advice from the Minister, which I very much appreciated, that 'the Woodville council has complete control over all activities that take place within the waters of the lake'. I would appreciate any advice that the Minister can give me about the date on which the Woodville council will officially take over control of the West Lakes waterway.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question on this matter, which he has been pursuing for a considerable time. I appreciate his concern and the frustration that these occurrences have caused. He referred to a good deal of vandalism within the area, and I suggest that the police have some responsibility in that regard. However, the Woodville council has been considering this matter for some time and has had discussions with Department of Marine and Harbors officers in relation to various responsibilities relating to control, operation and maintenance of the West Lakes area.

My understanding is that quite a number of negotiations have taken place and that there is a degree of agreement between the department and the Woodville council. However, one thing delaying matters more than anything is the fact that the Town Clerk of Woodville, Mr Doug Hamilton, has retired and is currently on long service leave, and his services will not be replaced until some time in December of this year. I am confident that as soon as his replacement is known negotiations can continue and that final agreement and the control of activities at West Lakes will be reached.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport explain why the contract for resurfacing the track at Olympic Sports Field had to be cancelled in the manner outlined in the letter today from the Auditor-General to the Speaker? The Auditor-General's letter makes the following point:

The company was advised that the contract for resurfacing the track at Olympic Sports Field had to be cancelled.

It further reveals that two amounts totalling $100 000 have already been paid to the company, Superturf Holdings Pty Ltd, as compensation for this cancellation, and points out that the Government may be liable for even further compensation. As these circumstances suggest a bungle by the Government in awarding this contract in the first place, I ask the Minister to explain the situation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am happy to provide the member with the answer. The problem, as I outlined in my ministerial statement, is that there has been some confusion as to whether the contract was actually cancelled or was being renegotiated, and the advice that I had in the Estimates Committee (and it might have been a question from the honourable member which I answered) was that it had been renegotiated and not cancelled. However, it is clear from the decision taken on 15 October 1985 by Cabinet, of which I was not a member (nor was I aware of the decision), that Cabinet had instructed the department and the then Minister to cancel that contract. That is how the confusion has come about and how the advice has come to me in relation to the contract. The instructions I have given today are quite clear—that we have to determine our situation legally in relation to that contract, to compensation and to—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member said it could be more: yes, it could be, but from my advice it may be less in relation to the overall contract. On that matter we might see whether we can carry over payments in negotiating any new contract. We have to test that as well, to find out whether that is legally possible as regards tenders. Until I have those answers from the Crown Law Department, the Auditor-General and the Treasury I cannot say in detail as to the direction the Government—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, I will tell the House exactly what the situation is.

PAIN CONTROL

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Health ask his colleagues what steps he can take to ensure that the benefits from the significant progress made by the Flinders Medical Centre in connection with pain control are extended to cancer patients in the northern area? The Minister may be aware of recent press reports in the *Elizabeth Gazette* referring to the Elizabeth Cancer Support Group, in which it is claimed that some cancer patients were dying in pain because of inadequate access to pain control services. The value of the work done by the Flinders Medical Centre in the field of pain control is acclaimed by the group and, I believe, by the whole community, but they are very critical of the lack of adequate support in the northern region. The option of travelling directly to Flinders Medical Centre is not viable for many terminal cancer patients in view of the distance.

While the Cancer Support Group is grateful for the dedication of the staff at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, they are

not satisfied that sufficient resources have been made available in the north to allow the best advantage to be gained by patients, and the recent cutbacks in the Flinders Medical Centre's budget mean that it will be unable to take any more patients from the northern region.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will be happy to refer it to my colleague in another place and seek an early response. It is my understanding that the work that has been done at the Flinders Medical Centre, of which the honourable member has spoken approvingly, is to the benefit of all cancer sufferers in South Australia, but, as I do not know how this work relates directly to the individual hospital and to the honourable member's electorate responsibility in the northern areas of metropolitan Adelaide, I will obtain that information as soon as I can.

SALISBURY SHOPPING CENTRES

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning explain why he and the Minister of State Development and Technology have changed their minds about the location of major shopping centres in the Salisbury council area? The original development plans for the Salisbury area provide for three major shopping centres at Parabanks, Ingle Farm and Parafield Gardens. I have been informed that the Minister of State Development and Technology, as the local member, and the Minister for Environment and Planning supported these three locations. However, the Minister now has before him a supplementary development plan which provides for a major shopping centre based at the Hollywood Plaza at Salisbury Downs rather than the Parafield Gardens location.

I understand that the Minister and his Cabinet colleague the Minister of State Development and Technology have now indicated support for this change to the proposed developers of the Salisbury Downs site, despite the fact that the Hollywood Plaza is only two kilometres from the Parabanks centre, which could mean a loss in custom at Parabanks—estimated at about $20 million a year, jeopardising the future of businesses in that centre. It has also been put to the Opposition that development of the Salisbury Downs site would be contrary to all sound and accepted planning principles, and that it is based on population projections which do not accord with those of the Department of Environment and Planning forecasting unit.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have not changed my mind about this matter at all. I would be interested and grateful to the honourable member if he could reveal at what stage I am supposed to have made up my mind along the lines that he indicates. My role in this matter as Minister is perfectly clear, and that is that I have a responsibility, upon receiving advice from the advisory committee on planning, to tender appropriate advice to Cabinet which, in turn, of course, recommends a course of action to His Excellency, and that is eventually gazetted and a supplementary development plan, if such is what we are talking about, then becomes part of the State plan.

What the member opposite appears not to know—because he appears to be sort of thrashing around here—is that, in fact, a clear decision has now been taken and Cabinet has looked at this matter and made a decision that is along the lines that he indicates, though, of course, not for the reason that he infers. He is wrong in relation to the distance involved. He knows very little about the advice that has been tendered to Government. It is true that as Minister I was the recipient of various mutually contradictory approaches on this matter. It is a matter of controversy in the Salisbury area and elsewhere as to what is the correct decision that should be made as to the third major shopping centre in that area.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Finally, someone has to make a decision, and are we to assume by the honourable member's interjections that he has made some mature judgment on this matter? In his explanation he was merely parroting what he indicated others had said to him. By way of interjection he now seems to be coming out and saying, yes, as a planner or something like that, he in fact knows. One of the telling arguments in relation to this matter was the very strong advocacy on the part of local government in the area for the decision that was finally made. It is important that we keep open very close channels of communication with local government. The Government believes very strongly in that principle and, given that there was area for argument in this matter, the Government for that and other reasons, which include planning merit, felt that we should proceed along the lines that the honourable member has indicated.

REYNELLA HERITAGE LISTINGS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning investigate the listing of the former Methodist Church building and the original Reynella school building on the State Heritage List? I received in today's mail a letter from two constituents, who state:

> My wife and I, along with four other elderly citizens who grew up in the old township of Reynella, have been out to the old school this morning to help the children to make a video film to be shown, comparing our school days as compared with what the school is now. We were most upset to learn that the old school building and the former Methodist Church building have not been listed as heritage buildings.

These constituents go on to request that the buildings be preserved so that the old character and history of the town is retained. They further state:

> We as children at school were told that it was one of the earliest towns to be settled in South Australia, there having been a vineyard planted as early as 1838.

I therefore ask the Minister whether he will report to the House on the historical significance of these buildings and whether he will investigate having them placed on the State Heritage List.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I suddenly recall that the first time I drove a motor vehicle on a public road was to conduct a service at what was then the Reynella Methodist Church. It was a rather adventurous drive, and I have often wondered whether that congregation might have been better served by an act of God on that occasion. Perhaps that is for others to judge. Subsequently, I worshipped in that church on various occasions when I was a member of that parish. I am well aware of the historical nature of the church, its architecture and so on. I will certainly get a report for the honourable member and the House as to whether it is appropriate for treatment under the legislation and, in doing so, I will ask my officers to disregard any personal involvement I might have had in the church, however relevant that might be to its heritage value.

EUROPEAN WASP

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Premier take urgent steps to determine which of his Ministers is responsible for the administration of a program to assist with the control

of the European wasp in this State? Will he increase his Government's commitment in support of this campaign as a matter of urgency? The spread of the European wasp—whose sting, I remind the House, can be fatal—has reached an extremely critical stage in this State. I am informed that, within the Stirling council area alone in 1984-85 167 nests were located and treated, and in 1985-86 that number had increased to 205 nests which were treated mainly as the result of assistance through a CEP grant.

Already this year, after only a couple of warm days, some 50 sightings of queen wasps have been reported in the Stirling council area alone. I am further informed that the Government has provided the paltry funding of some $30 000 a year for 1985-86 through to 1987-88, and it is stated that at the end of that period control of wasps will become the entire responsibility of landowners on whose properties nests occur.

Apparently the Local Government Department has been given the responsibility of administering this three year program. I am advised that even the $30 000 to which I have referred is a matter of discussion between the Local Government Department and the Department of Agriculture, with neither department wanting to administer the program. In response to a recent letter to the Minister of Agriculture from the Mid Hills Pest Plant Control Board suggesting that the Minister of Agriculture and not the Minister of Local Government should have responsibility for European wasp control, the Minister rejected this suggestion.

A letter dated 30 September 1986 from the Chairman of the Pest Plants Commission, Vertebrate Pest Plant Control Authority, to the Secretary of the Stirling Pest Plant Control Board, states:

> Local pest plant control or vertebrate pest control boards do not have any responsibility for wasp control, nor do they have any legal ability to undertake any such control.

In the meantime nothing is being done other than that the European wasp is multiplying at an alarming rate, causing considerable concern at least to Hills residents.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that there is joint ministerial involvement in this. The Department of Agriculture obviously has particular expertise in control methods, and so on, but the program can be best implemented at the local level, and this is where the Local Government Department is involved. It seems to me that if there is some bureaucratic haggle or problem it is best addressed by those people in local government, in local councils or pest control boards, as referred to by the honourable member, talking to the Minister of Local Government and the Minister of Agriculture about it.

MUSIC CURRICULUM

Mr TYLER: Can the Minister of Education—

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: Have you finished over there?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher, despite interjections, will direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can the Minister report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps the Chair was in error in not also pointing out to the House that interjections are out of order. The member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can the Minister of Education report to the House the extent to which music is part of the curriculum in schools in South Australia? In yesterday's *Advertiser* the Federal Minister for Education (Senator Susan Ryan) is reported as saying that she wants music to be part of the general school curriculum. That report, headed 'Ryan wants music part of curriculum', states:

> The Minister for Education, Senator Ryan, wants music to be part of the general school curriculum.
>
> She said yesterday her view was not shared by some educational policy makers.
>
> The education of every person should include a major component of the arts, including music.
>
> Apart from cultural reasons for learning music, it also had an important role to play in developing Australia's intellectual and creative resources at a higher level.
>
> 'The hard economic reality is that we need to take advantage of every resource and skill at our disposal. Australian music has an important role to play in this process. Some of the areas of our economy which are experiencing the greatest growth are those where music has a lot to offer,' she said.

A number of music teachers and constituents have expressed to me the sort of sentiments that the Federal Minister expressed yesterday. They argue that, with the onslaught of the technological revolution, leisure and recreation activities will play an important part in our lifestyle and they believe that music and the arts will play an even greater role in the future.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know of his interest in this aspect of life in our schools, especially as regards the curriculum. I concur in the sentiments that have been expressed by the Federal Minister, although I suggest that some of us in the community, however good the tuition, have little talent in some aspects of music and the arts. South Australia leads the nation in this area of curriculum development, as I am sure all members and people in the community would have seen, because it is a matter of very high profile. The arts, and particularly the music aspects of the curriculum, are often taken out into the broader community and seen and enjoyed by many people throughout the State. In South Australia the following four music schools have been designated special interest schools: Brighton and Marryatville High Schools, where the music course was established in 1976; Woodville High School, 1977; and Fremont High School, 1978. These schools provide for students who show a potential to develop a high level of musicianship. Students from throughout the State can apply for entry to one of these schools and are admitted after audition and interview. Support is given to these students through allowances, support with tuition fees, and the like.

I am sure that members would know how popular these school programs are. In other schools (indeed, in most secondary schools throughout the State) music is provided as a full subject in the curriculum. There are now three SSABSA subjects at year 12 level in music: the history and literature of music, performance and theory, and music. The students who take that course of studies can then progress through to study music at tertiary level, as many students do. This year, a secondary music guide was produced by the Directorate of Studies for teachers in the classroom. It was launched by my colleague the Deputy Premier, who possesses his own skills in this area.

Currently, more than 8 000 students, both primary and secondary, are gaining weekly instrumental tuition through support from the Music Branch of the Education Department. This instrumental teaching program supports the ensemble activity in schools, such as orchestras and concert bands, which are a feature of South Australia's music education system. The Music Branch also provides other support for teachers. It has a specialist resource collection and personnel with specialist advice and support for schools. Members who attended the Primary Schools Music Festival at the Festival Theatre recently would have appreciated and

enjoyed that contribution, especially from those members of the Music Branch who support that program. The branch will soon be redescribed as a school and will continue to provide services to schools throughout South Australia.

MARIJUANA

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Transport say what action the Government will take to protect the public from people who drive while affected by marijuana? All evidence points to an increase in the use of marijuana if the introduction of on-the-spot fines for personal possession goes ahead. This has serious implications for road safety, especially when it has been estimated that marijuana mixed with alcohol accelerates by four times the effects of alcoholic drink. However, no test is available in South Australia to determine whether marijuana may be present in a person who is involved in a road accident, and the police have no power to test for drugs. In view of the relaxation of the law relating to personal use of marijuana, legislation may need to be changed to ensure that effective deterrents exist against those who drive while affected by marijuana. I ask the Minister to consider this matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: First, I point out that section 47 (1) of the Road Traffic Act covers the alleged offence of driving when affected by alcohol or a drug. The honourable member started off his question with a statement for which he has no proof when he said that there would be an increase in the use of marijuana in South Australia as a result of the legislation that was recently passed. His statement is just part of a total program of misinformation which members opposite have mounted and for which they have no evidence. That matter was clearly demonstrated in the debate that took place in this House.

If the police suspect that a driver is under the influence of drugs or alcohol, a breath test is taken. If the result of that test is a zero reading, they may call out the police doctor and instigate a search of the vehicle and/or the driver for illicit drugs. If drugs are found or the driver admits to being under the influence, or agrees to a blood sample being taken, the driver can be charged with driving under the influence under section 47 (1) of the Road Traffic Act. The driver may also be charged with possession or use of an illicit drug. So, provisions already exist in the legislation. The penalties are there and, for the information of members opposite, I point out that the Attorney-General recently moved to increase the range of penalties for people who drive while under the influence of alcohol or a drug.

In any event, the Road Safety Division of the Department of Transport is continually in contact with identical bodies, both national and State, throughout Australia in order to examine the whole area of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and the steps that are needed to be taken will be taken. However, they will not be taken in response to the scaremongering of members opposite. It is a responsible program of road safety in which this Government is involved, and it will continue to be so involved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SALISBURY SHOPPING CENTRES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When asking a question this afternoon of my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, the member for Mitcham said that I had changed my mind on a planning issue relating to the city of Salisbury. I wish to advise members of a course of action that I have taken over the past eight years on a matter concerning the supplementary development plan on retail centres which was approved by the Government on Monday this week. In 1978, the Salisbury council, of which I was then an elected ward member, investigated the issue of the need for new shopping centres in that city. As a member of that council, I fully supported the proposition then put that Salisbury should have a three centre policy, the centres being Salisbury central, Ingle Farm and a site in the western part of the city of Salisbury. Further investigation by the Salisbury council when I was a member resulted in a series of possible sites being considered. The site chosen as the preferred site and known as site 4 was on the corner of Martins and Kings Road and, as I recall, the second site, known as site 5, was on the corner of Kings Road and Whites Road.

Ranking in the third category was the site which at that stage had planning approval for the development of a neighbourhood centre, namely, the site known as the Hollywood Plaza site. On that occasion I publicly indicated my full support for the two key elements of that supplementary development plan proposal: first, that there should be three centres in Salisbury, and, secondly, that the third (or the one serving the western portion of the city of Salisbury) should be at site No. 4 as a preferred site. The Hollywood Plaza site was then developed. The planning approval that had been given in 1978 by the council, before this whole thing was put in place, resulted in the construction of a neighbourhood centre at that site, and that became a significant shopping locality.

The result was that its significance was such that no developer seemed likely to locate or invest at site No. 4 and create the third district zone for the city of Salisbury. As a result of that, discussions took place in the Salisbury community in the early 1980s about whether or not site No. 4 was still the best site in practical terms (although it was clearly the best site in preferred planning terms). The question was then raised whether planning with no prospect of fulfilment was in fact a futile exercise and whether, if there was a possibility of expanding Hollywood, that should become the third district centre.

It then became apparent, by investment advice given in 1985, that an investor was prepared to invest at Hollywood and expand that site, thereby creating the third district centre. Given that, and although the Salisbury council was of the opinion that site No. 4 was the preferred site, it changed its mind. At that same time, in 1985, in considering this matter I also reluctantly changed my mind because site No. 4 was definitely the preferred site. As a result of that, I indicated that change of mind publicly on that occasion. I circulated that decision to my electors in the area by means of a letter to all those living in the vicinity of the affected areas and to the petitioners on both sides of the issue.

I might indicate that, with respect to the term 'change of mind', that is not a fully correct term. My letter communicating to constituents in the electorate indicated that I have not changed my mind on the decision to support the three centres policy. In fact, I did not do so and indeed have not done so.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We do not want four. Secondly, with respect to the location of the westernmost site, I indicated that the clearly preferred planning site was still site No. 4, or possibly site No. 5, and that Hollywood was not the preferred planning site. Given that there was no practical proposition before the community in the foreseeable future for the development of either site No. 4 or site No. 5, the best interests of the western residents of the city of Salisbury getting real shopping opportunities was provided by the Hollywood proposal and not by that which originally had been the preferred (and still is ostensibly the best) planning site.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 18 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PAROLE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 32 and 33 (clause 7)—Leave out ", on and from the day on which the court is determining the question,".

No. 2. Page 4, line 39 (clause 12)—After "prison" insert "and a sentence of imprisonment is imposed for the offence".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The amendments were moved by the Attorney-General in another place. I understand that they are for clarification and that they were accepted by the Opposition in another place.

Mr BECKER: The Opposition agrees with the amendments and is satisfied that what the Minister seeks will be done in this matter.

Motion carried.

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EGG CONTROL AUTHORITY BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 5 November. Page 1891.)

Clauses 2 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Members of the authority.'

Mr GUNN: This clause clearly indicates how four of the members of the proposed authority will be appointed, but it does not indicate how the fifth member will be appointed. Can the Minister briefly explain how that will occur?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I understand what the member is driving at—that there is no designation for all five members. My understanding and advice is that they are appointed by me as Minister. If one takes the difference between the members who have a designated origin as in subsection (1) *(a)*, whereby two must be appointed on the nomination of the United Farmers and Stockowners, the others—those not nominated by a particular organisation—can be nominated by the Minister.

Mr GUNN: I take it from what the Minister says that those people who are clearly mentioned in the Bill will be appointed and then the Minister can appoint any persons whom he considers necessary, even someone from, say, the Storeman and Packers Union or some other person of that nature.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is as I understand it.

Mr GUNN: The Opposition is not satisfied with this clause. It points up the gross deficiencies in this Bill, not only in what it stands for and its content but also in the manner in which it has been put together. We do not intend to take the time of the Committee. The Bill is completely unsatisfactory and we will oppose it at the third reading.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 29 passed.

Clause 30—'Minister may cause Act to expire.'

Mr GUNN: The Bill allows the Minister to give himself unfettered control and authority over the industry without any appropriate restraint, right of appeal or objection against what could be a completely arbitrary decision that could completely destroy the industry without adequate compensation or consultation.

This clause again highlights the great difficulty that the Opposition has with this measure. It is a thoroughly bad clause—that is the only way that I can describe it. It is contrary to the corresponding provision in similar legislation, so I place on record our total opposition to it. It is badly drafted, and allows the Minister absolute authority to intervene in the industry and to wind it up without the producers' views being considered.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Clause 30 (1) is important, as it sets the tone of the clause and states:

Where the Minister is of the opinion that, by reason of the non-payment of contributions under this Part, this Act cannot be administered or enforced effectively, the Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, fix a day as the day on which this Act will expire.

That relates to non-contribution: if there is a contribution made the Minister cannot then act. That is pretty clear to me. I cannot see how this differs from other legislation in relation to liabilities or the winding up of organisations. My advice from the Crown Law Office is that that is the appropriate way to word a Bill. I can think of Acts where this wording is standard in terms of the winding up provision.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (31 to 37), schedule and title passed.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I oppose the Bill in its present form and will be voting against it. I believe that this is a bad Bill. The Minister has not done his research on it, nor does he understand the industry.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition is totally opposed to this measure in its present form. The Bill has arrived at this stage in a most unsatisfactory form. It was drafted in such a way as to make it difficult, or virtually impractical, to rewrite, so the Opposition will be opposing it at all stages through the Parliament. I repeat that we will bring before the Parliament an improved measure which will protect producers and at the same time will maintain effective operation of the Egg Board.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): This is a sound and sensible Bill, not only from the point of view of consumers but also for the long-term viability of

the industry. We have heard the Liberal Party on numerous occasions heralding the need for competition and for overseas countries, particularly the United States and EEC countries, to be competing on a fair basis with Australia. Here we have an attempt to partly deregulate an industry to provide a marketing structure which will allow a fair and reasonable basis for competition, and in which, presumably, efficient producers—and I know that there are many of them—will prosper. I do not expect them to feel threatened by interstate invasions: indeed, they will probably extend their operations over the border and overseas with greater vigour and enthusiasm, because they will be able to compete without having an artificial barrier erected around them.

It seems strange to me that the Liberal members, who espouse a free enterprise philosophy when it suits them, oppose this Bill. Reference has been made to various reactions from members in the other place regarding this Bill. I refer members to the Hon. Martin Cameron's comments made in July 1981 in relation to a Bill and to his expressed concern as to the operation of this organisation. I have received a fair range of support. One former Liberal member of the House contacted me expressing his support and referring me to comments he made, which are recorded in *Hansard* in 1969, relating to this statutory body. His comments are quite critical of the Opposition's present attitude.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is obviously a raw nerve with the Opposition. We see what is happening—members opposite are now very nervous about this situation. I make the point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair takes the point raised by the member for Eyre. Nevertheless, whether it is a second reading debate or a third reading debate, the degree to which interjections are out of order is equally applicable.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. Am I correct in saying that in a third reading summing up new material is not to be included and that comments relate only to the Bill as it came out of Committee?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not aware of any requirement as to the introduction of new material at this stage, but certainly the Minister should be directing his comments to the Bill as it emerged from Committee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed. That is the very point that I am making, that the Opposition obviously has an exposed rump with regard to this Bill and is quite nervous. I made the point last night that not one city member stood to support the member for Eyre in his attack on this Bill—not one city member was vocally indicating any—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Davenport drifted off and we were not sure where he was. In relation to this very issue we know what happened—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must address himself to the Bill as it emerged from Committee and avoid the temptation to make the sorts of remarks he has been making about members opposite.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Unfortunately, I was succumbing to the interjections coming from the other side. I believe that this Bill is important not only—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Alexandra to order. The Minister has the floor. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Consumers in South Australia will definitely see a far greater flexibility in the price of eggs, as has been indicated, because we have looked at the prices of eggs both retail and cost at the farm gate, and know from all the evidence that this will mean a lower price at various periods of seasonal production for consumers of South Australia. I can speak from experience in this matter, having had discussions on the Bill with local eminent economists, including a conservative economist who would not normally support the Labor Party in this matter and who is concerned to see this Bill as it stands proceed through both Houses so that both consumers and the industry in this State can benefit from greater flexibility, resulting in increased viability within the industry.

I believe this is a very important and strong Bill to support a greater efficiency within the industry in this State, so I am delighted to see this proceed to the other place and look forward to seeing it passed there, because I know that members in the other place are very keen to see this Bill proceed as it stands, given their commitment to deregulation, although some of their colleagues in this place have indicated their lack of commitment to this Bill and concern themselves about the issues which they obviously find very uncomfortable because it deals with something they tend to herald constantly as being deregulation. So, I am pleased to see this Bill proceed and believe in all conscience that it should be in the interests of all South Australians that it go through the Upper House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Tyler.

Noes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, and Oswald.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Eastick and Wotton. Noes—Messrs McRae and Slater.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

The SPEAKER: The Minister.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: Is that motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham. No, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I was on my feet prior to the Deputy Premier getting the call and moving that last motion. I seek your leave and the concurrence of the House to move a motion forthwith.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House do now adjourn. That question has now been seconded. What normally follows is that three members express their grievance before the motion is formally put.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, at no stage—

The SPEAKER: The Chair must deal with this particular matter.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: You do not have a seconder to the motion. You did not call for it and it did not come.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is quite clearly of the recollection of having called for a seconder of the motion.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That was last night, not tonight.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition can only achieve his aim by the unanimous leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the House for leave to move this motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: For the benefit of the member for Albert Park, I was quick enough on my feet. It is just that the Speaker did not observe that I was the first to my feet before the Deputy Premier but the House—other than, obviously, the member for Albert Park—has been tolerant enough to allow me to proceed with the motion, which I appreciate.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the Leader of the Opposition proceed with his motion.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion.

Mr OLSEN: We have reached 3.35 p.m. having completed the program the Government set down for this sitting week. I contrast that with last week when the House, on Thursday, was unable to complete the program and the Government put in the guillotine at clause 4 of a 68 clause Bill. This week, it has set a program which has not even had the capacity to fill up the normal sitting hours of the House. We have completed the program set down by the Government. I might add that the parliamentary program and timings as set down by the Government are turning into almost a farce with that situation prevailing last week and that which has applied this week.

As the Parliament is getting up early Thursday afternoon, as there is an issue of vital importance to the community of South Australia, as the Bill I want to refer to is a simple one—there are but two clauses in the Bill to which I wish to refer to today—as we have put through the Government's program, as the Government has on previous occasions put through a Bill in one day, I believe it would be appropriate for this House to enable the Standing Orders to be suspended so that my motion of earlier today, moved in private members' time, can be reconsidered and debate may be continued on that Bill to fill in the remainder of the normal sitting time this Thursday.

The motion in relation to the debate on the Controlled Substances Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) being continued is of vital importance. There is no need for people to be prepared for that debate; the matter has been on the agenda now for some weeks. The fact is that it is a current issue. It is an issue of vital concern to the community of South Australia. If a mistake has been made in the voting pattern of the Bill last week, then at the first opportunity we ought to ensure that an appropriate vote is taken by this House and that an opportunity is afforded to this House to take such a vote. The fact is that the doubts that are currently prevailing need to be cleared up, and the best way that this matter can be cleared up is for the Government to accede to my request to suspend Standing Orders so that the motion can proceed and the debate can proceed on an issue that is of vital importance to the electorate of South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I oppose the motion. I explained to the House this morning the forms of this place. Apparently, the Leader has not been here long enough to understand what those forms and traditions are, and we should adhere to them.

I want to pick up a matter that the Leader has raised in relation to the setting of the program in this place. The Opposition is not without some responsibilities in this matter. The procedure, which for the most part has worked reasonably well, is that on Mondays I have met with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and have put to him propositions for what should happen for the remainder of the week. He has either given me an immediate response or has reported to his colleagues and I have received a response later in the week.

On no occasion where the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the program was too ambitious has the Government refused to remove some of the Bills from the list. It is of course true that last week we were not prepared to go as far as the Opposition requested of us, but it is certainly true (and I still have the document that was originally placed before the Deputy Leader in my office) that, in fact, the program that was placed before the Opposition last week was more ambitious than that which was eventually undertaken.

The point that I want to make simply is that I am not too sure that the Opposition's responsibility ends with its simply being, as it were, the censor of what the Government wants to do. It would seem to me that the Opposition has a positive role to play also. What I mean here is that not only are they in a position to be able to say to the Government that they think that the program is too ambitious and that the program should be recast but they also have a responsibility from time to time to say to the Government that the program is not ambitious enough, to point out that as a Government we are not to know how talkative Opposition members are going to be on a certain matter but that the Opposition does (because it is in charge of them) and that therefore it is the Opposition's mature judgment that the Government has set aside perhaps more time than is required for certain legislation and it would be in order for the Government to perhaps schedule an extra couple of pieces of legislation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If members of the Opposition do not want to play that positive and constructive role in this place, I guess that it is their business: be it on their own heads, and the community will judge them accordingly. If they merely want to be the people—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be in exactly the same position in that case as I would be; that is to say, he is not to know how talkative members on this side of the House are going to be in relation to various matters. So, I simply make that offer, or, at least give an indication to members of the Opposition that I think they should not only exercise their judgment as to whether a program is too ambitious—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Tell us what you have cut back.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have invariably cut it back, but not always in the way—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have invariably cut the program back, but I am not prepared to give up—

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time today I caution a member on the front bench of either side against the process of conducting a dialogue across the Chamber. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting, and I ask the Deputy Premier to direct his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir, and I am sure that it will make for a far more constructive debate. I am certainly not prepared to give up the Government's right to set a program and see that the Parliament adheres to it. But again I make the point that I see no reason why an Opposition, if it wants to be responsible, should from time to time not only say that a program is too ambitious but also that it is not ambitious enough and that the Government might consider the addition of one or more measures to that program.

However, I return to the substance of this motion—I have been led off a bit by the Deputy Leader and his reference to what happened last week and what happens this week. The Government opposes this measure. The Leader of the Opposition tried a dodge this morning to get debate on when it was not appropriate to do so. The Opposition has simply returned to the same dodge this afternoon. It is looking increasingly pathetic with the tactics that it is using in trying to bring on this matter prematurely, and I urge the House to reject the Leader's request.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Deputy Premier said that the Opposition should play a constructive role from time to time and put forward positive proposals: in fact, we are putting one forward to the House right now. We have completed the Government's business; we are not interfering with the Government's program at all in the House today, because we have completed the Government's program. There is spare time available between now and 6 o'clock—stipulated in the Notice Paper as being the normal adjournment time of the House. That being the case, we have an issue that is of currency in the community, is of importance to South Australia, and we are entitled (and I think we have a responsibility to do so) to put forward the proposal to the Government that time ought to be made available this afternoon—seeing that we are not going to do anything else, other than a grievance debate—for the debate to continue on the Controlled Substances Bill that I introduced earlier.

The Deputy Premier has attempted to abrogate his responsibility as manager of the Government's business in this House; he has walked away from it. Obviously the Government does not want to debate the issue. Why do members opposite not want to debate the issue? It is because they have to do some more work on some numbers to make sure that they roll out the Government's way when the vote is eventually taken. The Government has shown no inclination to debate this matter and will not devote time, even when Government business has been completed, to allow us to get on with the debate and for there to be at least some discussion in this Chamber about this legislation.

I repeat: we are not interfering with the Government's program, because the Government's program has been completed. The fact is that the Government cannot organise a program from one week to the next, to have an appropriate spread of Bills throughout the various weeks. When we get spare time, what is wrong with this Chamber proceeding with debate on a Bill of currency and importance—a basic and simple Bill that this House could deal with right here and now?

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Olsen (teller), Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, and Tyler.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Lewis and Meier. Noes—Messrs McRae and Slater.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: When the Leader of the Opposition was given leave to put his motion before the House we already had before the Chair the question 'That the House do now adjourn'. As that question has been seconded, there is no need for the motion to be put again. I call on the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Leave can be sought by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the conclusion of the three grievance debates that are part of the adjournment but before the actual question is put. The honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, how can the Leader of the Opposition seek leave of the House to move a motion but I cannot seek leave of the House to give a personal explanation?

The SPEAKER: The Chair has exercised the same prerogative as any of the other 46 members of this House to refuse leave to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, not out of any malice but simply because it has been traditional, as far as I am aware that, when personal explanations are made at this time of the adjournment, it is done after the three grievance debates.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. There is no precedent of which I am aware for that timetable as you have outlined to the House. A member can seek leave to do anything at any time. The Leader sought leave to move a motion, and I seek leave to make a personal explanation. No-one in the House has sought to deny me that leave.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair, using his prerogative as one of the 47 members of the House of Assembly, refuses leave for that personal explanation to be made at this point. I call on the honourable member.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: as Speaker of this House, as the impartial adjudicator of proceedings in this House, do you attach to yourself in this circumstance the right of a backbencher or any other member of this House, as though you were sitting on the benches in this place, to refuse me leave when no other member does?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. In the course of Question Time each day when leave is withdrawn from any member who, in the course of making a personal explanation, introduces comment, the Chair does exactly what the Deputy Leader has suggested is not a practice of the Chair. I call on the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in the whole period since I have been in this place, which is about 16½ years now, on no occasion has

the Speaker sought to give a ruling on the basis that he is exercising his right as a member of this place other than the impartial Speaker making an adjudication. On all other occasions, to my memory, when a member has sought leave to do something, the Speaker has then asked whether members of the House have any objection to that member having leave. For some reason or other, Mr Speaker, you have not chosen to go down that road. You are now asserting that you are exercising a right as though you are not sitting in the Chair but sitting as a member and refusing that leave. To me, that is a completely unprecedented situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is the situation that prevails. I will not uphold the point of order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can seek leave in exactly 30 minutes time, at the conclusion of the three grievance debates.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order Mr Speaker. You are not prepared to put to the House the question of whether the House—and not you, Sir—will give me leave to make a personal explanation. The reason I seek to make a personal explanation now is that this is the first opportunity that I have had, because of the procedures that were under way, to reply to the allegations involving me by the Deputy Premier in the course of his response to the Leader's motion. Of course, I could not seek leave to make a personal explanation at that stage because of the procedure of—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has refused leave to the honourable member. I call on the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: In those circumstances I am wasting my time here. I might as well go.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: How silly can you get?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): It is my intention to reflect on the extraordinary events of last week as they affected the debate on the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Bill. In doing so, I may indeed cover some of the area that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wished to lay down in his personal explanation. I believe that the events of last week brought disrepute to the South Australian Parliament, to Premier Bannon, to the Deputy Premier and Minister Blevins.

I know that a number of members on the other side have queried the circumstances surrounding the debacle that we had in this House. It is my intention to make quite clear that the Opposition made every attempt to facilitate debate and to ensure that the House was run as it has always been run. All members should recall that this Parliament had not sat for six months until the budget session commenced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: We had before us a Bill that was declared to be urgent. The Assistant Secretary of the UTLC declared that for every day this Bill did not proceed another person would die. These were the circumstances behind the Bill. Members will recall that the Bill had sat on the Notice Paper for five weeks without being debated, despite the fact that I asked the Minister of Labour more than once when he intended to have the debate brought on.

During the previous week this House rose early because it had insufficient business to conduct. Opposition members and, we believed, Government members thought that this was a crucial Bill for South Australia from two aspects: it was important for improving safety in the workplace and for improving industrial relations in this State.

Not only today but also previously, the Deputy Premier has peddled untruths about the circumstances of the debate on the Bill and I ask members opposite to listen to what I have to say. Perhaps they will then go back to the Deputy Premier and tell him that the things he told them were untrue. The Opposition made clear on Monday that having two major pieces of legislation before the House, with the Government expecting the debate on them to be completed by the end of that week, was untenable. Surely it was clear to the Government that the Occupational Health Safety and Welfare Bill was an important piece of legislation which deserved the full attention of the House, adequate debate, and as much time as could be made available for that purpose. All members would agree that such a complex and far reaching Bill deserved at least 10 hours debate on the second reading and 10 hours on Committee.

An honourable member: Why 10 hours?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor at the moment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: When I say that the Bill needs 10 hours second reading debate and 10 hours Committee debate, I have in mind that a number of members were prevented from making a contribution to the debate on that Bill. A number of Opposition members, as well as a number of Government members, wanted to speak on the Bill, but they were prevented from doing so. After all, we had only eight hours in which to conduct the second reading debate and to deal with the Bill in Committee. That time was clearly insufficient. When we went into Committee and spent three hours on the Bill, there was no filibustering: simply, questions were asked. Amendments covering 24 pages were before the Committee.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will get to that in a moment. The member for Fisher, who has been in this House for such a short time, continues to interject, saying that I took two hours on the Bill. However, I remind members that I spent four months researching this matter. At great expense to the taxpayer, I went overseas and talked to a number of Government officials there. I visited establishments and rehabilitation centres, and I talked to people who were involved in occupational safety at the forefront. However, I restricted my contribution in that debate to two hours, although I could well have spoken for six hours, because I believe that that much attention should have been paid to the Bill and that all members should have had their full 20 minutes to talk about this fundamental issue. If the Government wants to treat this matter in the way that it has, it shows that it has no concern for safety, because it would not let the House debate the Bill properly.

I will tell members opposite what happened, so that they fully understand what went on after negotiations had taken place with the Deputy Premier and so that the record will be straight. At least three times the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, 'We cannot manage it in the time available.' That time happened to be eight hours. We went back to the Deputy Premier three times and told him that the Opposition could not work under that timetable. We asked that the debate on the Bill be brought forward to Tuesday so that it could be fully considered although, even if it had been brought forward to Tuesday, the debate would still have been curtailed.

In 1981, on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, members were held up for 35 hours in Committee debating only one clause. If we use the measurement that

has been applied by the Deputy Premier in this case, the Parliament should have spent only five minutes on that issue in 1981 because this Bill contains 68 clauses and sets new standards, yet the Deputy Premier said that he did not want to see it debated. We continued to negotiate until 5.45 on Thursday and said, 'We will push as hard and as fast as we can and we can get the Bill through by Tuesday evening.' After all, 18 pages of amendments had still to be considered. After the debacle that occurred, this House took one and a half hours to pass the clauses without debate. So, Government members would realise that setting aside 10 hours for the Bill to go through Committee was insufficient, but we would have managed it because we would have reached agreement with the Deputy Premier. Had any other urgent matters arisen, we would have facilitated debate on such matters. As I have said, just five years ago this House was tied up for 35 hours on one issue, yet on an issue as important as this the Opposition is given only eight hours to consider a new Bill of 68 clauses.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Members opposite will recognise that the Opposition kept saying throughout last week, 'We will move as quickly as possible.' The honourable member may mention my two hours but, had I been a good legislator, I would have spent five or six hours talking to the House about things that have taken place overseas, about the innovations and new approaches, and about the things that have worked and other things that have not worked. As members know, I have written an extensive report on this subject. I believe that what the Government did last week was disgraceful. As I said at the beginning of this grievance debate, I believe that the conduct of Government members in relation to this Bill brought disrepute not only on themselves but also on the South Australian Parliament.

It is not just a simple matter of saying that someone was ejected from the Chamber: it is a matter that reflects on the South Australian Parliament—a Parliament that has worked well ever since I can remember. It has allowed just debate and it has allowed freedom of speech to members, unencumbered. I have been involved in politics in some way or another for over 20 years, and I cannot remember such an example in this House before. I believe that politics and the Parliamentary process have been the big losers. I cannot understand why those decisions were made or why the Government wanted to trample on the traditions of this Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): That is the greatest load of drivel that I have heard in the seven years since I became a member. I know the sort of tactic that is employed by the Opposition: to drag out the debate for two hours and then, with crocodile tears, to say, 'The Government is denying us the right to discuss this Bill.' What garbage! The member for Mitcham knows that it is, and we know it, too. We have seen the member for Mitcham carrying on like a pork chop in this place, when he deliberately baited the Speaker, knew what was coming, and invited it in the uproar that took place. People were wandering around the corridors of this place calling out 'Bastards, bastards'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I witnessed that taking place, so let us hear no more hypocritical garbage from members opposite. It is not very often that I get stirred up in this place, but do not let members opposite impute improper motives to me as a member of the Government. I could say much more, but I want to get back to matters that affect my constituents.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member should contain himself. He has had his drivel and now I want to say something constructive. For seven years, as member for my electorate, I have complained to successive Governments about the need for proper regulations and controls on what I perceive to be the most used waterway in the western suburbs and possibly in metropolitan Adelaide—the West Lakes waterway. Since 1981, I have called three public meetings; I have letterboxed extensively around my electorate; and I have put out about 18 000 leaflets on this subject in an effort to get people along to public meetings in order to get regulations to control the West Lakes waterway.

At the last meeting, in excess of 250 people attended because of the problems being experienced not just in the West Lakes and West Lakes Shore area but indeed in other parts of my electorate. These problems are caused by people who come in from outside the electorate, although I must concede quite readily that there are within my electorate people who are not only abusing the facilities in and around the waterway but at the same time are harassing the residents in this area by various means. Members who have been here for the same length of time as I (or longer) would know of some of the things that concern me on the waterway also concern elderly residents in this area, right from Trimmer Parade at the southern end of the waterway to Bower Road at the northern end.

There are situations where fishermen defecate behind fences and use them as urinals; and there is also swearing, boozing and the use of spear guns, which is illegal and dangerous. Mark my words: this will occur if this practice is not curtailed very quickly. Street lights have been uprooted; there is dangerous driving in and around the streets; there is teenage drinking in various parts of the electorate; and beer bottles are smashed on roads and against people's fences. There is a problem particularly down by Bartley Terrace. People have been knifed in my electorate, and so on.

At the public meetings organised at my own initiative, I called for regulations to control this waterway. I can recall the Minister of Housing and Construction (when he was the shadow Minister) attending a meeting at the West Lakes Football Club. Prior to the meeting, we looked around the waterway at the signs which were erected in the area and which purported to have some legal redress or some parliamentary imprimatur. However, that is not the case. The police inspector at the time, Peter Mildren, told the people at the meeting that the signs were not worth a cold pie—and that is the case. As a consequence of that meeting, an *ad hoc* committee was set up.

It has taken since that time until now to try to get regulations enforceable so that not only the police but also the council can use them. Local residents get on my back about this. It is a bit like being in the army: if I have a problem, I will pass it down to someone who will do the job and clear up the trash around the waterway. I really mean that. We have trash in the area; elderly people are being harassed; and, as I related in Question Time today, some people are frightened to move out of their homes. At no time do I reflect on the police, particularly Inspector Marshman at Henley Beach. He does a good job with the number of people that are available to him. At least two inspectors from the Woodville council should be involved in and around this area. I am not trying to tell the council how to suck eggs. From the comments made to me, I believe that I am reflecting the views of local residents in this area.

We need people from the council to control the waterway in particular. The waterway has over 100 organised aquatic events a year. Also, in excess of about 120 000 schoolchildren are organised through the West Lakes Aquatic Centre at the SARA headquarters. Other people come from all over the metropolitan area and the State to use this facility. Organised clubs complain that when they are involved in competition on the waterway—and it could be rowing, canoeing, surfing or whatever—they are being disrupted. To the best of my knowledge, no inspector or anyone from the council, or indeed from the Police Department, conducts a water patrol in the area to police unorganised and unlawful access to the waterway.

Residents like myself are fed up to the back teeth with the garbage that is going on around the waterway. People are urinating from a bridge on to launches filled with tourists going by underneath. That is a great thing for tourism in the western suburbs! I make no apology for trying to attract more business into the western suburbs and more opportunities for jobs and employment for the people whom I represent. I do not like to see this trash—this garbage—that carries on in this manner. I make no apology for standing up in this place, as I have for over seven years, to try to weed out this garbage. I do not believe that any member of Parliament would condone such actions. I would bend over backwards to try to help some people, be they adults or youths. However, I do not condone in any shape or form the sort of action that I have described. I think it is about time that the Woodville council got its act together.

There has been a need for regulations since 1981, and we are now five years down the track. My constituents are still complaining bitterly. I have a letter dated 1985 from a Mr Blundell, who lives in my electorate and who says, 'When these regulations come into force a medal should be struck for the local MP, because he is involved in trying to get these regulations into effect.' I make this statement in the House: sooner or later, if these regulations are not brought into effect and we do not have patrols around the waterway and on the waterway, someone will be seriously injured. Just recently, members saw how emotionally upset I was about a constituent who was killed. As members would recall, I predicted that someone would be hurt. Unfortunately, that came to pass.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity to place a few matters on the record and to ask some questions of Ministers. The usual practice would be to place such questions on notice. However, I bring to the attention of the few members who are left in the House at this time the fact that I have had a series of questions on notice to Ministers of this Government for nearly four months. In the almost 12 years that I have been a member, this is the most disgraceful situation that I have experienced in regard to the lack of answers being provided by Ministers. It has always been recognised that, if a question is not asked without notice, the opportunity is provided to place questions on notice. I have done that on a series of matters.

At the present time I have something like 14 or 15 questions on notice in my name, and some of them go back to four months ago. There is no excuse for Ministers not being able to provide this information. When I was a Minister in the Tonkin Government, it was recognised that it was the highest priority for Ministers to answer questions promptly. Indeed, every measure was taken to ensure that that happened. My questions on notice are quite plain and well expressed. I should have thought that Ministers would be able to come up with the answers.

For example, I have asked the Minister for Environment and Planning about a survey carried out by the Heritage Unit of his department to investigate the possibility of declaring a portion of the main street of Hahndorf a heritage area, when was it considered, when was it completed, and whether such a declaration has been approved by the State Heritage Committee and Cabinet. I would have thought that that would require only a brief answer, but at this stage I have received no reply. I also asked the Minister of Transport the following question:

What was the cause of the derailment and capsize of seven trucks and the brake van of the ballast train on the Victor Harbor railway line on 9 September?

That is when the accident occurred. The question was put on notice the following week. Some people are anxiously awaiting the answer to that question.

We are now hearing about money being spent on the Steamranger venture to Victor Harbor. Many concerns are being expressed about the standard of the rail line going through the area where the accident occurred, and it is important that that information be provided. I do not want to go on with more detail, but many simple questions are not being answered by Ministers of this Government because they do not want to go out of their way to make information available.

I would have put on notice as questions the matters that I refer to now if I thought that they would be answered, but because of the concern that I have expressed, I am raising them now and directing questions to the Ministers through the *Hansard*, hoping that they will answer them a little more quickly than they do questions on notice.

The first relates to a water study carried out on the River Onkaparinga in the vicinity of Old Noarlunga, which is part of my electorate. I attended a public meeting in April 1985, 18 months ago in the hall at Old Noarlunga.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Old Noarlunga is part of my electorate and was part of my electorate at that stage. Along with a lot of other people, I was expressing concern about the quality of the river. We were told at that stage by officers from the Department of Environment and Planning that a survey had commenced. I have asked four or five questions about that survey. My latest question received a reply about three months ago indicating that that study was to be completed in October. Part of the study involves taking water samples.

Most members of this House would be aware of the desire of the people of Old Noarlunga for a deep drainage system to be installed in the area as soon as possible. There is no septic system in the area and there is grave concern about waste finding its way into the River Onkaparinga. That is why we want the results of the water study to be made public as soon as possible. So, through the method of this grievance debate, I request the Minister for Environment and Planning to make public the results of that study as a matter of urgency. If the results are not at hand, and if the survey has not been completed, then I request that it be completed as a matter of urgency. Many people require information regarding that survey, particularly the results of water samples taken.

The second matter to which I refer relates to the Adelaide Hills watershed catchment area. Last week I attended a public hearing in the Stirling Council Chambers relating to this particularly controversial SDP. A number of people were present and considerable concern was expressed by the majority of them about the draconian regulations and controls that have been brought down under that SDP.

One of the questions asked that I now direct to the Minister for Environment and Planning is: when exactly is

the two year study into matters relating to the Adelaide Hills that the Minister announced some month ago to commence? Who will carry out that study? And, who are the people who have been given responsibility for looking into these vitally important matters relating to the future of the Adelaide Hills? When he made the announcement, the Minister indicated that he would provide an opportunity for public consultation, so what form will that consultation take?

For many weeks I have had a motion on the Notice Paper for the setting up of a select committee to look into future land use in the Adelaide Hills. Unfortunately, that motion is still on the Notice Paper. It has not been picked up by the Government, so I have no idea how genuine it is about involving members of this House in matters of grave importance regarding future planning for the Adelaide Hills. Again, I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning to make that information available at his earliest convenience.

The third and final point relates to the matter I brought to the Premier's notice during Question Time today and concerns the European wasp in the Adelaide Hills. I repeat, for the benefit of members of the House, that the situation with regard to the European wasp has reached a critical stage in the Adelaide Hills, and while the numbers continue to increase we have the farcical situation of a couple of Government departments wrangling over who should take responsibility.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: Local government—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am glad that the Minister of Agriculture is sitting on the front bench at this time. He says it is the responsibility of local government. If the Minister had listened he would have heard me during Question Time today quote a letter from the Minister of Local Government to the Hills Pest Plants Board in which the Minister of Local Government says this is the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture.

While this quarrel is going on, no action is being taken to control an extremely dangerous situation. I urge the Minister of Agriculture to accept some responsibility. The Premier was today asked a question which he pushed off very lightly indeed, but I hope that the Minister of Agriculture recognises the seriousness of the situation, will consult with his colleague the Minister of Local Government, and for Pete's sake do something about it.

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

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Today the Deputy Premier made statements concerning negotiations with me and sought to draw a conclusion which was not justified and which I believe misrepresented the true situation in which I was involved. As a result of the change in Standing Orders which saw the speaking time for members in this place reduced from 30 minutes to 20 minutes, and saw an extra sitting on Thursday mornings to give the Government more time to get its business through more expeditiously, an arrangement was made that I would meet with the Deputy Premier on Monday mornings at an appointed time to discuss the program.

The Deputy Premier sought to convey to the House the view that some agreement was reached last week on the basis of the Government removing five minor Bills from the program. I want to make perfectly clear that no agreement was reached. The purpose of the meeting is to reach agreement; if there are problems the matter is discussed. I made it perfectly clear to the Deputy Premier that we believed that the marijuana Bill incorporating clause 8—which is the controversial clause—would require an extended debate. I indicated that the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill would involve a debate of two hours or so, and that in my view, and on the best advice I could get from the shadow Minister concerned, the debate on the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Bill would require about 20 hours, which I did not believe was unreasonable in view of the fact that the Labor Party, when in Opposition, took 34 hours to discuss one clause of a Bill to amend the Industrial Code.

I want to make it perfectly plain to the House that no agreement was reached, and I told the Deputy Premier in quite plain language that we could not complete that program. So I want to correct the impression he sought to give. In no way did the Government, by way of agreement, accommodate the Opposition last week. The Government introduced into that Bill, as I have said before, eight pages of amendments at 11 o'clock on Wednesday night, and the Government itself, even if the Opposition had not moved its program, could not possibly have completed that program.

The Deputy Premier wants to have the best of all worlds. He has now introduced into this arrangement a suggestion that we should tell the Government if its program will not completely fill out the week. That would be one of the most absurd suggestions. We have no control whatsoever over the Government or its backbenchers, or who will speak on its side. All I have done is give an undertaking as to what the Opposition will do to meet any deadlines.

I might say that there has been no occasion when I, as Leader in charge of the business of the House for the Opposition, have not met any arrangements which I have agreed with the Deputy Premier. That has been due to the high degree of cooperation which all members of the Opposition give to honour undertakings made on their behalf by me. I might say that that is in distinct contrast to the arrangements which obtained when the roles were reversed. When the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Jack Wright, sought to make agreements with me on the program, he was invariably unable to meet those commitments, through no fault of his own, because his own Party in Opposition was completely uncontrollable. I simply want to make the point—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member had been here and observed the behaviour of members opposite, particularly after dinner at night, she would have no hesitation in agreeing with what I am saying. I want to put the record straight. The fact is that we have honoured all of our commitments. The Government is suggesting that some sort of agreement was reached last week. I made it perfectly clear that the program was impossible, and events proved that. The Deputy Premier donned the hobnail boots, and we know the end result.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is wandering a bit far from the personal explanation as to how he was misrepresented.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will wind up by saying, Mr Speaker, that the procedures will work if the Deputy Premier sticks strictly to the facts of the matter.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 November at 2 p.m.