

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 August 1988

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. J.P. Trainer) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.10 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.40 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

DEATH OF PASTOR SIR DOUGLAS NICHOLLS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.15 p.m. as a mark of respect for the memory of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls. All Australians, regardless of race or ethnic background, have lost a champion for social justice with the death of former South Australian Governor Pastor Sir Douglas Nicholls. Sir Douglas, who died in June this year at the age of 81, will be remembered for a lifetime of achievements, for reaching new goals, and for speaking out on behalf of the Aboriginal people long before this became either fashionable or even acceptable within Australian society. Across a broader sweep of cultural and sporting activities, Sir Douglas will be remembered throughout Australia with affection and respect.

Looking back through the records, you find Sir Douglas Nicholls in the forefront of so many areas of achievement. He was the first Aborigine to receive an MBE, the first to become Father of the Year, the first Aboriginal Justice of the Peace and, of course, Australia's first Aboriginal Governor. Sir Douglas was born at the Cumerooogunga Reserve on the Murray River in New South Wales in 1906. His athletic ability led him first into a dazzling football debut with the Northcote Club in the Victorian Football Association. He later progressed to the Fitzroy Club in the VFL, representing his State several times.

But his sporting prowess was not confined to the football oval—he was also a champion sprinter, and even turned to boxing with Jimmy Sharman's showground troupe. But the most significant development in the life of Sir Douglas had nothing to do with sporting achievement. His mother, on a visit to Melbourne, took him to a local Church of Christ. At the age of 26, Sir Douglas committed himself to religion, and became a Pastor in a small church in Gore Street, Fitzroy, catering mainly for Aborigines.

He was to forever change the attitudes of both the church and its congregation through an aggressive, evangelistic style which quickly attracted local attention and eventually made him a respected spokesman for the Aboriginal community. Sir Douglas always adopted a very positive, original and individual approach. In 1963 he resigned from the Victorian Aborigines Welfare Board because of Government plans to close an Aboriginal settlement and relocate families. But he did not restrict his criticism to the white population. In 1969 he attacked radicals within the Aboriginal Advancement League, of which he was a Director, for organising a visit to Australia by a black power leader.

During these years Sir Douglas was awarded an MBE (in 1957), and in 1963 became a Justice of the Peace. In 1972 he received his knighthood—the first Aborigine so to do—and in 1977 he was made Knight Commander of the Royal

Victorian Order. A remarkable fighting spirit, obvious to those who watched him in the sporting arena, was always part of the resilient attitude adopted by Sir Douglas.

In December 1976 he was appointed Governor of South Australia. His approach to the office of Governor, and his dignified yet affable attitude to the rigours of the affairs of State made him popular with staff, Government, and citizens alike. He distinguished both the office and his people during his time in Government House—a term tragically cut short by ill health which forced Sir Douglas to relinquish office and return to live in Melbourne. His last years were marked by continuing ill health and the death of his wife, Lady Gladys Nicholls, in 1981.

Sir Douglas was a remarkable ambassador for his people, and a great contributor to Australian society through his sporting, religious, and Vice-Regal roles. In many ways, it is to be regretted that South Australians did not have a better opportunity, through an uninterrupted term of office, to fully appreciate the talents of this remarkable Australian. On behalf of the people of South Australia I extend deep sympathy to the family of Sir Douglas, including his five children: Mrs Nora Murray, Mr Bevan Nicholls, Mrs Lillian Tamuru, Mrs Pamela Pederson, and Mr Ralph Nicholls. Their father will be remembered not just as a champion in the cause of Aboriginal rights, but also as a widely respected and talented Australian.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This morning we welcomed to this Parliament as its newest member a man with a different upbringing from most of us. This afternoon we farewell, in a sense, another man whose early life was very different from anything any member here has experienced. Each, in his own way, has shown, however, that Australia is a nation which embraces diversity and different cultures, and we are the richer for it.

Sir Douglas Nicholls was a man small in stature but big in achievement. It is a very long way from being born on a New South Wales Aboriginal station in 1906 to becoming the first Aborigine to be awarded the MBE in 1957; the first to be knighted in 1972; the Victorian Father of the Year; a champion sprinter; a skilful VFL footballer; and a devoted and determined representative of the interests of thousands of under-privileged Australians.

I did not know Sir Doug Nicholls, but I have spoken to many people who did. What impressed them most was his dignity, his grace, and his unfailing good humour. Through the Aborigines Advancement League, he was a pioneer in speaking up for the interests of the original Australians, but he did not do this in a way which sought to inflame tension—to polarise opinion.

In his own way, he simply asked all Australians to understand each other; to acknowledge that, while we are a nation of many and varied backgrounds, we can unite behind some common goals and aspirations. The citation by the Fathers' Day Council as Victoria's 1962 Father of the Year referred to 'his outstanding leadership in youth welfare work, and for the inspired example he has set the community in his unfailing efforts to further the cause of the Australian Aboriginal'. His approach to representing the cause of his people was eloquently summarised by him in his biography *Pastor Doug*.

I have no embittering personal experiences of racial prejudice. I have been encouraged by the white man . . . but for the under-privileged and misinterpreted of our race, I have tried to act as an interpreter. Our future is not a cold-blooded political matter, it is a question of humanitarian consideration.

For the balance, reason, tolerance, understanding and, I guess, the plain commonsense that Pastor Sir Doug brought to this debate, he did Australia a great service. His approach

should be a constant reminder to all people in public life who initiate debate about matters affecting community relations that our aim always should be to inspire understanding rather than to foment division.

All the things I have said so far about Sir Doug apply to the very full and active life he led before his appointment as Governor of South Australia in late December 1976. I am not going to censor the historical record by pretending that this was an appointment that did not provoke some controversy. It was a personal tragedy that a stroke within several months of his appointment prevented Sir Doug from completing his term at Government House. That was an unfortunate end to Sir Doug's public life.

While we would not be debating this motion this afternoon had Sir Doug not served briefly as our Governor, his enduring achievements were accomplished in other capacities. As the preface to a later edition of his biography recorded, his life was 'a story of human relationship, of harmonious race relationship. Race relationship, friendship, a smile, a word of encouragement instead of criticism, of understanding, of black and white working together'. This is an epitaph Sir Doug richly deserves. For the sake of Australia's future, I hope that it is one many more people will aspire to.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I will ensure that the *Hansard* transcript of members' contributions is forwarded to the family of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls.

Motion was carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 12.50 to 2.30 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

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

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS: ARID LANDS BOTANIC GARDEN

Petitions signed by 594 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an Australian arid lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta were presented by Messrs Goldsworthy, Hopgood, and Keneally.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SELICKS BEACH WASHPOOL LAGOON

A petition signed by 646 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to recognise the Washpool Lagoon at Sellicks Beach as a natural wetland and protect it from commercial development was presented by Dr Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITION: SELICKS BEACH GROYNES

A petition signed by 2 247 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to excavate or

construct groynes at Sellicks Beach was presented by Dr Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CHILD ABUSE

Petitions signed by 124 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review practices and increase penalties in the prosecution of child abuse cases were presented by Messrs Groom and Keneally.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PRESCHOOL STAFF SALARIES

A petition signed by 262 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant the 4 per cent second tier wage increase to preschool teachers and assistants was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: NURSING HOURS

A petition signed by 121 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to reduce nursing hours was presented by Mr Klunder.

Petition received.

PETITION: PUBLIC TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 450 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to improve public transport to the Lyell McEwin Health Service was presented by Mr M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: MORGAN-BLANCHETOWN ROAD

A petition signed by 873 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to seal the road on the west bank of the Murray between Morgan and Blanchetown was presented by Mr Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: MINTABIE PROSPECTING AREA

A petition signed by 341 residents of South Australia praying that the House extend the Mintabie precious stones prospecting area and excise the area from the Pitjantjatjara lands was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: ALBERT PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to form a neighbourhood watch scheme in the Albert Park electorate was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: NURSING HOME FUNDING

A petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to raise the level of nursing home funding to maintain nursing staff hours was presented by Mr Ingerson.

Petition received.

PETITION: COORONG FISHING

A petition signed by 455 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the use of larger mesh nets for recreational fishing in the Coorong was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: PINNAROO ROAD JUNCTION

A petition signed by 338 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport to redesign the Loxton Road junction at Pinnaroo was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: FOOD IRRADIATION

A petition signed by 72 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to introduce food irradiation was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to—
Chief Executive Officer, TAFE.
State Coroner and Deputy State Coroner.
Chief Executive Officers.
Country Members of Parliament, Accommodation Allowance.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Pay-roll Tax Act 1971—Regulations—Accommodation and Travelling Allowances.
Public Finance and Audit Act 1987—Regulations—Appropriation Fund and Auditor's Declaration.
Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—General.

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

State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1986-87.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on Proposals of—

Toilet Block, Martindale Hall.
Carparking Facilities, Smart Road, Modbury.
Community Health Centre, Whyalla.
Redevelopment of Murray lands TAFE College.
Retaining Wall, River Sturt at Coromandel Valley.
Woolpunda Groundwater Interception Scheme.

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Permit System.

Planning Act 1982—Regulations—

Display Advertisement.
Thebarton Joint Development Committee.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1987.

Technical and Further Education Act 1976—Regulations—Expiation Fee.

Tertiary Education Act 1986—Regulations—South Australian Institute of Language.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

Building Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.

Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act 1973—Regulations—Authorised Log Books, Sleeper Cab Design.

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—

Declared Poisons—Organochlorine Insecticides.

Expiation of Simple Cannabis Offences Form.

Pesticide—Pest Control Code of Practice.

Possession of Poisons—Licensed Pest Control Operators.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir, for your protection.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Murray-Mallee for continuing to interject after, by inference, having been previously called to order. The honourable the Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, again, Mr Speaker.

Further papers were laid on the table, as follows:

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

Dentists Act 1984—Regulations—Registration, Qualifications, Fees and Annual Returns.

Dog Control Act 1979—Regulations—Registration Areas.

Drugs Act 1908—Regulations—Deletion of Sale of poisons.

Food Act 1985—Regulations—Standards and Codes.

Health Act 1935—Regulations—Deletion of Pest Control Powers.

Local Government Finance Authority 1983—Regulations—the Institute of Municipal Management Inc.

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—

Registration and Licence Fees.

Towtruck Fees.

Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—

Blood Analysis Certificates.

Certificate of Inspection.

Inspection Fees.

Orroroo and District Hospital.

Photographic Detection Devices.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Central Linen Service.

Waste Management Act 1987—Regulations—Licence and Extract Fees and Prescribed Wastes.

Corporation By-laws—

Brighton—No. 1—Regulating Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore.

Campbelltown—No. 42—To Repeal Certain By-laws.

Port Adelaide—

No. 5—Parklands.

No. 6—Foreshore.

No. 12—Repeal of By-laws.

Woodville—No. 62—Dogs.

District Council By-laws—

Berri—

No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.

No. 3—Cemeteries.

No. 5—Motor Vehicles.

No. 7—Reserves and Public Places.

No. 9—Street Traders and Street Musicians.

Mannum—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Streets.

No. 4—Fire Prevention.

No. 6—Parklands.

Warooka—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Street Traders.

No. 3—Obstructions to Vision Near Intersections.

No. 4—Garbage Containers.

No. 5—Bees.

No. 6—Animals and Birds.

No. 7—Dogs.

- No. 8—Caravans.
- No. 9—Tents.
- No. 10—Parklands.
- No. 11—Repeal and renumbering of By-laws.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister of Education resume his seat. Has the honourable member for Murray-Mallee a point of order!

Mr LEWIS: Under the name of whose hand was authority given for the Minister of Health to issue and have issued in this place on his behalf—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not seem to have a point of order: he seems to be asking a question of the Speaker.

Mr LEWIS: Which member of the Party authorised that?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Further papers were laid on the table, as follows:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

- Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1986-87.
- Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report, 1987.
- Judges of Supreme Court of South Australia—Report, 1987.

Rules of Court—

- Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Local Court Rules.
- Defences and Workers Lien.
- Pleadings and Practitioner's Fees.

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—

- Execution of Judgments.
- Interstate Practitioners and Board of Examiners.
- Pleadings, Endorsements and Taxation of Costs.
- Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.
- Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—Regulations—Fees.
- Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.
- Business Names Act 1963—Regulations—Fees.
- Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Fees.
- Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.
- Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.
- Gas Cylinder Rental.

- Co-operatives Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
- Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Regulations—The Vales Private Hospital.
- Electoral Act 1985—Regulations—Declaration of Vote Certificate.

- Fair Trading Act 1987—Regulations—Commercial Tenancies.
- Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Places of Public Entertainment Fees.
- Friendly Societies Act 1919—Regulations—Insurance and Loan Limits.

- Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.
- Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—
- Building Societies Trust Account.

- Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.
- Liquor Consumption—Berri.
- Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Regulations—Fees.
- Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.
- Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—
- Dangerous Articles.
- Photographic Detection Evidence.
- Record Keeping Exemptions.

- Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.
- Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulations—Protective Helmets for Cyclists.

Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

- Industrial Relations Advisory Council—Report, 1987.
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Regulations—Fees.

Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Fees.

Explosives Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.

Lifts and Cranes Act 1960—Regulations—Fees.

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—

- Control and Removal of Asbestos.
- Fees.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of 129th Meeting.

South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1985-86.

Meat Hygiene Act 1980—Regulations—Pet Food.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations.

Exotic Fish, Fish Farming and Fish Diseases—Undesirable Species.

Gulf Water Experimental Crab Fishery—Blue Crabs.

Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence and Net Registration Fees.

Marine Scale Fishery—Licence and Net Registration Fees.

Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Mussels and Razor Fish.

Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Licence and Net Registration Fees.

River Fishery—Reach Fishing.

Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Mackerel, Mussels and Razor Fish.

Squid Jig, Berley and Netting.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Racing Act 1976—Rules—

Betting Control Board—Licence and Registration Fees.

Trotting—

Claiming Races.

General and Club Fees.

Soccer Football Pools Act 1981—Regulations—Prescribed Fee.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Susan Lenahan):

Sewerage Act 1929—Regulations—Examination and Registration Fees.

Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—Examination and Registration Fees.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. Susan Lenahan):

Bills of Sales Act 1886—Regulations—Registration and Discharge Fees.

Crown Lands Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.

Pastoral Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.

Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—

Fees.

Form of Instruments and Certificates of Title.

Land Division Fees.

Strata Plan Applications.

Strata Titles Revocation.

Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Regulations—Registration, Deposit and Enrolment Fees.

Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Regulations—Survey Plan Fee.

Strata Titles Act 1988—Regulations—

Fees.

Strata Plans.

Surveyors Act 1975—Regulation—Fees Revocation.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder):

Gas Act 1988—Regulations—Gas Quality, Testing of Meters and Registration.

Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.

Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder):
Forestry Act 1950: Proclamations—Hundreds of—
Grey.
Riddoch.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Forests): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As the new Minister of Forests I have made it a priority to report to the House at the earliest opportunity concerning recent developments in relation to the South Australian Timber Corporation's investment in the timber products group International Panel and Lumber Holdings. The two major companies within that group are IPL (Australia) and IPL (New Zealand).

Honourable members will be aware that a select committee has been formed in another place to review, amongst other things, the involvement in IPL. I do not wish to preempt that review, but I believe it is appropriate that the House be brought up to date on this issue. Before discussing these events, I believe it will be useful to both members and the public if I cover some issues which are part of the history of this investment. Such a treatment will necessarily be broad.

The decision to merge the operations of the SATCO owned O.R. Beddison Pty Ltd based in the South-East with the New Zealand-based Aorangi Forest Industries was not primarily aimed at an expansion of SATCO's activity *per se*. The aim of the joint venture was to ensure that, following the Ash Wednesday fires of 1983, Beddison would have a sufficiently wide range of products to ensure that it could continue to operate. At the time of the destruction of the forests, it was deemed to be necessary for Beddison to seek a source of high grade furniture plywood to complement the predominantly low grade products it was then limited to producing because of the lack of adequate resources in the South-East. If Beddison had been forced to continue to sell its limited range of product on the market, it would have faced both a limit on its marketing ability and a limit on its likely return.

The primary goal was maintaining Beddison's position and protecting the more than 100 jobs involved at the Nangwarry plywood plant. That goal remains today and the threat to Nangwarry that existed five years ago is every bit as real today. The concept of a merger between Beddison and Aorangi grew from an earlier joint marketing arrangement. SATCO believed, from information given by Wincorp (the owner of Aorangi), that the access to Aorangi's high grade output could be lost to Beddison because of Wincorp's intention to sell out. Concern about the future of Beddison led SATCO to investigate the proposal of Wincorp to merge the two operations. The negotiations took place over six months in the latter half of 1985. Information was exchanged between the two companies during this period.

In considering the information provided by Wincorp, SATCO worked closely with its financial adviser. Neither SATCO officials, who had the main carriage of this business decision, nor its adviser were aware that the information provided by Wincorp would ultimately prove to be incorrect. Subsequent investigation following settlement has shown that the balance sheet of Aorangi Forest Industries was seriously deficient. Liabilities were understated and certain financial assets were overstated. The effect of this was reflected in a net asset shortfall of \$NZ3.2 million.

Further, in his letter to Parliament of 20 October 1987, the Auditor-General pointed out that the important prerequisite to the investment decision was the appointment of an independent person at arms length from the venture. I have been informed that this was not done because at the time SATCO believed that sufficient information was available to make these judgments. When the full effects of the misrepresentation by Wincorp became known in mid 1986, SATCO undertook a number of actions in New Zealand to gain control of the operation of Aorangi, now called IPL (New Zealand).

Legal action was also initiated against Wincorp in the Federal Court. This action has limited the ability of the Government to explain matters related to the balance sheet and the performance of IPL (New Zealand). As was announced in June this year, SATCO withdrew its action in the Federal Court against Wincorp and others in relation to IPL (New Zealand). SATCO has signed an agreement with the various New Zealand parties to terminate legal action and to facilitate the full transfer of all IPL assets to SATCO.

The decision to terminate the legal action and settle was based solely on commercial criteria. There were three primary issues which determined this. SATCO had been advised that its legal case was likely to be successful. I am told that, despite this likely success, there was no guarantee that the joint venture partners would be able to meet any judgment against them. Given that continued legal action was likely to achieve little or no financial benefit or, more properly, the retrieval of any financial loss for SATCO, the decision was based on the net impact that ongoing litigation would have on the business.

SATCO was therefore concerned with the impact of uncertainty on the ability of the IPL group, especially IPL (NZ), to operate on the market. But apart from these marketing issues, SATCO was also concerned to gain full control of IPL to allow the company to be managed in a non-hostile environment. The significance of this has been outlined by my predecessor when he explained the benefits of the redeemable preference share arrangements carried out by IPL (NZ) in March this year. Essentially the preference share arrangement allowed IPL (NZ) to raise \$NZ40 million. This has allowed IPL (NZ) to repay its SAFA borrowings, including capitalised interest amounting to \$A11.2 million. Because of exchange rate appreciation since the borrowings were taken out, IPL (NZ) has enjoyed an exchange rate gain of about \$2.3 million which will be reported in its 1987-88 financial statements. The balance of the \$NZ40 million has been deposited with a major New Zealand bank at a rate which produces an interest margin for IPL (NZ). Further, on 30 June 1988 IPL (NZ) made a further preference share issue for \$NZ10 million. \$NZ9.45 million of this issue is deposited in a bank in New Zealand producing certain interest benefits which will again accrue to IPL (NZ).

Before moving to the financial situation of IPL (NZ), I wish to outline the essential features of the settlement with the New Zealand parties. First, the 30 per cent share in IPL Holdings which had previously been held by Wincorp was transferred to SATCO. Secondly, all other assets including land and equipment were passed to IPL (NZ) now owned by SATCO through IPL (Holdings). Thirdly, all connections between IPL (Holdings) and IPL (NZ) on the one hand and the various New Zealand parties on the other hand have been severed. Finally, based on the advice I have referred to earlier that Wincorp and certain directors of that company would not be able to pay any damages stemming from

successful legal action by SATCO, it was agreed to write off a debt of \$3.2 million owed by Wincorp to IPL (NZ).

I refer now to the position of the SATCO investment in IPL (NZ). As I have indicated, the position of IPL (NZ) is not currently a viable one. The accumulated losses to June 1988 are of the order of \$NZ6 million. In the last year trading losses of about \$1.5 million were incurred. This is despite the efforts of SATCO to improve the overall management of the operation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Minister resume his seat. The House gave leave for a ministerial statement to be made. The Chair anticipates that that statement will be heard in silence and not greeted with interjection from the Deputy Leader. The honourable the Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The major reason for this has been the impact of the New Zealand dollar. The amount of product exported has declined from 3 400 cubic metres in 1986-87 to some 1 100 cubic metres in 1987-88. Any efficiency gains, and there have been a number, have been subsumed by falling sales. This leads me to the decision as to whether or not to sell IPL (NZ). To sell IPL (NZ) now would, in my belief, convert what are currently paper losses to real losses. Such a move now will forfeit any possibility of gaining a reasonable price for IPL (NZ).

In 1987-88 the profit and loss statement indicates that after interest and the exchange gain the overall result is a profit of about \$1 million. The trading loss I have referred to earlier, however, cannot be ignored, nor can IPL (NZ) be valued for any resale in terms of extraordinary items on its profit and loss statement. For IPL (NZ) to regain a marketable value will require the achievement of trading profits. The existence of extraordinary items and the opportunity to achieve profits do, however, offer some breathing space in reaching a decision on IPL (NZ)'s future. It is my decision at this point in time to maintain the investment in IPL (NZ).

STANDING ORDERS

The SPEAKER: I have received the following memorandum from His Excellency the Governor's Deputy: 'The Governor's Deputy returns herewith a copy of amendments to Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, adopted by the House of Assembly on 14 April 1988, and approved by him in Executive Council on 30 June 1988' above the hand of C.M. Laucke, Governor's Deputy.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses held today for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. Charles Murray Hill.

DEATH OF MR ARNOLD NOACK

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): By leave, I acknowledge the passing of Mr Arnold Noack, the former Head Attendant of the House who died suddenly on 14 May 1988. Arnold Eric Noack was born on 18 January 1933 at Nuriootpa, so he was 55 years of age when he died. His career in this place is as follows: he was appointed as a

messenger on 21 January 1977, he became a Chamber messenger on 26 February 1982 and he became Head Attendant on 30 September 1983. Those of us who are the older hands around the Assembly therefore had an opportunity to have a very long association with Arnold and we all mourn his passing.

This is an opportunity for all members to place on record their appreciation not only for the many years of service that he gave to all of us and to the Parliament but also for the many servants of the Parliament who in a self-effacing way ensure the smooth running of both Houses. Arnold was always very obliging and helpful in all the requests that were made to him and, believe you me, from time to time some rather strange and almost impossible requests are made of our attendants and other people who are involved in the servicing of this Parliament.

Nonetheless, they always come up smiling and try to do the very best they can in the way in which they meet our requests, which are often rather urgent requests, as is the nature of debate and organisation in this Chamber and in the other place. I remember Arnold Noack with a great deal of respect and affection, and I know that all my colleagues join with me in expressing that sentiment. Our condolences are extended to his family.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the remarks of the Deputy Premier in relation to the passing of Arnold Noack and I speak on behalf of the Liberal Party and the Opposition in acknowledging the respect in which he was held by all members of this Parliament. Respect is an attribute that is earned and not lightly given. Arnold, through the performance of his duties in a very diligent and efficient manner in this Parliament, earned the respect, I am sure, of all members. From the point of view of the Opposition, with its offices located in this building, we are very much dependent on the goodwill and support of the various staff members throughout this building for the efficient operation of those offices.

Arnold was a courteous person at all times. He was certainly fair and unfailing in that courtesy and in the diligent way in which he discharged his duties to ensure that this Parliament ran efficiently. I would join with members in this House in expressing condolences to his family on his early passing. He had 18 months service as Head Attendant and 11 years service in this Parliament as a messenger and attendant, and prior to that I understand he was a member of the South Australian Police Force. He served this State well in a quiet and certainly self-effacing way, as the Deputy Premier said. I add to the Deputy Premier's remarks by acknowledging the courteous, diligent manner in which Arnold Noack served this Parliament.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to add my thoughts and words to those of the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing condolences on the passing of Arnold. In a one person Party, the opportunity of being able to liaise with attendants is very important, and I found Arnold most helpful and scrupulously fair at all times. Everything he did was in the interests of all members and on a fair and equal basis. I regret that I was unable to be at his funeral. However, my condolences were conveyed at that time, as I was out of the State, and on this occasion I can only express my condolences again to the members of Arnold's family.

The SPEAKER: It is appropriate that the House has acknowledged the passing of a good servant of the Parliament, and I will ensure that the *Hansard* record of members' contributions is conveyed to the immediate family.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of the Premier, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Tyler and De Laine and the Deputy Premier (mover) be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech on opening Parliament and to report on motion.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr OLSEN: When Cabinet agreed today to indemnify the former Minister of Health for all legal costs, damages and other proceedings in respect of his defamation case, what estimate did Cabinet have before it of the cost to taxpayers so far; does the decision extend to any appeal and, if so, what is the additional estimated cost to taxpayers; and has any limit been placed upon this further indemnity given that the matter could go as far as the High Court, in which case total costs could amount to several hundred thousand dollars?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Cabinet did have before it certain information as to costs although, of course, the final costs have not as yet been calculated. Essentially, the amount that is known is that damages of \$75 000 plus \$5 000 interest (that is, \$80 000) have been awarded by the judge plus an award of costs. The costs would need to be taxed, and that is the legal expression used to refer to the way in which actual costs are assessed by a Master of the court. This will be done under the surveillance of or in conjunction with Crown Law. The plaintiff's legal costs could total somewhere in excess of \$30 000. The defendant's costs may match those, but until details of the actual taxed costs are made available we will not know the exact amounts. Once they are they will be put on public notice.

The proceedings at appeal will be nowhere near as expensive as the case itself, involving as it did days of sitting and witnesses. An appeal will relate to legal argument which will be disposed of fairly rapidly, and one can therefore talk in the vicinity of \$10 000 or so. In saying that, I am putting a figure in the public domain only because, if I do not put any figure at all, the Leader of the Opposition will accuse me of being evasive. I put clearly on the record that I cannot be held to that figure: it is a rough estimate at the moment. Indeed, we will not know—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The important essential thing was to make a decision on principle. Once that principle is established and once it is properly established that an indemnity should apply, the actual amount becomes less relevant. This would be exactly the same situation that the Tonkin Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, would have had before it in a prospective action involving the then Minister of Labour, Mr Dean Brown, who is unfortunately no longer with us. The Cabinet then indemnified that Minister against any costs or damages arising—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —from that particular action.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I caution the honourable the Minister of Agriculture, the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Murray-Mallee for their repeated interjection. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The fact is that in any of these situations either a settlement can take place—as indeed took place in the case involving Minister Dean Brown, and therefore the amount of money involved was infinitely less than in this case; but nonetheless the principle had been taken. If that matter in fact had gone to court and the same sort of result ensued then the same order of cost would have been paid under that decision by the Tonkin Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I make that clear, and it is not irrelevant; nor is the question of settlement, because it was members opposite who in fact sought the good offices of the Attorney-General, and anybody else, to assist them to try to get a settlement and agreement in the case. Knowing that the plaintiff in this issue was in fact a prospective member of Parliament they in fact sought our offices to achieve a settlement. That is how concerned they were about it.

In this present instance, in fact Cabinet had earlier agreed to an indemnity to apply in the case of a settlement, because at that stage a settlement was proposed involving all the media and Dr Cornwall himself. Dr Cornwall's aspect of that settlement was in fact rejected by the plaintiff, who insisted in the end that the matter went to court. That was the right of the plaintiff. But I simply put that in perspective: the degree and extent of costs, in a sense, are not as relevant as the decision in principle. Once that decision in principle is taken, then a commitment has to be made. That is the situation we are in.

In relation to supporting the appeal proceedings, I also ought to make the point that if, in fact, the appeal is successful in whatever respect then the Government's cost as the indemnifier will be reduced. Let us take the example of the quantum of damages being reduced—obviously that is to an advantage. Let us take the point of some ruling being made on the question of qualified privilege. Again, it is in the interests of Government, of whatever political persuasion, to have those principles properly adduced and analysed, and it is worth supporting action to do it.

So, Mr Speaker, I am prepared to meet public criticism on this matter—and it is rightly raised, and the public needs, and rightly demands, an explanation as to why we do this. However, I am astonished that members of a former Government, which in fact grappled with these issues and came to exactly the same conclusion that we have and which when we came to office made urgent entreaties to us to stick by the decision that they had made not to politicise the matter, not to change our view but to please stick with the decision they had made, are now standing up and criticising us today. I will accept the criticism from the general public and I will attempt to answer it, but I will not cop the hypocrisy from the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Albert Park and the Leader of the Opposition to order.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS WATER SUPPLY

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Water Resources assure the House that the \$100 000 mains cleaning program is not 'useless' and 'a cover up' of the real water problems, as claimed on the front page of the *Southern Times Messenger*

of Wednesday 29 June 1988? In the article, a southern resident, Lee Delaine, claimed that the E&WS clean up program would not solve water problems in the southern suburbs. She is quoted as saying:

It is only a short-term thing to make it look like they are doing something when it won't make much difference.

As a consequence of this article, I have been approached by constituents asking what this clean up program really means and whether it will improve water quality for residents of the southern suburbs.

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question because I have been very much involved with this issue for some years. Contrary to what the honourable member has heard, the mains cleaning program that is currently under way in the southern suburbs is most certainly not a waste of money or merely an attempt to make the situation look good. Pending the completion late next year of the Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant, the Government has done its best to ensure that the quality of water delivered to households in the south has shown a marked improvement. It is recognised that this type of program is certainly not a long-term solution—that solution is, of course, filtration. However, statistics available since 1984 indicate that air scouring of mains, which is currently being undertaken in the southern community, is not generally required again for at least two to three years.

Therefore, the benefits of the current mains cleaning program should last well into the advent of filtered water from the Happy Valley plant, and indeed such a large cleaning program should not be necessary in the area again. For the honourable member's information and that of other members, there are three teams working in the southern community on mains cleaning. To the end of July, 90 kilometres of mains have been cleaned since the start of the program on 20 June 1988. I should be pleased to make available to the honourable member a series of photographs that clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of this mains cleaning program.

MINISTERS' INDEMNITY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier confirm that the former Minister of Health is not entitled to an indemnity for his costs and damages, under guidelines drawn up by the Government? In his press statement this morning, the Premier referred to discussions between the Attorney-General and the shadow Attorney-General relating to 'a bipartisan approach to the question of indemnity to Government Ministers'. These are the Premier's words. The Attorney-General had asked the Opposition to preserve confidentiality about those discussions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier's statement this morning therefore reaches the confidentiality of discussions in which the Opposition has sought to ensure that Ministers are not given *carte blanche* to defame individual and innocent South Australians. As he has raised these guidelines publicly, I reveal to the House and to the public the fact that the guidelines most recently submitted by the Government to the Opposition contained the following stipulation relating to an indemnity for a Minister sued for defamation:

Such assistance will not be provided where the publication complained of did not reasonably arise from the performance of ministerial duties.

This means that the former Minister cannot be entitled to assistance unless the Government believes it is reasonable for a Minister to label as (and these are the Minister's words) 'a scurrilous fool', 'a robber baron', 'a wild man' and a doctor prepared to 'hold his patients to ransom', a man judged by a court, in its comment to have been 'a respectable and respected citizen' and 'an industrious and hard working surgeon who was completely devoted to the treatment of his patients'. The criteria outlined in the Government's proposed guidelines would not possibly justify an indemnity for Dr Cornwall.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That last remark was in fact the honourable member's opinion: it was a comment in his own opinion and had nothing to do with an objective statement. The question—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It justifies Dean Brown's indemnity and hangs your bloke by the neck.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Could I have your assistance please, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear the words uttered by the Deputy Leader. I caution all honourable members that their good manners need not go out the window simply because there is a highly charged issue before the Chamber. If I have to name members in the course of today's Question Time, I will do so without hesitation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I can assure you that I will not be intimidated by the guerilla tactics and gross utterances of members opposite. I will deal with what I believe is a serious public matter in a serious public way. If members opposite genuinely seek information from the Government, they will get it from me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already cautioned honourable members to cease interjecting. One or two honourable members in particular are extremely close to being named. I will not name them at this moment but the warning is there, clearly.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I repeat: I will not be prevented by disruptive tactics from answering directly these matters, although it is quite obvious that members opposite are not interested in the answer. Instead, they are interested in simply chivvy around the issues they want to raise, just as the Deputy Leader's question was aimed at rehearsing things just for his own titillation. He asked a substantive question about the guidelines. The problem is that at the moment no guidelines exist, except in draft form, because of the dilatory behaviour of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —in responding to Government invitations to treat on this matter. The first invitation was made in 1984 as part of an agreement that was reached as the Government, at the behest of Opposition members, attempted to settle the Dean Brown case. One point agreed as a result of that was that we would try, between ourselves, to establish guidelines which would then be used in all subsequent cases so that we did not have the embarrassment of a decision being made by one Government perhaps being counteracted by another. We should know where we stand so that Ministers of the Crown understand the rules under which they operate.

To this stage those guidelines have not been agreed and, as I said in my statement today, unless we can get agreement very soon we will promulgate them unilaterally. Members must understand that it is far better to have an agreed set of guidelines that we all understand and which will, irrespective of a change in Government, remain in operation, because some of these cases can go on for some years. That

is the first point: there are no guidelines in force, but draft guidelines are under consideration.

Notwithstanding that, I suggest that the decision we have made in this case would conform to any such guidelines. However, the important point about guidelines is that they do not mean that a Minister of the Crown or any other official of the Parliament or the Opposition has some sort of open slather, and in fact there is a limit to such indemnities based on those particular guidelines. That is the situation and that is how we attempted to address this matter.

It is regrettable that we do not have agreed guidelines. In case members are concerned about my reference to what I would call the 'dilatatory reaction of the Opposition', the fact is that over a long period an attempt has been made to reach agreement. Meetings have been held and drafts have been exchanged. The Attorney-General showed me a copy of one letter that the Hon. Trevor Griffin sent to him as far back as September 1986 in which Mr Griffin thanked the Attorney for a letter he had sent in respect of indemnity. It was a letter saying, 'How about it, can we get on with doing this?' Mr Griffin said, 'I have not had time to consider these papers.' The interesting fact is that he said, 'The earlier correspondence you provided to me is somewhere in my office. To save time, I would appreciate it if you could let me have a copy of the relevant material.' In other words, he has lost it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The most recent communication the Government had on this matter was in March 1988, when the shadow Attorney-General said that he would be responding within a few weeks and, at the latest, after Easter. I am saying again, as I said today, that we need to get those guidelines properly adopted. Obviously, the way in which the Opposition is attempting to exploit this situation shows that the sooner we can do it, the better.

GENETIC ENGINEERING

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology inform the House whether any consideration has been given to the provision of regulations relating to the deliberate release of genetically engineered organisms? Concern has been recently expressed by people working in the field of genetically engineered organisms that some horrible mistake might occur by the accidental or even deliberate release of these organisms. People working in the field have stated that there should be uniform national legislation, even though the majority of these matters lie with the State.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question: it is certainly a very important issue. The concern the honourable member reflects now certainly has been voiced in other areas of the community. In 1984 when Barry Jones, the Federal Minister, and I formally launched the South Australian Biotechnology Promotion Committee we indicated that this was one issue which needed examining. That committee has responsibility for examining industrial opportunities in biotechnology and the further responsibility of what one may term the general socio-technological questions which are involved.

I have been advised by the Biotechnology Promotion Committee that it is examining this question in some detail and hopes to have a report before me in early 1989. The terms of reference for the report are to examine whether existing regulatory structures in such areas as occupational health and safety, public health and environmental protec-

tion are capable of integrating genetic manipulation monitoring and control with their existing responsibilities and duties; or whether special regulatory structures are required to monitor and control all aspects of genetic manipulation work. Clearly, that will anticipate recommendations which will not just be directed to regulation within South Australia but, indeed, what national coordination may need to be sought, and even, may I suggest, what international work should perhaps be done in some of these areas. When I have a report on this matter I will advise the honourable member and the House.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr BECKER: My question is directed to the Premier. Did Dr Cornwall resign of his own choice, as the Premier claimed this morning—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. Dr Cornwall is the title that should be used.

Mr BECKER: Did the Hon. Dr Cornwall MLC resign of his own choice, as the Premier claimed this morning, or did the Hon. Dr Cornwall MLC argue against his resignation on the grounds that it was too severe a penalty to pay, as the Hon. Dr. Cornwall has said this afternoon?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I said this morning in my statement, I did not force Dr Cornwall to resign.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Dr Cornwall resigned in consequence of a discussion that I had with him, in which we went through the various issues involved.

THIRD PARTY PROPERTY INSURANCE

Mr De LAINE: Will the Minister of Transport re-investigate the possibility of introducing compulsory third party property insurance? In the *News* of 21 July the general manager of one of South Australia's leading insurance companies called for the introduction of third party property insurance to work in tandem with the existing third party personal injury insurance.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a question which has been presented to me in a number of forums all over South Australia since I have been Minister of Transport. On the face of it, it sounds like a good idea, but on close investigation it has some problems. The need for third party property insurance to cover damage to a vehicle caused by an uninsured driver who is unable subsequently to meet his liabilities is a problem that many members of society have faced.

I understand, as the honourable member has pointed out, that the introduction of compulsory third party property insurance was recently promoted by a senior officer of J. M. Insurance who has received some public acclaim for his initiative. The difficulty facing a Minister in pursuing a topic such as this is that on the surface it is a very attractive and simple proposition which, I am informed by my advisers and other independent insurance experts, rapidly becomes more complex in its implementation, to such an extent that the benefits are outweighed by the disadvantages.

At the outset, let me draw attention to the fact that the body representing the insurance companies of this State (the Insurance Council of South Australia), the body representing the motorists of this State (the RAA), and the compulsory third party property insurer in this State (SGIC) all

oppose the introduction of compulsory third party property insurance. I think that it is worthy of note that no other State or Territory has managed to implement any comparable scheme. It has been suggested to me in forums that schemes are in place in other parts of the world but, on investigation, those schemes do not measure up as those recommended by people in South Australia.

We do not have a scheme similar to those which have been recommended and which have been suggested here today. The main ground for not proceeding relates to cost. If a third party property scheme were to be made compulsory, insurance companies would no longer be able to screen out bad risks as a way of keeping down premiums. If the scheme were to be fair and comprehensive, there would be a need to protect against the hit-and-run driver. This would require the setting up of a nominal defendant process. This would be open to abuse with the temptation to ascribe blame for accidents for which a person himself was responsible—for instance, backing into a gatepost—to an unknown hit-and-run driver.

Such petty fraud would be very difficult to police. Technically, the scheme would be expensive to manage in terms of covering costs of litigation, because of the absence of any arrangement whereby companies could operate knock-for-knock agreements. For all these reasons, insurance experts state that premiums for a compulsory scheme of third party property damage would be much higher than those presently available voluntarily. That cost could be as much as two or three times greater. This creates an anomaly where some safe drivers would wind up paying almost as much for compulsory property damage as they pay presently for full comprehensive cover. And they would be the real losers.

I can stress only that motorists take out comprehensive insurance. If they do not insure comprehensively, they must face the consequence that, if they are unlucky enough to have an accident with an uninsured driver of limited economic means, the saving in premium that they would have gained initially would be seen to be false economy. I make the point that compulsory third party insurance has been a part of Labor Party policy for a number of years, and it is a decision that I think Ministers of Transport and Ministers of Consumer Affairs over a great number of years would have been happy to have implemented if it was possible to do so. The fact is that, on all the evidence that is available to me, introducing a compulsory third party property insurance scheme would result in higher, rather than less, cost to the insurer.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Premier. After having advised the Hon. Dr Cornwall that his actions would be indemnified but before the matter went to trial, did you as the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should say, 'Did he, as the Premier.' You are addressing your question through the Chair.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Did the Premier, the Attorney-General or any other member of Cabinet give advice to or consider giving advice to the Hon. Dr Cornwall to apologise to Dr Humble for defaming him and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, I am not quite clear about the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think I indicated in my answer earlier, and perhaps the honourable member was

not listening, that back in 1986, I think it was, an attempt was made to settle the case. All the defendants, which included representatives of the media as well as Dr Cornwall, collectively agreed that whatever appropriate apologies and so on would be necessary would be made in order to achieve a settlement.

As I understand the situation, settlement was agreed between the media, and that is referred to in the judgment that was issued. I think an amount in excess of \$50 000 was paid collectively by those media groups in full settlement of their claim. However, Dr Cornwall's participation in that settlement was refused by the plaintiff and the matter then proceeded to court.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has just called the House to order, and that call to order was then followed by a further interjection by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee. The next interjection by the member for Murray-Mallee will lead to his being named forthwith. The honourable member for Newland.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Emergency Services examine ways of stepping up introduction of new Neighbourhood Watch areas in view of the real success of the scheme, its cost effectiveness and the 175-odd areas on the waiting list? The Commercial Union Assurance Company's sponsorship of Neighbourhood Watch has allowed some 102 areas involving 200 000 residents to be established, not the 60 000 residents recently mentioned in a media report.

Dramatic results in reducing crime, particularly house break-ins, theft and vandal damage, have resulted. The estimated cost of setting up a Neighbourhood Watch area of some 600 homes is \$1.25 per home. I am advised that police and Neighbourhood Watch officials believe an additional spread of the scheme would be a good investment in crime prevention.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A week or so ago the Cabinet journeyed to the honourable member's electorate where, as I recall, the honourable member soothed her constituents on to me. We had a very useful meeting with a group of people who had been involved with Neighbourhood Watch for some time—a very pleasant meeting where these people were able to very effectively put their point of view as to how efficacious they felt Neighbourhood Watch had been in their area, and they were also able to make a very cogent case for the quicker spread of the Neighbourhood Watch concept.

Following that meeting I did determine that I would have the matter investigated, and that is still proceeding. However, I think I can give the honourable member an assurance that we are looking very sympathetically at the possibility of a bit of a raid on the piggy bank which will enable some of those areas that are already in the queue to get an earlier institution of this service.

We already have sufficient experience of the Neighbourhood Watch program to be able to say that it does have an effect on certain types of crime. I think earlier on there might have been some cynical judgment that all the Neighbourhood Watch program did was to displace crime from area A that was under the Neighbourhood Watch program to area B that was not. However, it can now be established that generally there has been a lowering in the incidence of housebreaking and that sort of thing, because crime of an

opportunistic nature tends to be reduced because of the signs in the streets, the general knowledge of what is happening and people's vigilance. Obviously, it has been one of the most promising initiatives in community security for some time, and we should endeavour as much as we possibly can to satisfy the desire of those areas that are awaiting the introduction of that service. I thank the honourable member for her question and for the way she had her constituents very effectively put this point to me. We will be taking up the matter.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier dissociate his Government from the behaviour of one of its employees this morning and give a guarantee that the Government does not question the independence or impartiality of His Honour Acting Judge Bowen-Pain of the District Court? Early this morning a television news cameraman was telephoned at home, on his silent number, by the Press Secretary to the former Minister of Health.

The Press Secretary indicated that she had reason to believe the cameraman had gone out with a girl whose surname was Bowen-Pain. The Press Secretary asked if the cameraman was aware whether the girl he had gone out with was in fact the daughter of Acting Judge Bowen-Pain. She then inquired whether he was aware of the Acting Judge's political affiliations and, specifically, 'if the judge was a Liberal'. The cameraman was upset and embarrassed by the call which he regarded as an attempt by the Government to obtain information intended to undermine the independence of the Acting Judge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot call on the Premier to reply until the House has come to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know nothing of the incident reported, and it sounds to me as if it may well have been some private transaction which has obviously been put in the public domain. If the facts are as stated, and one would have to know what are the circumstances—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, if the cameraman concerned has a complaint, I invite that complaint to be put in writing to me.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles has asked her question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the implication of the question is that in any way the Government, and I in particular, would condone action which attempted to denigrate a judge in whatever capacity, I can assure members that that is not the case. In particular, whatever the views may be of the judgment made by Acting Judge Bowen-Pain, he is a judge empowered to draw conclusions and reach them as a result of the case heard before him. He has given his reasons extensively in writing and I do not think that one would find anything I have said in commentary on that case that in any way attempts to attack the *bona fides* of His Honour.

If in fact there is some complaint in respect of this over which I have some jurisdiction, I would invite the complainant to let me know and I will certainly investigate the matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Coles that they are following a

path that will lead to their being categorised with the member for Murray-Mallee as being—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! —subject to being named if they persist with their interjections. The honourable member for Briggs.

CHLOROFLUOROCARBONS

Mr RANN: My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Does the State Government intend to take similar action to Western Australia in order to limit the use of chlorofluorocarbon propelled products? The Western Australian Minister for Environment, Mr Hodge, has taken action to make it an offence to manufacture, import or sell pressure packs propelled by chlorofluorocarbons unless they are essentials, like asthma sprays, or are covered by temporary exemptions. Mr Hodge has also announced that a total ban, except for essential use, will apply by the end of next year. I understand that the Tasmanian Government has also announced its intention to ban CFCs, but that its legislation has not yet been introduced.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Let me tell members all about the Tasmanian Government. The Tasmanian Government announced some months ago in a great flourish that it was going to introduce legislation, and then adjourned the House and off they went. There has still not been any legislation in Tasmania.

I will put this whole matter into some perspective, which may assist honourable members as Federal legislation is coming forward and they need to know the background in which it is being considered. The Montreal agreement was drawn up against a background of a degree of scientific knowledge about what was happening in the ozone layer and the impact of CFCs on that ozone layer. Since that time there has been an updating of scientific knowledge. One of the things that has been revealed is that a hole (not a complete hole, but a significant lowering of the concentration of the ozone layer over the Antarctic continent) occurs in the southern spring in October/November of each year and, although it seems to be held in place by a vortex in the atmosphere, there is some chance that it could spread to lower latitudes. We now understand that the position with the ozone layer is somewhat more critical than we have been led to believe. Because of this, governments around the world are saying that that which was set down in the protocol to the Montreal agreement is not really tough enough in order to address the problem.

I remind all members that we are not simply talking about sprays. Most pressure pack sprays I understand are now propelled by hydrocarbons and there is much less use of CFCs in those sprays. However, its use as a refrigerant continues and a good deal of research is going into an acceptable replacement for the CFCs that are currently being used. There have been two reasons for announcements by some State jurisdictions in relation to this matter. One has been a reaction to the understanding that the Montreal agreement is inadequate to do the job and the second has been a degree of cheer chasing on the part of some governments.

At the recent Australian Environment Council, Ministers were lectured by an adviser to Senator Richardson on the dangers of racing off in all sorts of directions. It was made perfectly clear that Senator Richardson will be legislating later this year for standards which will be more stringent than the Montreal agreement. Those levels will be honoured

in any of the arrangements made in this State as they will throughout the continent. If it is necessary for this Government or Parliament to consider legislation ancillary to the Commonwealth legislation, clearly we will do so and I hope that there would be unanimous agreement by all members ancillary to that. Senator Richardson will be legislating in the Budget session, which gives some indication of the timing if indeed ancillary legislation is actually needed.

The other point I make, without in any way minimising the problem about the reduction in the ozone layer, the effect it would have on crops, and so on, is this: one thing we need to keep in mind when people talk about a 5 per cent, 10 per cent or 15 per cent increase in exposure to ultraviolet radiation is that, if a person living in Melbourne transfers their place of abode to Brisbane, they are immediately and permanently exposed to a 70 per cent increase in ultraviolet radiation.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Mr OSWALD: In reference to the question asked by the member for Coles, will the Premier raise the matter with the Press Secretary and establish her version? If the events are as outlined by the member for Coles and he finds that they are correct, will he take appropriate action and, if necessary, will he sack her?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will not respond to a second-hand report from the member for Coles. I will respond, as I said in reply to the member for Coles, to a complaint from the individual involved.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. One more interjection and he will be named.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suppose it was appropriate that the Leader interjected—

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Premier not to provoke the Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It so happens that the member for Morphett asked me the question—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —as handed to him by the Leader of the Opposition and as written down by the Leader of the Opposition from dictation on the telephone. Be that as it may, I repeat what I said: if the direct person involved is prepared to state a case to me, I will very happily take it up. If the facts are as stated, I will definitely take some appropriate action. But I will not respond to hearsay evidence produced here by the member for Coles in a politically stirring environment.

SARICH ORBITAL ENGINE

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology advise what efforts are currently being made and what benefits there would be if the Sarich orbital engine construction plant was established in South Australia? A series of newspaper articles in mid-July outlined critical developments in the 16-year-old history of the development of the Sarich orbital engine. They included the licensing agreement with Ford; the design of the Ghia Saguro car which could house the Sarich engine; the criticism by the Federal Liberal spokesman on industry of the car being built in Australia at all; the bids by various State Governments to attract production to their State; and the

visit by officials of the Department of State Development and Technology to Perth, all of which have generated great interest and debate for the Sarich engine's prospects in South Australia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. If the present race between South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia, in which we would say we are ahead by a nose but by no means at the end of the line yet, results in the project coming to South Australia, the benefits, which the honourable member has asked about, would be the creation of many hundreds of jobs (between 800 and 1 200 directly and others in component industries) and, secondly, a boost to exports from South Australia because the bulk of that production would be exported, thus joining the many other successful automotive component companies exporting from South Australia. The third advantage is the technology boost that would occur.

Already we see a number of exciting initiatives taking place in technology in South Australia which would reflect the momentum that has been building up over recent years. I repeat: it is a race still on with a number of characteristics to it. It is a race to determine whether or not this technology is to be picked up by the international automotive industry. Whilst it is true that the recent move by the Ford Motor Company in the US to sign a non-exclusive licensing agreement was a major step forward for OEC and Sarich, it still has to get to a further stage where it is being put into a production vehicle by Ford or any other company. It does, however, give validation to this new phase of that orbital engine technology. The next aspect of the race is between the different States which are bidding for the project and indeed between Australia as a production site and the US as a sole production site as proposed by, amongst others, the Liberal spokesperson mentioned by the honourable member.

One of the misapprehensions that some of the people within the Sarich organisation, the orbital engine company, had was that it would be more expensive to produce that engine in Australia. Ralph Sarich himself quoted a \$100 million cost penalty to produce in Australia compared with producing in Michigan. It was the South Australian Department of State Development and Technology that did significant number crunching on that and talked it through with Ralph Sarich, other people in OEC and the chairman of the Sarich trust, for example, and was able to convince them that the figures on which they were working did not correctly reflect the cost of production certainly in South Australia or in Australia at large. That \$100 million cost penalty, we argued, did not exist to that magnitude but there was a cogent case that the cost differential between Michigan and Australia regarding the production of the Sarich engine, all things taken into account, was in Australia's favour and not in favour of the US. We understand from advice we have from Ralph Sarich and his people that they accept the figures we have done and indeed were impressed with the effort we put in to prove what the real cost of production would be.

But as I say, we still have some way to go in this particular race. If the technology reaches that next stage of being picked up in a production sense, then South Australia is still very much in the race to be bidding to be a production site of the engines for that technology. At this stage we are ahead by a nose.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr D.S. BAKER: Will the Premier agree that Dr Cornwall's behaviour before and during his defamation trial

forfeits any right he may have to return to the Ministry on retirement of the Minister of Transport? Will he give a guarantee not to support Dr Cornwall's re-election to the Ministry?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, I simply refer the honourable member to the statement that I have already made on this matter.

GREENHOUSE EFFECT

Mr ROBERTSON: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of reports of pending climatic changes arising out of the accumulation of so-called greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, is the Minister able to acquaint the House with any forward planning undertaken by his departments to predict the effects that such climatic changes might have on South Australian agriculture? I am sure the Minister would be aware of an article in the *National Farmer* of 5 February this year in which Mr Peter Hemphill stated that for the majority of Australia the effect of the greenhouse effect would be that it is likely that there would be more summer rainfall and in the southern areas of Australia less winter rainfall. The article went on to say that the changes in Australia's climate during the next 50 years may mean dramatic shifts in farming operations, to the extent that previous grazing country may eventually become cropping regions, and vice versa. The article concluded by saying that what is certain is that there will be greater diversification in farming enterprise. For that reason, I ask what steps are being taken to anticipate that diversification?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is a very important issue not only from the point of view of Australia's position but also that which pertains internationally. I know that, for example, in the United States various Congressional and Senate committees are looking at this issue and its implications for not only agriculture but the economy as a whole. The impact, as the honourable member has indicated, could lead to a temperature increase and also a change in rainfall patterns, particularly in the southern part of the continent, of anything up to a 20 per cent increase in rainfall in the summer period and a corresponding drop in the winter period. The department is endeavouring to build up an intelligence or an information bank on the impact. At this point of time it is very hard to make any estimates of the impact, but we are looking at a program which more than likely will establish meteorological recording bases throughout the district centres in South Australia in order to assess the changes. We estimate that the changes will be quite gradual over a period of time. It will give us intelligence of what is actually happening in the environment and some way of estimating what impact the changes will have on the agricultural economy of this State. Certainly, it is a very important question.

Recently an officer from the department attended a national conference which dealt with the greenhouse effect. That national conference formulated a number of resolutions, which I think all Departments of Agriculture throughout Australia, and the Federal Government, have picked up in terms of monitoring and assessing the impact. The department will also be embarking on an education program and an information program for the rural community in particular, so as to highlight the changes that we might encounter. Again, one must point out that these are purely estimates of best guesses at the moment, but certainly we will be looking at the overall impact for the rural community. I expect to be able to make further announcements in

the near future about what steps we are taking in a specific area and in certain districts to establish the meteorological assessment and the information base for future decision-making.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr MEIER: I address my question to the Premier. Did the Crown Solicitor today or at any earlier time recommend that the Crown should indemnify the former Minister of Health in his defamation case? If so, when did he make that recommendation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Crown Solicitor actually happens to be a woman, Mr Speaker. The recommendation on indemnity was put before Cabinet, as appropriate, by the Attorney-General in the course of preparing his advice to Cabinet. Naturally, the Attorney would have consulted with his officers. The recommendation came from the Attorney-General.

MOUNT LOFTY AND ENVIRONS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As Minister responsible for the preservation of the State's environment does the Minister for Environment and Planning support the development proposed for Mount Lofty and environs? In recent times I have been made even more aware, as a result of considerable representation, of the immense amount of opposition to the proposed development on the St Michael's site, adjacent to Mount Lofty summit in the hills face zone. The scale of the development, the impact that it will have on what is an extremely sensitive part of the Adelaide Hills and indeed the State environment, plus its detrimental effect on the Cleland Conservation Park, which is in itself a very special area, as a result of the development proceeding, makes the project in its present form totally unacceptable. Further, a number of people who have contacted me have expressed the fear that the Government is committed to proceeding with the project despite the outcome of environmental impact assessment procedures.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I know that it is a long time since the honourable member was Minister for Environment and Planning in this State, but let me just remind him that for me to—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You personally supported it—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You must have made up your mind—if you have got a mind.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is up to the Deputy Premier whether he takes offence at that last remark. What concerns the Chair is that the member for Heysen continued to interject after having been called to order for interjecting, and therefore I warn him. So, along with two other members of the Chamber he is warned, and any further interjection will lead to his being named.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Sir, I have a high personal regard for the honourable member and I do not think that I would ever take offence at anything he said. I know from time to time we go over the top with these things, but I am prepared to ignore that remark—which I think the honourable member tried to bite off almost before it came out. What I was trying to explain was that there is a procedure in the Planning Act for these matters to be considered and we are proceeding through that in relation to this project, as happens to be the case for several other projects. I think the honourable member would agree that for me to give a

direct answer would potentially open up the possibility for litigation in this matter, because I am part of the ultimate decision-making process in this matter, which depends on an environmental impact statement and the assessment of it. If one of the umpires commits himself, as it were, prior to the proper examination of the process, does that not potentially open up the possibility for people who are aggrieved by that to go to litigation? So, however much I would like to assist the honourable member in this matter I think that all I need do is refer him to the realities of the Act, which he himself passed through this Chamber.

ABORIGINAL SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr De LAINE: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs give urgent consideration to supporting increased Aboriginal support services in the electorate of Price? The recently released census figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show a high level of Aborigines living in the Enfield, Woodville and Port Adelaide council areas. There is a strong local call for increased services to cater for this large local Aboriginal population.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and indeed for his interest in the wellbeing of those Aboriginal constituents in the electorate of Price and indeed of all those living in the western suburbs of Adelaide. We are acutely aware of the special needs of many Aborigines in our community. The honourable member would be aware that the responsibility for Aboriginal programs in this country is vested predominantly in the Commonwealth Government and that they are supplemented by many State Government services. ABS surveys reveal that, in South Australia in 1986, 14 291 persons (about 1.1 per cent of the State's population) identified themselves as Aborigines. Of this number, almost 6 000, or 40 per cent, of Aborigines in the South Australian community, live in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, mainly in the northern and western statistical subdivisions.

Areas of special interest to the honourable member include Enfield, which is part of the northern statistical subdivision, where 562 persons were identified as Aborigines, that is, 3.1 per cent of the subdivision's total population. Other areas include Enfield (western subdivision) where Aborigines comprise 1.7 per cent of the total population; Port Adelaide, 3.8 per cent; and Woodville, 8.2 per cent. Aborigines are entitled to all Government services where they are eligible along with other members of the community. The Department for Community Welfare is the major provider of welfare services and departmental statistics indicate that Aborigines use those services frequently.

Concerning the provision of housing for Aborigines, the South Australian Housing Trust has established a special division to meet the housing needs of Aborigines throughout the State, and a special unit controls 1 293 dwellings throughout the State, 746 of these being in the metropolitan area.

As to education, the Adelaide area of the Education Department has about 43 200 students enrolled at 151 schools. About 530 of those students are of Aboriginal origin, a high proportion attending schools in the western suburbs. There is an especially high concentration of Aboriginal students at Alberton Primary and Junior Primary Schools. This is the direct result of the creation of the Alberton Aboriginal preschool and its associated transition program and the fact that many Aboriginal families move into the area to attend the Aboriginal Community College at Port Adelaide. At present, 80 Aboriginal students com-

prise 20 per cent of the Alberton school's enrolment, making this the largest Aboriginal school in the metropolitan area. The Warriappendi Alternative School at Marleston provides a special program for under-achieving secondary-age Aboriginal students.

The provision of services for Aborigines throughout the State is the responsibility of certain departments which have recognised clearly the special needs of Aborigines. Within the metropolitan area, and specifically in the honourable member's electorate of Price, the major welfare, housing and education facilities are well serviced by the respective departments and well used by the Aborigines of the area. However, I shall certainly be encouraging all departments to continually re-evaluate their programs and services, especially where high needs exist, to ensure that Aborigines have ready access to services and that those services are culturally and socially appropriate to Aborigines.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the Hon. J.H.C. Klunder:

I hereby tender my resignation as member and Chairman, Public Accounts Committee, effective from the close of business on 28 July 1988.

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

That Mr M.R. De Laine be appointed to the Public Accounts Committee in place of Hon. J.H.C. Klunder, resigned.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, Mrs Appleby, and Messrs Eastick, Ferguson, and Oswald.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs S.J. Baker, De Laine, Ingerson, and Rann.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

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

That for this session a Library Committee not be appointed.

Motion carried.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1988)

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

That the Firearms Act Amendment Bill (1988) be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the select committee on the Bill, appointed by this House on 6 April, have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Thursday 18 August.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I have been concerned for some time, as my questions today may have indicated, that the implications of the greenhouse effect are now well and truly on us. The greenhouse effect is not to be confused in its implications with the overlapping effects of fluorocarbon gases in the ozone layer of the upper atmosphere, but it certainly is an issue that must be discussed. For many years the scientific press has carried stories on the greenhouse effect and its implications. Those of us who read magazines such as *Nature*, *Scientific American*, and indeed *Journal of Science* would know of that effect, its causes and its implications.

Even the popular scientific and geographic press over the past decade has picked up the issue, so we have had a regular succession of articles in *National Geographic*, *Australian Geographic*, and the British magazine *Geographical*, which is not unknown to readers of scientific journals. Even radio magazine shows of the Science Show variety have picked up the issue, and those of us who listen to that as religiously as possible would know that the greenhouse effect has been the cause of some concern even in the semi-scientific press for some years.

Therefore, it is with some relief that I note that in recent weeks it has become the subject of discussion in the popular media. Only several weeks ago it first rated a headline in the Adelaide *Advertiser*. The issue has now come the whole distance: it is now in the public domain and it is now an issue about which the public is thinking. In this regard, I pay a tribute to journalist Rex Jory for bringing out the issue in a timely article. Probably, the article should have seen the light of day 10 years ago, but now it finally has and I am glad of that.

As I have suggested, the impact of the greenhouse effect is well known, but I would like to run over one or two of the implications. One I touched on in my question today—the implications for agriculture in this country and in many other countries—will be quite severe, and I will touch on that in more detail later. Members will know that even the thermal expansion of the atmosphere caused by greenhouse gases will lead to something of the order of 1 centimetre a year of sea level rise for the foreseeable future. When we look at planning marinas, coastal developments, sea walls, towns and drainage systems we must account for that sea level rise.

For example, at Port Adelaide we could have a rise of about 50 centimetres by the year 2030. That is a ball park figure, but it is one that certainly needs to be taken into account when developments are planned. Not only is the sea level going to rise at Port Adelaide but it will rise all around the world. If the warming of the atmosphere causes major parts of the Eastern Antarctic Iceshelf, which is an area of tens of thousands of square kilometres of ice between 1 kilometre and 2 kilometres thick, or the Ross Iceshelf to slide into the sea, the implications will be traumatic, sudden and pretty enormous. Certainly, it would make a 50 centimetre increase at Port Adelaide look like a Sunday school picnic.

I am not sure what research has gone into quantifying the sea level rise that could be expected if the East Antarctic Iceshelf was suddenly mobilised at its base by warming of the atmosphere and the turning of ice to water. If large amounts of the iceshelf slipped into the Southern Ocean, the effect would be instantaneous and catastrophic. I thought everyone knew—I am sure that everyone now knows—of the overall climatic impact of the greenhouse effect. It will lead to an expansion of the tropical zones of the earth. It will mean that cyclones in the tropics reach further north and south. It will mean that summer rainfall patterns are

spread more widely over the surface of the globe. It will mean, at the other end of the ledger, that the circumpolar weather systems will contract southwards and so places like South Australia will not get the same amount of winter rainfall, and the Minister mentioned that fact in his answer today.

The greenhouse effect will change the Roaring 40s into the Roaring 50s. All the winter weather systems will move southwards and the net effect will be more rain in the tropics and in the warm temperate zones, and considerably less rain in the cold temperate zones and further southwards and northwards. Presumably the agricultural impact of that will be an expansion in the area of wet rice cultivation, which could be nothing but good for many areas of the third world but, correspondingly, there will be a shrinkage in the cereal crop areas of the world devoted to corn, maize, wheat, and to some extent dry rice cultivation.

That will have a marked impact on the wheat belts of the US, Canada, USSR, Southern Africa and South Australia and Victoria. To say the least, the impact on the world economy will be dramatic, and it will mean that many of the richer countries of the world that have grown rich on their produce and on the production of cereal crops will no longer be so rich and the surplus of grain in places like the US, Canada, and Australia will no longer be so great.

On the other hand, this change will have a positive effect on tropical Africa, Asia and Central America and that can do nothing but good for the many people in those parts of the developing world. Also, it is a fact known to many people that since the industrial revolution of the 1760s carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide levels have increased. It is a fact that carbon dioxide levels have doubled in that time and, although carbon dioxide still constitutes less than .5 per cent of atmospheric gases, only half of that excess gas can or has been absorbed by the biosphere; most of it by planktonic algae and marine plants, but a considerable proportion by the world's forests.

The implications of that and of deforestation for the atmosphere and the health of the atmosphere and the biosphere ultimately are quite catastrophic. In the world at present we have a loss of tropical rainforest of about 20 hectares a minute. Most of that rainforest is being carted off to developed countries for use in the production of paper. Japan, which is 60 per cent covered by natural forests, is busily buying wood chip from places such as Sumatra (which is now about 30 per cent deforested) the Solomon Islands, Fiji, Kalimantan in Indonesia and from Tasmania.

It is in that context that the decision which is to be made in the near future on the Lemonthyme and Southern Forests becomes particularly poignant. The United States and Canada are developed countries which are busily buying wood chip from places like Guatemala and Brazil. Indeed, the major part of that 20 hectare a minute rainforest being lost occurs in the Amazonian Basin of Brazil. Back in the 1970s the American industrialist Daniel K. Ludwig was the ultimate optimist in floating in a factory to clear rainforest land and convert it to the production of cash crops such as cassava. He showed how intent American industry was in deforesting Brazil.

Of course, it is not only rainforests that are being affected by deforestation. In Australia, which was only 6 per cent covered by rainforest initially, we have lost 75 per cent of that rainforest and it is in that context that the steps taken by the present Government in Canberra to preserve Cape Tribulation and also, hopefully, the Lemonthyme and Southern Forests are particularly significant.

The implications of the greenhouse effect for Australia's agriculture are huge. I have mentioned the impact on cereal belts, but it is not simply the clearance of rainforest that has caused it. It is also the clearance of savannah forest. By removing mallee in Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia we in turn have contributed to that loss of vegetation and ultimately to the increased carbon dioxide levels.

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

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I propose to put before the House some facts relating to precedents for the Government's paying the costs and damages of a Minister involved in a defamation action. This morning the Premier said an indemnity given to Mr Brown was a precedent for payment of the costs and damages of the former Minister of Health. There are, however, no significant similarities between the two cases. I remind the House, first, of the context in which the case arose involving Mr Brown and the present Minister of Agriculture. It occurred in February 1982.

At that time, the present Minister was the Labor Party's endorsed candidate for the marginal seat of Unley. He was also Acting Secretary of the Public Service Association. In this capacity he was the chief spokesman for that union in a campaign it was running against the former Liberal Government in support of demands for significant pay rises for all public servants—rises of well over 10 per cent—demands which led to a strike which disrupted the affairs of thousands of South Australians.

An examination of the public record demonstrates that during the course of this dispute, which lasted over a month, the present Minister of Agriculture made a number of false statements and he was also the signatory of prominent newspaper advertisements, paid for by PSA members, which similarly attacked the Government. Many public servants complained at the time about the nature of the campaign. They believed it was politically motivated. They believed that the present Minister was deliberately taking a high profile in attacking the Government to help his chances in the seat of Unley.

It was against this background of sustained and false attack by the PSA, led by the present Minister of Agriculture, that Mr Brown made a statement on 20 February 1982. The following are the words the present Minister of Agriculture cited in his action against Mr Brown:

A militant clique within the leadership of the Public Service Association had been spoiling for next Friday's strike for a long time . . . the leaders of . . . this push had been engineering the strike for weeks and they had spent thousands of dollars on advertising to orchestrate yesterday's meeting . . . the key spokesman of the Public Service Association was the Labor candidate for the seat of Unley in the next election and he appeared to be trying to embarrass the Government. His motives had to be seriously questioned.

However, in his statement of claim in the matter, the present Minister of Agriculture was unable to cite how or to whom these words had been stated. There is no record of their publication in newspapers circulating at the time. In fact, Mr Brown denied that he had ever made such a statement. It was in these circumstances that the former Government agreed to Mr Brown's request that he be indemnified for any costs arising from this action, and the present Government supported that decision.

The differences with the case of the Minister of Health are clear and significant. Mr Brown did not call the present Minister of Agriculture a 'scurrilous fool', 'a robber baron', 'a wild man' and 'bloody minded'. Indeed, no evidence was produced that Mr Brown had made any personal attack whatsoever.

Contrast this with the position of the Minister of Health and Dr Humble. Dr Humble was not known to the Minister at the time he was libelled. Dr Humble was an individual caught up in the Medicare dispute. He was not the chief spokesman for one side of the argument; he had not previously publicly attacked the Government or the Minister. According to the court, Dr Humble had not acted out of any political motive.

In all the circumstances, any criticism Mr Brown made of the present Minister of Agriculture was not personal and must be seen to have been a reasonable exercise of ministerial duty in defending a policy of the Government to protect the interests of all South Australian taxpayers. Mr Brown made no admissions in the matter. It never got to court. Presumably, the present Minister of Agriculture did not believe his case was sufficiently strong to succeed.

In the sharpest contrast the Minister of Health was taken to court; he was found by an independent judge to have libelled a 'respected individual'; but, most importantly, in considering any similarity with the Brown case, the Minister of Health was denied the defence of qualified privilege. The judge said:

There is no way in which it can be suggested that the general public of South Australia had an interest in receiving Dr Cornwall's words.

In other words, it was not a reasonable or responsible exercise of ministerial duty and this is the only justification the Government could have for paying the Minister's costs and damages. If there is any precedent in this matter, it is that each case has been treated on its particular merits.

This was the practice of the former Dunstan Government. It will be remembered that it was the Dunstan Government in 1972 which agreed to pay costs awarded against a union official of more than \$9 000. I have no doubt that the Premier will remember that matter. It involved a black ban on Kangaroo Island farmers by the Australian Workers Union—an organisation that the Premier once served as Industrial Officer.

More recently, the Dunstan Government on a number of occasions gave financial assistance, at public expense, to Ministers involved in defamation actions. My Party believes that there are circumstances in which this is appropriate. In each case it is a matter ultimately for Cabinet to determine. The key consideration always must be whether the Minister had acted reasonably and whether or not it was in the exercise of his or her duty, on behalf of the Government. The Premier said in his statement this morning that 'at all times Ministers must exercise discretion and responsibility'. There is absolutely no way the Minister of Health could be held to have done that. The court said that he did not and majority public opinion is saying that he did not.

The damages awarded against him were punitive—the first time ever in South Australia in a defamation case. They were intended to punish him personally for his conduct. Let us remember that it is not only conduct of four years ago we are talking about. The judge found that the Minister had shown 'little or no contrition' and that he had used the trial, conducted only in the past three months, 'as an opportunity to further his political ends by making political statements at every opportunity'.

This comes on top of a long history of occasions on which the Minister has personally and publicly attacked and intimidated individuals. We can all recall incidents when the former Minister of Health has deliberately gone out to intimidate and demean people in the public forum. There is absolutely no precedent for the way in which the Minister of Health has behaved, and no justification whatsoever for taxpayers to pick up the tab. I refer to one other matter raised by the Premier in his statement this morning. He

mentioned discussions which have been taking place between the Attorney-General and the shadow Attorney-General on guidelines relating to the question of indemnity for Ministers. The Attorney-General had asked the Opposition to regard those discussions as private and confidential. The Premier has therefore breached that confidentiality by making the statement he did this morning. I have come to understand that when their backs are to the wall as to undertakings, they go to the wind, and we have seen a classic example of that again today.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Completely untrustworthy!

Mr OLSEN: They are untrustworthy, but as the Premier's statement this morning implies criticism of the Opposition, I want to make one fact very clear. In those discussions, it has been the shadow Attorney-General's desire to ensure that they do not produce guidelines which give Ministers *carte blanche* to libel individuals, safe in the knowledge that taxpayers will foot the bill for any consequent legal action.

Accordingly, the last set of draft guidelines given to the Opposition include the following stipulation for granting assistance to Ministers sued for defamation:

Such assistance will not be provided where the publication complained of did not reasonably arise from the performance of ministerial duties.

The court did not accept, the Opposition does not believe, nor does the public believe that Dr Cornwall's attack 'reasonably' arose from the performance of his ministerial duties.

Mr RANN (Briggs): It seems as if the Leader of the Opposition has heard reports from the media that they were extremely disappointed in his and the Opposition's performance during—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RANN:—Question Time today, so we have seen a rather strange and prurient attack aimed at an empty gallery, with the media not hanging round any longer to see the sort of drivel he wants to bring up. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition is rapidly becoming the Morton Downey of the South Australian Parliament: he is learning to use his mouth as a shovel, and we can all see what is coming out.

I want to talk about a profile in courage. A few weeks ago in the *News* I pointed out, through a new column arrangement which the member for Goyder and I have entered into, a story about a young man in my district, in Para Hills, who has been showing an enormous amount of guts and determination in trying to overcome his handicaps. Today I would like to thank readers of the *News* for their response. We all know that the *News* reaches out into the community and to individuals, and is a very good paper. Its standard of columnists has risen enormously in recent weeks.

Stephen Hellier is blind and deaf. He was not born that way but suffered a reaction to antibiotics when he was a young baby and became deaf. He was educated at the Oral School for the Deaf here in South Australia and, unfortunately, at the age of 14 was struck by double tragedy. Stephen started to experience visual difficulties and was diagnosed as having a very rare form of eye disease, which has led to the situation today whereby he is legally blind. Stephen has set his heart on attending Gallaudet University in Washington D.C., which is a university specialising in the tuition of the deaf and the blind/deaf. It is the only university of its type in the world.

Last year Stephen's parents, Sam and Rene Hellier, sold their car to enable Stephen to visit the US to find out more about Gallaudet University. As a result of that trip and that sacrifice by his parents, he has set his heart on studying

there. It will not be easy. It is an extremely expensive business, and we are looking at raising more than \$US20 000.

I have spoken to the Director of the Gallaudet University in the past few weeks, and he assures me that they are keen to welcome Stephen. I am now involved in a fundraising exercise, trying to raise funds from the business community and from ordinary people to assist Stephen. I am very pleased, as a result of that article and some other publicity that has been given to Stephen's case, that we have now raised some \$7 500. We are not halfway there yet, but the response from the community has been terrific. I have received cheques for \$1 000 from Dick Smiths, \$1 000 from Sir Peter Abeles, \$1 000 from the workers at Bridgestone (which I think was a tremendous contribution), and \$500 from the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide. This demonstrates the depth of support in the community for people trying to overcome hardship.

Stephen's story is one of enormous tragedy. Apart from his own problems, his sister died some years ago of a brain tumour and his father has been battling cancer. The family has undergone an enormous amount of suffering and is trying to overcome it. They are not the sort of people who appear on Derryn Hinch's show or who run to the media saying, 'Woe is me'; they are dignified, decent people trying to overcome the obstacles that their son is facing. I take this opportunity to thank the enormous number of people who have come forward with small donations to help this very deserving case.

I also take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for Environment and Planning. When I first became the candidate for Briggs back in 1985 my attention was drawn to a situation relating to the Salisbury East open space, east of Bridge Road. Three hundred hectares of land was set aside and, while various people referred to it as a park, it was a park that was not being used. It was fenced off and very few people had access to it. Over the years there has been considerable debate about what should happen to that open space.

In 1981 a concept study was prepared by the local community, the Salisbury council and the Tea Tree Gully council as to the future use of that open space. In fact, that concept study talked about it being opened up in terms of riding tracks, running, ovals, and perhaps the development of horse riding paths. However, essential to that was the preservation of the hilltop part of that land, which is a stand of excellent gum trees—in fact, a very fine piece of land on the hilltop of Salisbury East.

Since that time various other suggestions have caused concern in my community. One of those suggestions, which was from the Delfin Group involved in the development of Golden Grove, related to parts of the hilltop land being used for housing development. The idea was that three pockets of land would be developed for housing and that the proceeds of the sale of that land should be used to fund development of the park further down the slopes.

This seemed to me to be rather strange, that we would actually be using housing development on the most environmentally sensitive part of the open space to try to fund legitimate recreation development on the least sensitive part of that open space. I was very delighted, after some years of debate in which the Salisbury council did various cartwheels and various submissions were made by it—it at one stage believed that any housing on the park would be the end of civilisation as we know it—that it came round and fully supported that development at a later stage.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that the Deputy Premier arranged a meeting with the Salisbury council, the Tea Tree Gully council, and other interested indi-

viduals and has informed us that there will be no housing on the Salisbury East open space. Indeed, the Salisbury East open space will be officially declared a recreation park and this will give it the same status as the Belair Recreation Park.

There will be a registration of interest at a later date to enable recreation developments to occur on that park so that it is used by the local community. I think that the Deputy Premier has recognised that to build houses along the hilltop would permanently scar the most beautiful part of this land. In taking the action necessary to have the area declared a recreation park is a recognition of the interests of residents, and our children's heritage has been put first.

It has been a very long fight by a number of very decent people in the Salisbury East area, many of whom had reached the stage of almost giving up hope. They are certainly delighted that the land will be gazetted under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, that it will be administered and maintained by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and that the new park will be partly funded by compensation

received from the Highways Department for the Golden Grove connector road which will run through the Salisbury East reserve.

So, in every possible way, this will be truly a people's park in the Salisbury area. It will preserve the heritage and a unique stand of bush and will also allow the people of Salisbury access to the park for a variety of recreational purposes. I certainly would hope to see tennis courts, picnic areas, walking tracks and other recreational developments, and I hope that local people will be involved in the planning of that recreational use of the park. A golf course, which is badly needed in the Salisbury area and the northern suburbs, certainly should not be ruled out of hand. It is something that we should look at and something that should be taken seriously. I would like to thank the Deputy Premier for his support on this action.

Motion carried.

At 4.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 August at 2 p.m.