

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 August 1988

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 454 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to increase Housing Trust rent above 25 per cent of the net income received in each dwelling was presented by Mr Allison.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: CHILD ABUSE

Petitions signed by 884 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 P.B. Arnold, Becker, and Meier.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: WINE GRAPES

A petition signed by 271 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to repeal the legislation dealing with the pricing and terms of payment for wine grapes was presented by Mr P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

## PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 992 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Housing and Construction to rescind rental increases by the South Australian Housing Trust and restrict future increases to no more than percentage rises in average weekly earnings was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL SALARIES

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant the 4 per cent second tier wage increase to pre-school teachers and assistants was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PETITION: NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

A petition signed by 118 residents of Henley Beach South praying that the House urge the Government to establish a Neighbourhood Watch scheme for the Henley Beach South area was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:  
By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Ministers of the Crown, Officers and Members of Parliament.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon D.J. Hopgood):

Summary Offences Act, 1953—Regulations—Reflector Plates.

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

South Australian College of Advanced Education—By-Laws—Parking.

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

Department of Local Government—Report, 1986-87. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations.

Articulated Vehicle Licences.

Duties of Towtruck Operators.

Corporation of Salisbury—By-laws—

No. 5—Dogs.

No. 6—Bees.

No. 9—Swimming Centres.

District Council of Waikerie—By-law No. 61—Dogs.

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

River Murray Commission—Report, 1986-87.

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

Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—Surveyors Board Fees.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant (revised proposal) (after session paper), together with minutes of evidence, Murraylands College of Technical and Further Education (new multi-purpose facility) (after session paper), together with minutes of evidence,

Settlers Farm School, Paralowie South West (stage 1)—progress report (after session paper),

Yatala Labour Prison—New 'F' Division (revised proposal)—final report (after session paper), together with minutes of evidence,

Final Report relating to Settlers Farm School, Paralowie South West (stage 1), together with minutes of evidence. Ordered that reports be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier advise whether the Government has sought a ruling from the Taxation Commissioner on whether it is liable to pay fringe benefits tax on the costs and damages of the former Minister of Health, and, if not, will it immediately seek a ruling? The Opposition has received advice from both the Australian Taxation Office and from legal sources that the indemnity that the Government is providing in this matter will attract—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Yes, I am more than happy to table the prospective Commonwealth legislation on fringe benefits tax.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition has not been given leave to respond to out of order interjections.

**Mr OLSEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We have received advice from the Australian Taxation Office that the indemnity that the Government is providing in this matter will attract tax under section 20 of the Fringe Benefits Tax

Assessment Act, which covers situations in which an employer pays or reimburses a financial obligation incurred by an employee. As the State Government pays fringe benefits tax on behalf of its employees at a rate of 49 cents in the dollar, this would add at least another \$73 500 to the bill that South Australian taxpayers will be forced to pay for the former Minister's inability to hold his tongue, bringing the total—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable member is clearly commenting and debating the matter. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not advised on our position in relation to fringe benefits tax, and I would like to thank the Opposition very much indeed, because it has obviously done some research into this matter. It has made some inquiries, and that is very helpful indeed. I appreciate its concern, and I will be very happy to receive any information that the Leader has. I much appreciate his raising the point and I will certainly follow it up and make inquiries.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### REFERENDUM PROPOSALS

**Mr RANN:** My question is to the Premier. Does the State Government officially support the 'Yes' case in all four referendum proposals even if the success of the 'Yes' case involves an electoral redistribution before the next State election? On 3 September Australians will vote on the four referendum questions. The Federal Liberal Party Leader, John Howard, has announced that the Liberal Party will urge Australians to vote 'No' to all referendum questions, including that relating to the provision of fair and democratic parliamentary elections throughout Australia and a constitutional recognition for local government. It has been put to me that the State Opposition has been noticeably quiet on these matters.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The last remark was comment, therefore it is out of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** First, the questions that are to be put before the people were originally considered in the report of the Constitutional Commission, which was a very broadly drawn group and which advised the Federal Government. The questions themselves are pretty basic in terms of the rights they establish: fair electoral boundaries, fewer elections, a recognition of local government—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member might draw a line there, I suppose—and, finally, a guarantee of people's rights. I would have thought that, whilst in the past referendum questions have not had a great success, and where there are usually disputes over them, in this instance we could expect at least some sort of bipartisan support if, in fact, the Opposition was fair dinkum—

**Mr Duigan:** And consistent.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is not. It is neither fair dinkum nor, as the member for Adelaide points out, at all consistent. It has been very interesting to see the high profile of the Federal Leader of the Opposition, who has blundered into a whole series of areas lately. He is trying to come across as being macho or tough. He is trying to be sort of an Australian answer to Maggie Thatcher. We have not seen or heard very much from the Leader of the Opposition in this State or from members opposite about the matter.

In relation to fair elections, I would have thought that we have long since had that debate in South Australia. It was agonising and it was long, and it took the combined efforts of a number of people on this side of the House and, in particular, former Premier Dunstan and the appreciation and action of a former Liberal Premier of this State, Mr Steele Hall, before something was done about it. I would have thought that people like Steele Hall would be disgusted by the attitude of their colleagues, nationally and in this place, over their attitude to this particular question and their silence on it, when it talks simply about the basic one vote one value in a democracy, getting rid of the rorts in places like Queensland, where three country electorates of 8 000 votes elect three members while a 25 000 city electorate elects one. Then we come to the question of fewer elections.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** 'Fairness' interjects the honourable member. Fairness indeed when we had senators sitting well into a period of political history beyond that for which they were actually elected, with senators elected in the decade previously determining the fate of the Whitlam Government because of the rorts raised then. Since 1965, no senator has served a full six-year term, yet the Opposition says, 'No, no, we will preserve the full Senate power in this respect'. However, it will not support this referendum question. There is the question of people's rights: the right to trial by jury, the right to freedom of religion, and the right to fair compensation for the acquisition of property. I should have thought that those things had been argued and extended throughout the Commonwealth and that there would be support for them.

Finally, perhaps the most staggering hypocrisy of all concerns the recognition of local government. It was the Opposition which used to trumpet about the third tier of government and its rights and duties, and we agree with that. Indeed, we supported the Bill that brought in the constitutional recognition of local government in this State. Indeed, as Minister of Local Government in a former Government I had in fact approved such a measure to be introduced to the House, but the Government changed. However, the incoming Liberal Government went ahead with the measure and we supported it, and well and good. Now that the opportunity has come to do so within our Federal constitution, what happens? The Opposition is urging a 'No' vote. It says that no longer is it the third tier of Government, or perhaps it is an irrelevant constitutional amendment. Perhaps it is just show, or it is just form. Where were Opposition members when this matter was debated previously? Only in March this year John Howard, Federal Leader of the Opposition, wrote to a constituent saying how strongly he was wedded to the principle of constitutional recognition for local government, and what do we have? No way! We do not hear a peep out of the Opposition now that the Federal Opposition Leader has taken a stand.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for loudly interjecting that the Premier should respond to another out of order interjection.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is gross hypocrisy and it is time that honourable members opposite stood up and were counted. It is disgraceful that the Leader of the Opposition, himself a former mayor of a council of a country township with some experience in local government, is not sticking up for the rights of local government, and I hope that the member for Goyder will do the same when the time comes.

Let us hear them loud and clear in supporting the 'Yes' vote.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We hear about the 'disgraceful wording'. Every single argument raised on the wording has been answered. The honourable member is making an idiot of himself. He should listen to local government. Local government does not think that the wording is unsatisfactory. Indeed, local government says unanimously that it wants it, so how about listening to local government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Obviously I have touched on a raw nerve. Little wonder that this morning we read a report stating that more people believe that the Opposition's performance has deteriorated than approve of that performance. We have this frenetic activity, these mid term campaigns, these grubby little pamphlets being issued, by-elections and whatever, but more people say that the Opposition is looking worse than it did 12 months ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to restrict himself to the content of the original question if he wishes to continue.

#### HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** As the fringe benefits tax would apply to the damages and costs awarded against Dr Cornwall in the recent slander case that he lost, making a total of over \$220 000, will the Premier say whether the Government will review its decision to totally indemnify Dr Cornwall?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know that that is a fact at all. I certainly undertake to investigate the matter, and then these answers can be provided.

#### SOLAR-THERMAL POWER

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Deputy Premier investigate the feasibility of using solar-thermal power—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. If the honourable member could just restrict herself to the question and not introduce props.

**Ms GAYLER:** Will the Deputy Premier investigate the feasibility of using solar-thermal power for the proposed Wilpena resort development in the Flinders Ranges or ensure that any ETSA reticulated power is put underground to minimise the landscape intrusion of overhead power supplies?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms GAYLER:** Environmental assessment of the project is under way. I am advised that one of the main concerns of conservationists is the intrusion of overhead power lines on the unique Flinders landscape. I am also told that an expert at the Australian National University, Mr Steve Kaneff, considers solar-thermal power is now an economically more viable proposition for South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now introducing material—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! —that is canvassing pros and cons. The honourable member is debating the question. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Just in case some poor benighted student grubbing through *Hansard* in 100 years

time is trying to make some sense of your direction to the honourable member, Sir, perhaps I should place on record that the lights blinked as the honourable member asked her question about energy. This matter has been investigated. First, any reticulated electricity supply to the resort, should it proceed and should it be seen as necessary to reticulate power, will be undergrounded certainly within the immediate vicinity of the resort. However, that is something that might not arise.

The possibility of using photovoltaic technology was investigated last year as part of a general investigation into the servicing requirements of such a resort and was found not to be feasible. The possibility of using direct solar power for generation of hot water was seen as being feasible; however, it is likely that natural gas will be used at the facility for a good deal of general power generation and, for that reason, it is probably not necessary to go into solar generation. That is something that is still being investigated, along with the investigation of whether local power generation as opposed to reticulation is seen as appropriate.

Almost certainly some use of natural gas will be involved and, should reticulation of electricity be involved, I can give the assurance that some undergrounding, at least within the immediate environs of the resort and where the line would cross the road, would certainly proceed.

#### HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**Mr OSWALD:** My question is directed to the Premier. On what date did Cabinet first approve an indemnity for the former Minister of Health, and was that indemnity conditional on the former Minister's making an apology to Dr Humble?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The indemnity that was provided as a result of the judgment delivered last Tuesday—that is, a week ago—was approved by Cabinet on the Thursday morning.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** As I understand it, the indemnity that is current—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** —was approved by Cabinet on Thursday morning.

#### SMALL BUSINESS

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** My question is to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. It may also have relevance to the Minister of State Development and Technology via the Small Business Corporation. Will the Minister consider requiring the Registrar of Companies and/or business names to supply an *aide-memoire* for the guidance of persons starting up new businesses? A constituent of mine, in partnership with her sister, recently started a small business handling and selling finely embroidered jumpers, and they were soon doing well. Some few days ago inspectors operating under the Trade Measurements Act issued them with an infringement notice with a penalty of \$200, because the garments they were selling did not have washing instruction tags affixed to them.

I would not be in order if I attempted to debate the question and pointed out that there was a need in the State for small business, so I will not do that. But my constituent—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Although one would have to accept that the honourable member is some years out of practice, I am sure that he is aware of what is required in a question.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My constituents are honest, law-abiding persons who had no intention of acting unlawfully, but they had no knowledge that this was a requirement. The matter was remedied immediately, but it has still made it very difficult for them in starting up a new business which they wish to prosper.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this matter. I certainly will see that it is conveyed to my colleague in another place and will have investigated whether the Registrar of Companies can provide the *aide-memoire* sought, and what relationship that may have to the advice given by the Small Business Corporation.

#### HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Why did the Premier mislead the House last Thursday when he said that the former Minister of Health had offered to apologise to Dr Humble? The Premier told the House last week that the former Minister had agreed that the appropriate apologies would be made in order to achieve a settlement. Such an unqualified public apology before the trial would have very significantly reduced the cost to taxpayers in this matter. However, the Opposition has information that the former Minister of Health in fact never offered an apology in the manner referred to by the Premier.

I have in my possession letters exchanged between solicitors for the former Minister and Dr Humble. They record a request by Dr Humble for an apology, and a reply on behalf of the Minister as follows:

We confirm that our client is not prepared to publicly apologise to your client as demanded by you.

The Opposition understands that this was an attitude which the former Minister maintained right up to and during his trial. The judgment against him specifically referred to the correspondence from which I have just quoted, and described it as 'further evidence of the arrogant, deceitful and unrelenting attitude' of the former Minister. The judgment also had this to say about the former Minister's attitude to Dr Humble:

As far as the conduct of the action up to the time of the trial is concerned, the defendant has maintained an attitude of scorn and contempt for the plaintiff and the proceedings generally.

The facts and the judgment show that the former Minister made no genuine attempt to apologise to Dr Humble and that the Premier, therefore, misled the House last Thursday when he inferred that Dr Humble's refusal to accept an apology was to blame for the size of the bill taxpayers would be forced to pick up.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I did not mislead the House and I did not infer any such thing. I was, in fact, describing a situation that came before Cabinet in 1986—around about May of 1986—in which it was proposed that the defendants in the action, which included Dr Cornwall but also representatives of the media, would make a collective settlement. I will read my words. I said:

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.

A settlement proposal was placed. I draw attention to the words 'appropriate apologies': indeed, I would have thought that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—the very letter quoted by the honourable member had the words 'apologies as demanded by you'. There is a fundamental disagreement on this point, and that is what the case was all about. Dr Cornwall said that he did not use certain words. He said that he did not use the words 'scurrilous fool' and that he did not say that Dr Humble was a liar. Dr Humble was requiring him to apologise for using those words. Therefore, he did not accept the apology as demanded: that is quite clear. However, prior to that exchange of correspondence—and I do not know which particular letter is referred to—a collective settlement was attempted. In the event the media representatives did settle, and Dr Cornwall was unable to settle. No settlement took place. Dr Humble then proceeded to court—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—and that was his right. However, let me again draw the honourable member's attention to what I said in *Hansard*, which is absolutely correct: an attempt was made collectively to settle and to get appropriate apologies, but quite clearly such apologies as were being offered were not appropriate because, as the very correspondence the honourable member read out indicates, those were apologies as demanded by Dr Humble. If she had read the case she would understand that that was what it was all about.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Regardless of their status, this is not a private debating chamber for the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier to conduct a dialogue across the floor.

#### ROAD SAFETY STRATEGIES

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Will the Minister of Transport inform the House of the success of the Government's new road safety strategies generally, and in particular will he report on the success or effectiveness of the red light cameras during their first month of operation? South Australia has recorded several long fatality free periods on the roads in recent months, and credit for the consistent drop in road fatalities in the past 18 months may well be due to the new road safety strategies introduced early last year.

The latest weapon in the fight against the road toll was the introduction on 1 July of red light cameras at 15 city and suburban intersections to deter red light runners. Will the Minister inform me of their success or otherwise?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question, and I take this opportunity to congratulate him, both as a Minister of the Government and as a backbencher, for the concern he has demonstrated over the period that he has been an elected member of this place in relation to the whole question of road safety. The honourable member asked a question in two parts. First, it is appropriate to say that the trends in road safety are positive and are very welcome. Fatalities are down again this year from last year which, in turn, was a reduction on the previous year. However, that can turn around very quickly. It is not a matter of the Government patting itself on the back or being complacent about road safety because one death on the roads is one death too many and, even with the reductions in South Australia, we still have a very bad fatality record.

The more interesting and relevant statistic that people should note is the consistent trend in reductions in road crashes. This is the third successive year that there has been a significant reduction in the number of road collisions that result in either fatalities or hospitalisation. I think that that is a more relevant statistic to examine, and that, too, is heartening.

Road safety is something about which everyone should be concerned because, even with the improvements, our record is still very bad. No doubt exists that some of the measures introduced by Government are addressing some of the problems. Obviously some matters involving road accidents require further research, and when information is available measures can be introduced. However, the trends are positive. We have had this year two occasions during which we have had a fatality-free period: one of 15 days and one of 13 days. That shows that it can be done and that people in South Australia can use our roads for long periods without fatalities occurring. It is not just a fluke, although certainly good luck is involved, but South Australian motorists ought to be encouraged to see that it happens more often.

No doubt increased potential for the detection of drink driving and breaching road traffic laws has encouraged motorists to be more careful. I also believe that South Australian motorists are developing a greater responsibility in road behaviour generally. All of us who use the roads frequently would agree with that, but it only needs a few irresponsible drivers to turn those statistics around and cause considerable trauma and tragedy to families. Every member in this place would, I am sure, know of people who have experienced such tragedy.

We intend to undertake a study of the effectiveness of red light cameras after six months operation in South Australia. We have the example of Victoria from which it is clear that the introduction of red light cameras at the intersections in question has reduced the number of rear-end and right-angle accidents. I am sure that that will happen in South Australia, but we have not had the opportunity to see red light cameras in action effectively.

I point out to the House that the cameras concerned have been repaired and are back in operation. People need to be aware of that. It is perhaps best not to say anything at all about the individual who thought it was a smart idea to damage most of the red light cameras. I think that by his very nature (I think it is a 'he') that person would welcome any sort of notoriety. It was a most irresponsible, dangerous and anti social thing for anyone in South Australia to do. If that individual is gloating somewhere about how clever it was, it was not clever at all, having put at risk a whole number of motorists and innocent people in South Australia.

Those cameras are now back in place, and it is the responsibility of all South Australians to ensure that road safety initiatives are just that and that we do not have people in the community going out of their way to place their fellow road users at risk.

#### HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**Mr OLSEN:** Given that indemnity was offered several years ago, will the Premier advise whether it is a fact that Dr Cornwall did not apologise because he knew that Cabinet would pay his damages and costs?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is most inappropriate that questions should be heard in silence while the replies are drowned

out by interjections. I ask members to come to order and maintain a reasonable degree of decorum. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The indemnity to which I referred was given in a very specific circumstance in a very specific decision. At no time was Dr Cornwall led to believe—nor did he believe—that he would have an indemnity that carried beyond that act of attempting to seek a collective settlement. It was clearly understood that any further question would have to be considered on its merits at the time, and in fact that is exactly what has happened.

#### WEST LAKES PLANNING

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Deputy Premier consult with his colleague the Minister of Local Government to investigate the possibility of introducing third party appeal rights or other mechanisms against planning authority decisions made specifically in relation to West Lakes? I have been approached by an angry member of the Woodville council and by a number of my constituents expressing a view along the lines of correspondence which I have received, as follows:

Dear Sir,

I am writing with reference to a town planning authority ruling for West Lakes in the Woodville council area.

The Woodville council has advised me that no third party appeal rights exist against planning authority decisions made specifically in regard of West Lakes.

I have checked this information with the Department of Local Government who initially assured me that all local planning authority decisions were appealable but they have since contacted me to say that West Lakes are apparently the exception.

Perhaps you could raise this matter with the Minister of Local Government with a view to having this anomalous situation corrected.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** First of all, I point out that not all development control decisions by local government are appealable. They have to be consent applications and therefore have been advertised otherwise, of course, no rights of third party appeal would attach to them, anyway. But in general, the information given to the honourable member is correct: the legislation that set up the West Lakes indenture does not permit third party appeals. To get what the honourable member is hinting at would require some amendment to that indenture legislation, which of course is something which Parliaments have been a little loath to undertake in the past.

I would make a couple of other points. The first is that, if one of the concerns rests with a member of the Woodville council, that person at least is in a position of being one of the decision makers in this matter and perhaps hardly needs to exercise third party rights of appeal in that he or she would be one of the people actually sitting in judgment on the specific development control matters to come before that council. The second point I would make is that, if the planning documents for the area of West Lakes generally are inspected, I think one will find that they tend to be rather more prescriptive than is the case with a lot of the areas which are subject to the development plan. For example, the water areas themselves are actually zoned, which of course is most unusual. I am not aware, for example, that Lake Alexandrina or Lake Albert are zoned so far as development control matters are concerned. So, that is just one indication that the planning documents are rather more prescriptive than is sometimes the case, which is perhaps some sort of makeweight to the fact that there is no third party appeal generally permitted under the indenture legislation. However, I will take up the matter with the Minister

of Local Government and get a report for the honourable member and the House.

#### HON. J.R. CORNWALL

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My question is addressed to the Premier. What recommendation did the Crown Solicitor make to the Attorney-General on the question of indemnity for the former Minister of Health? When asked last Thursday whether the Crown Solicitor had recommended that the Government pay the former Minister's costs and damages, both the Premier and the Attorney-General did not answer the question directly. The Premier said only that the Attorney would have consulted with his officers. However, there is speculation that the Crown Solicitor did not in fact recommend that the Government provide indemnity.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There is no basis for speculation one way or the other. The Attorney-General clearly took advice from his officers and any other sources and took responsibility for making recommendations to Cabinet.

#### DRIVING TESTS

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister of Transport consider increasing the number of inspectors providing physical driving tests? Over recent months some of my constituents have complained about the length of time that it takes people to have a physical driving test in order to obtain a driving licence. Delays of up to eight weeks and more have been occurring at the Port Adelaide testing centre. This has caused considerable inconvenience to some of my constituents and the problem becomes worse when a constituent needs to be retested.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I have received letters from members on both sides of Parliament asking a similar question or forwarding a similar request. Our problems in this regard are caused not by our not having the correct number of inspectors as part of our strength but rather by our having received an unusually high number of resignations from driving inspectors in South Australia. That has caused problems that have resulted in the delays experienced throughout the State. The period of eight weeks has been mentioned on a number of occasions and I have no reason to believe that that is not accurate. The department has recruited suitable people and put them through the appropriate examinations to equip them for the onerous task of conducting driving tests so that tests can be undertaken much more quickly. It is unreasonable for people to have to wait such lengths of time after, as they would see it, equipping themselves to sit for a driving test. We are doing what we can to ensure that we will have sufficient inspectors to reduce the waiting list and bring it back to normal.

While answering the question, I point out that some members have claimed that the driving inspectors in their district are unusually harsh in testing applicants for driving licences. After looking at that matter, we believe that there is little difference between the pass and fail rate throughout South Australia, which would indicate that the driving inspectors are doing their job. One cannot expect that people who are failed would be happy about their result. Indeed, as a local member I have had representations, as have other members, that the inspectors in the local area are unusually harsh. However, there is no evidence to suggest that, but there is evidence to suggest that driving inspectors require

applicants for driving licences to be appropriately trained and safe in their use of motor vehicles on the road in the interests of the new driver and everyone else, and they should be so. I prefer driving inspectors to err on the side of harshness rather than on the side of leniency. I believe that the driving inspectors do their job well and should be supported in their difficult task.

#### POLICE LEGAL COSTS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Premier say why the Government is taking so long to decide whether it will pay the costs of police officers recently acquitted of a series of charges that arose from National Crime Authority investigations when it gave immediate approval to a full indemnity for the former Minister of Health? The Opposition understands that the Police Association has asked the Government to pay more than \$110 000 in legal costs incurred by an Assistant Commissioner (Mr Harvey) and the other officers recently involved in various cases.

The police general service orders stipulate that 'the Government will meet reasonable legal costs and expenses' where an officer has been acquitted or where the court has found there is no case to answer. While the Police Association first applied to the Government in April, more than three months ago, to pay these legal costs, I understand the Government has so far made no final decision, even though it was prepared to give a full indemnity to the former Minister of Health within 48 hours of the judgment against him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Again, I remind members that it is most unseemly for a question to be heard in relative silence and for the responding Minister to be drowned out before he or she can even commence the reply. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am not aware of the correspondence or application referred to. I imagine that it would lie with the Attorney-General, and I will refer the question to him. I would like to make the point—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Do you want me to keep talking above this babble, Mr Speaker, or just forget it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order. It is most unusual for the Chair to have to reprimand the member for Chaffey for misconducting himself after the House collectively has been called to order, but I do so.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Opposition members are making fools of themselves in this, I would suggest. As far as seeking information, which I am perfectly willing to give, is concerned, it is quite clear that in asking these questions the Opposition is not interested in receiving the information because members opposite chaff as soon as a Minister gets to his feet in order to reply. I will continue: it is often the case, particularly where royal commissions and other inquiries of that kind occur, that the Government does indemnify or provide the legal cost of representation. It has happened in a whole series of areas and we are—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody is exactly one of those cases, as the Minister of Labour points out. There is precedent, there are some guidelines and they will be applied.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE BUDGETING

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Does the Premier and Treasurer endorse the report of the Government Management Board Task

Force which recommends the development and use of effective performance indicators within the public sector as an integrated component of the program performance budgeting system and, if so, will he instruct all departments and statutory authorities to develop relevant performance indicators and related targets and to document these in their yellow book budget documents?

Some time ago the Government Management Board established a task force to consider the question of performance indicators for use in the public sector. The report covered the existing and potential use of these indicators in several representative Government departments and agencies and showed how they could provide useful information of particular relevance to the Parliament during the Estimates Committee debates. The report outlines the need for significant development work to be undertaken to establish appropriate performance indicators and the forward targets which would be associated with them. While it would not be possible to incorporate this work in the budget due this month, Government endorsement of the concept would allow work to proceed in time for the concept to be a valuable component of the 1989 budget documents.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Certainly, as the honourable member points out, there has been some quite intensive work done in this area. Of course, it is not an easy area, as measures of performance must vary greatly because of the enormous disparity of functions of various Government departments and instrumentalities. With some there are readily established financial criteria; with others, it is very much more nebulous in terms of trying to assess output and so on. That was what the pilot studies were attempting to pin down, by taking some typical departments across the range to try to work out whether one could come up with some form of performance indicator that would provide a better measure than the program and performance budgeting material that we have at the moment.

I cannot give the honourable member an up-to-date assessment on just how that study has gone at this stage, but I certainly undertake to do that. In principle, by authorising or supporting the Government Management Board's pursuit of that exercise, I think we are indicating that we would like to see it develop.

The only caution I would put on this is that, because of this wide ranging disparity of function I was talking about, it may not be possible to get a performance indicator that in fact can answer all the questions which might be raised by members as to the sorts of measures that are needed. But there is no question that the whole thrust of the new Government Management and Employment Act is for departments to perform, for them to perform to targets, for that output to be measured and for performance to be judged, and that will naturally affect promotion and all these other things.

Even without these performance indicators being specifically noted, I think that we have seen very considerable improvement in efficiency. For instance, the performance agreements which Ministers and their chief executive officers are making have been a very important part of that process. It is a personal agreement as between a Minister and his chief executive, on which they agree on the aims and objects of the department over that time and, obviously, that is assessed periodically. That is certainly in operation, but to make that more general in terms of departmental performance is taking a little more time.

#### INVESTIGATION OF POLICE OFFICERS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My question is directed to the Premier. Following the Premier's statements that more

charges and court cases would follow the guilty plea by the former head of the police Drug Squad, does this mean that other police officers have been under investigation? I refer to statements by the Premier reported in the *News* last Friday in which he predicted further charges and court cases based on, and I quote, 'evidence and information from Moyse'. These statements have been seen by many people to imply that other police officers may be under investigation.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I was referring there to the fact that, while Mr Moyse had pleaded guilty to certain charges, charges were not being pressed in certain other matters but that those matters were in fact continuing, that there were indeed people under indictment, and proceedings were going on. Leading from that, one would hope that, if there are any further charges to be laid or any further information that can come from the fact that Moyse has confessed to certain offences, that would be good. However, I have no specific knowledge as to what may be so in that case.

My colleagues the Attorney-General and the Minister of Emergency Services (the Deputy Premier) will be making a statement on this general issue at some time in the near future, and I think that that will throw more light on this general question for the honourable member.

#### RESEARCH GRANTS

**Mr De LAINE:** I would like to ask the Minister of State Development and Technology how South Australia is performing in the receipt of research grants from the Commonwealth and, in particular, how we compare with other States. I have noticed in recent months that several South Australian companies have been reported as receiving grants for research and development from the Commonwealth Industry Research and Development Board. These reports, however, have indicated only a few grants to companies in this State and, on the surface, it would seem that we may not be doing as well as other States.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The honourable member is asking whether South Australian industry and institutions are getting their fair share of the grants under the AIRDB grants scheme. Of course, that begs the question as to what is fair. Would South Australia be getting a fair share if we got 100 per cent of the grants, 90 per cent of the grants, 8.7 per cent—our population share—or some other figure? The facts are that what is fair is, clearly, what is deserved, and I point out to members that the grants reflect a national recognition of the excellence of research and development activity in the various parts of Australia, in private enterprise and in the public domain.

The grants are made to companies which have a real chance of developing their ideas, technology or products into the market place, with those winning products. They are awarded in diverse areas of research and development ranging from biotechnology through ophthalmology, and even such things as sewerage pipeline renovation. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of statistics relating to this matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member give an assurance that it is entirely statistical material?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes.

Leave granted.

1987-88

The following table shows the number and total value of discretionary grant agreements signed to date by location of the companies.

Location	Number	Amount \$
Victoria	24	7 066 798
New South Wales	19	4 832 000
South Australia	14	4 232 500
Queensland	6	1 867 350
Western Australia	2	729 050
Tasmania	2	329 150
Australian Capital Territory	1	151 900
Total	68	19 208 748

Average value of agreement \$282 482.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** When members have had a chance to peruse this table they will see that South Australia is indeed doing very well with respect to the grants being given by the Australian Industry Research and Development Board. For the financial year 1987-88 South Australian firms won 14 of the 68 discretionary grants that were awarded, that is, 20.6 per cent, and it was an even better figure with respect to the actual value of those grants: South Australian grants totalled \$4 232 500, that is, 22 per cent of the total \$19.2 million committed by the board—in both cases well above our population share of 8.7 per cent.

Indeed, the most recent round, announced on 6 July, saw Austek Microsystems and Flow Force Technologies of Unley winning grants, with Enterovax winning two. They join the other companies that have already won grants in the previous 12 months—as I mentioned, some 14 out of 68—a credible record indicating that South Australia is capable of excellence and is able to put up market winning products and undertake high quality research to win grants of that order.

#### PENFIELD MARIJUANA CROP

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** I address my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Why did the Crown not proceed with charges against the former head of the police Drug Squad relating to the growing of a \$4 million marijuana crop at Penfield? While Mr Moyse faces sentencing on 17 charges, four others, involving conspiracy to grow this massive crop seized by police in May 1987, have been dropped. Public statements by the Premier, referred to in previous questions, suggest some plea bargaining may be involved in which Mr Moyse has agreed to provide 'evidence and information', to use the Premier's words, in return for the Crown's agreement to drop these charges. In his reply, I also ask the Minister to reveal whether any such plea bargaining extended as well to the nature of the sentence the Crown is seeking to have imposed on Mr Moyse.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** I rise on a point of order. I understand that the person to whom the honourable member refers has not yet been sentenced by the Supreme Court, so that the statements the honourable member has made and the matters to which he has alluded are highly prejudicial to the normal sentencing process.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The precedents on which we operate are fairly clear with respect to a trial. Erskine May is less clear with respect to sentencing. However, the principle on which we operate is that Parliament voluntarily accepts that the principle of parliamentary privilege does not apply to matters which might in some way prejudice the outcome of a trial or perhaps, at a later stage, an appeal. I caution members that, in framing questions and answers which relate to the judicial process, they take that principle on board. The Chair is sure that no member would wish to be

publicly seen as being indirectly responsible for justice not being correctly served. The honourable Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In the light of your caution, Mr Speaker, I think at this stage I have to content myself with simply two statements. The first is that, so far as I am aware, plea bargaining in any formal sentence is totally unknown in this State, and I am not aware of any component of that applying to this case. The second thing I will say is that I will confer with the Attorney, and such information as is proper to be shared with the Parliament at this stage will be so shared.

#### BIRD EXPORTS

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Has any consideration been given to legalising the export of certain species of parrot which have been designated agricultural pests? I am sure that the Minister is aware of an article in the *Farmer and Stockowner* of 27 July in which it was pointed out at the recent UF&S convention that delegates had decided to ask for the export of sulphur-crested cockatoos, galahs and long-billed and little corellas as part of a management plan. The article states:

The only way farmers can reduce bird numbers is by poisoning, trapping and using explosives.

In the light of the article, it has been put to me by many cereal growers—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROBERTSON:**—that to continue to ban the export of these species only increases the likelihood that they will continue to be exported in defiance of the law, thereby causing unnecessary suffering and death to the many thousands of birds concerned and netting millions of dollars in profits to those who export them.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** As I understand it, some wheat is still grown in the honourable member's electorate. I think I know that because it was once my area. There has been a good deal of debate at Concom, the conference of nature conservation Ministers, about the possible commercial exploitation of native species which are common. For example, one or two States are interested in emu farming, and I believe there was a fashion parade of products made from emu hide (if I can use that term) in another State not so very long ago. An attempt is being made to set up codes of practice which would enable the proper commercial exploitation of these very common species to take place.

However, the commercial exploitation of common species for the purposes of keeping their numbers down is almost completely useless. I can find no evidence to suggest that that has any real impact at all on the numbers of some of the species that the honourable member has indicated. There is some interest around Australia in certain States for some limited commercial exploitation of native species which are common and which are under no threat whatsoever, and that is something that is proceeding, although there has been no final agreement on this. However, it is not seen as the answer to the reduction in the numbers of those species that are almost in pest proportions.

#### REPORT ON CORRUPTION

**Mr BECKER:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services make public at least an edited version of the report on corruption he has received from the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt? I understand the Minister has received a report



from the Police Commissioner following a seven month internal police inquiry into the potential for corruption in the Police Force and the wider community.

In the *Advertiser* of 20 May, Mr Hunt was quoted as saying that the report would provide a major assessment of the causes and sources of corruption in the South Australian community. The Opposition appreciates that it may be necessary to keep some parts of the report confidential at this stage to protect sources of information or on-going police investigations. However, the release of those sections of the report which do not affect informants or current investigations would assist the Parliament and the public in assessing what further action needs to be taken to guard against police or other forms of official corruption.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** In the form in which the honourable member has asked the question, the answer is 'Yes', although the context in which it will occur will be explained to the House in reasonably short order.

### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

### JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. J.C. Irwin to fill the vacancy on the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. C.M. Hill.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier)** brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In doing so I add my regret to that of the Governor in recording the death, on 4 June this year, of a former Governor of South Australia, Sir Douglas Nicholls, KCVO, OBE. Sir Douglas was a great Australian who was appointed Governor of South Australia in December 1976 and it was a sad day for all of us when just four months later he was forced to retire due to ill health. Sir Douglas, of course, was a very accomplished sportsman in both athletics and VFL football, but I think he will be remembered for the contribution he made to the Aboriginal community and his work for his faith and church. I join with the Governor in expressing great sadness at the passing of Sir Douglas, and I pass on my sympathies to members of his family.

The Governor's speech lays down a mandate for further economic and social reform in this State. His speech acknowledges that the Government's major priority will be the proper management of the State's economy, whilst also acknowledging that South Australia is now able to consoli-

date advantages made possible by the Government's earlier fiscal responsibility. In his speech the Governor acknowledged that the reduction in Commonwealth moneys of some \$100 million will mean more difficult economic decisions for the Government, particularly in calling for responsible restraint across the community. However, the Governor also acknowledged that there were now some encouraging signs in key economic indicators relating to this State. I agree completely with the Governor that South Australia is now well placed to take advantage of the restructuring that has taken place in the past and I, like the Government, am also encouraged by the response from industry and commerce across a broad range of areas. A bit later in my speech I intend to address some of these important areas as they relate to my electorate.

However, there are some other important points mentioned by the Governor which will have a significant impact for constituents in my electorate. The first is that the Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant is due for commissioning in November next year, some two years ahead of schedule. This is an \$85 million capital works program that will result in filtered water being supplied to some 40 per cent of metropolitan Adelaide. Of course, that includes not only my electorate but those electorates that run from the Le Fevre Peninsula to the Onkaparinga River. Four hundred thousand people will see the direct benefits once the water starts filtering through to their taps.

The Governor also mentioned the Noarlunga hospital complex which is expected to commence this financial year. I look forward to this hospital, and it certainly will be a fitting memory to the outstanding service that the former Minister of Health in this State, the Hon. Dr John Cornwall, has made to health services. I am sure that my southern colleagues, particularly the Minister of Water Resources, who has been very diligent in pursuing a hospital in the southern area, was delighted to hear the Governor's reference to the hospital, as will our friend and sometimes foe Mr Brian Wreford, a local Morphett Vale resident. Mr Wreford has been single-minded in his desire to see a hospital built in the southern suburbs. He lobbied, harassed and petitioned local members, and I congratulate him on his persistence. The hospital is a fitting tribute to his initiative.

I also am very pleased that the Governor mentioned the second stage development of the Hallett Cove school. Even though this school is situated, geographically at least, in the electorate of the member for Bright, part of the school's catchment is in my electorate, particularly those residents in Sheidow Park and Trott Park, so I welcome that announcement. The Governor also mentioned the fact that several schools will be commenced this financial year, including the Aberfoyle South Primary School. This is a much needed school that will increase the number of primary school places that are available to Aberfoyle Park, and consequently I hope that it will reduce pressure on the primary schools that are either in or surround the Aberfoyle Park area.

The Governor also mentioned the findings of the primary education review and also the Government's ongoing development of pre-school education. These areas are of particular importance to a young community like the one that I represent, and I most certainly appreciated the Governor making particular reference to this very important area in State Government activity.

I also would like to join with the Governor in conveying our best wishes to the 27 South Australian athletes and six support staff who have been chosen to represent Australia at the Seoul Olympic Games. I hope that they have a very

worthwhile and stimulating trip in which they do the very best job that they can. I hope that some personal best performances are forthcoming, and perhaps it might even bring South Australia a medalist. If that occurs, it would be an added bonus. I wish them well and, like the rest of Australia, I will be closely following the performances of our home-grown athletes during the Olympics.

I also would like to use this opportunity to wish my colleagues, the member for Mitchell and the member for Spence, all the best for the future following their retirement from the Ministry. It is interesting that, between them, they have on average eight years of ministerial service to this State. They also have, on average, over 15 years service as members of this Parliament. I am sure that members will acknowledge that this is an outstanding record, and the member for Mitchell and the member for Spence should be proud of their achievement and the service they have given this State. I believe it is appropriate for me to make special mention of the contribution that the Hon. Dr John Cornwall has made to health and welfare services in this State. I have known the Hon. Dr Cornwall for about 10 years, and I am proud to call him a friend. There is no doubt that in his time as a Minister he touched the lives of many South Australians and did his utmost to make life easier for ordinary people. This has certainly been the case for many of us in the southern suburbs.

The Hon. Murray Hill is a person whom I did not know until I became a member of Parliament. However, in the past three years I have had the honour of serving on the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee with him, so I was in the unique position of being able to work very closely with, and get to know, him during that time. I found Murray to be a thorough gentleman. He was also a member who was prepared to freely offer advice to those of us on the committee who were new, but he never did it in a patronising way. The Hon. Mr Hill during his time as a member of Parliament made a significant contribution to the affairs of the State and is one of the few, if not the only, Liberal member of Parliament to be able to say that he served in two Liberal Governments in this State.

This is certainly the case if we look at modern history. I would like to wish the Hon. Mr Hill and his wife all the best for a long and healthy retirement. I would also like to congratulate the three new Ministers—the member for Mawson and the member for Todd, and members would know that the member for Florey was elected to the Ministry by the Labor Caucus this morning. I am sure that they, like their predecessors, will make a significant and positive contribution to the quality of life in this State. I personally would like to wish them well, and I look forward to working with them in their new capacity.

This afternoon I would like to address some very important matters about the way this Government spends its revenue. This is a subject that is often raised in the media and by the Opposition. This includes a wide range of topics from the amount that individuals are asked to pay in taxes and charges to how the revenue is spent and how various experts—sometimes self-appointed—believe it should be spent. I intend to address just a few of these matters that are particularly relevant for my electorate.

First, where does our petrol money go? Indeed, this is an interesting question which the RAA posed and sought to answer in its *South Australian Motor* magazine of May 1988. The RAA did not like the answers that it came up with. The RAA claims that petrol is taxed at a higher rate than other household and luxury items. It states that only one-fifth of Federal Government petrol money and one-third of State petrol tax are returned directly to the maintenance

and construction of roads. The rest, it claims, goes into general revenue. The RAA was apparently unable to find how much of that is spent in indirect benefits to motorists, such as health services, education, road safety campaigns and environmental research and protection.

The RAA also found, not surprisingly, that more than one-quarter of motorists surveyed wanted all the tax levied on petrol to be spent on roads. A further one-third believed most of the tax should be spent on the nation's roads. I have to agree that there is nothing quite like driving on a well-designed and perfectly maintained highway, but we must be realistic about the difference between what is desirable and what is practical. While acknowledging that there are problems with our road network, I believe that urban South Australia is very well serviced in the number of excellent roads available. The current land space used for roads as well as that committed to future road development in Adelaide is well above the ideal of 25 per cent of urban land space.

Another point that is not often recognised by taxpayers is that the roads currently available are used for only approximately four hours per day at capacity. For the rest of the 20 hours per day most, if not all, roads are grossly under-utilised. I am not advocating this as a reason to cease further road construction, but I do believe that it is something that must be borne in mind when seeking a solution to peak hour traffic build-up which, in my view, will not necessarily be solved by more of the same or, in fact, by the mindless 'revenue grab' advocated in the RAA's article. This was the reasoning which led me to suggest—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** If the member for Murray-Mallee would like to listen for a while, I will explain to him why I have made that statement, and he just actually might learn something.

**Mr Lewis:** I have been listening; I am giving you some advice.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee will in due course have his opportunity to take part in this debate. The Chair would appreciate it if the member for Murray-Mallee would extend the same courtesy to the member for Fisher that the member for Murray-Mallee would I am sure like to have extended to him when it is his turn.

**Mr TYLER:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Before I was interrupted I was going to say that I suggested to the Minister of Transport the idea of reversible traffic flow management. This is sometimes called tidal flow. In August 1987, I wrote to the Minister urging a change in our approach to moving large volumes of traffic during peak periods. I believe that we can use our urban arterial roads in a much more flexible way. For instance, when most motorists from the southern suburbs are driving north in the morning we could have a system to enable at least one of the roads on our road grid, for example, South Road, Goodwood Road or Marion Road, to be used solely for northbound traffic for the morning peak period. Similarly, the role could be reversed for the afternoon peak period.

I have seen this system used effectively overseas and interstate. It seems to me that in these tough economic times this would be a much more cost-effective way of using our roads. It would be a smarter and more adaptable way of using the resources that we have available to us now. The Minister of Transport agreed that this proposal has some merit in seeking a solution to some of our traffic problems, and he has asked the Highways Department and the Road Safety Division to evaluate the suggestion. As well as looking at the long and short-term financial implications, they were also asked to look at how this would affect local

communities and the management of intersections closer to the city. Interestingly enough, I also wrote to the RAA about this suggestion last year but, disappointingly, as yet I have not received its considered reply. However, the Minister of Transport has replied, agreeing to my suggestion for a trial period for reversible flow traffic for Flagstaff Road.

Flagstaff Road is currently a two-lane road, 3.2 kilometres in length, with an additional climbing lane from South Road for a distance of approximately one kilometre. The road is presently under the care, control and management of the City of Happy Valley and is classified as a local road. This is also in my electorate, Mr Speaker. However, the status of this road is likely to change soon, following the completion of the new road, Happy Valley Drive, which links Flagstaff Road with Chandlers Hill Road. The volume of traffic using Flagstaff Road has increased steadily over the past six years due to increasing residential development in the Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park area. If honourable members look closely at the way the electorates are going, they will find that the Fisher electorate is about 24 per cent above quota and thus one can appreciate the staggering development that has occurred in the past six years in and around my electorate. Honourable members would be familiar with that as I have raised this problem in the House many times in the past. The population increase has had a very significant impact on Flagstaff Road. As I have said, it is a local road, and the increase is quite staggering. The estimated number of cars using that road daily has increased from 8 300 to 15 400.

The Highways Department has been planning improvements to this road for some time, and towards the end of this year it hopes to have a plan for staged works available for public comment. In the meantime, starting in October this year, the reversible flow traffic system on this road will be tested. The scheme will operate in the morning peak period, when 90 per cent of the traffic using the road is travelling north—that is, downhill—where two of the road's three lanes will be used to take city bound traffic. At the end of the morning peak period the road will revert to its normal arrangement of two lanes for southbound—that is, uphill—traffic. During the trial, traffic flow between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. will be controlled by flexible posts placed on the road, with special signs informing motorists of the lane configuration. There will also be temporary changes at the South Road-Flagstaff Road intersection as several lane arrangements are to be tested.

This will be the first time that reversible lanes have been used in South Australia and the Highways Department will be monitoring the effectiveness of the scheme very closely. Certainly this is the first time it has been used on a road like Flagstaff Road. It is used from time to time in relation to major sporting events, and honourable members would recall that reversible flow is used as a means of clearing traffic after a SANFL grand final. Let me emphasise that this tidal flow scheme was not suggested by me as an alternative to the upgrading of Flagstaff Road or the construction of major arterial roads when the Government deems it to be necessary. It is merely a road management technique which I believe will enable us to use the available resources more effectively and, in fact, wisely.

The distinction between taxes and Government charges is often overlooked by the media and, strangely enough, also by the State Opposition. Let us consider in a little more detail precisely what is that distinction. Taxes include such items as payroll tax, land tax, stamp duties, and business franchises (petrol and tobacco). Contrary to common perception, increases in State taxes have been few and far between over the past two years. On the other hand, charges

generally reflect the price of the service provided by governments, for example, electricity, water and transport fares. These charges are used to pay for the operation of the enterprises that provide the services and are not treated as a means of raising revenue. In fact, the contrary is true: these charges do not make a profit for the Government, the cost of some of these services being subsidised by taxation, such as the petrol tax discussed earlier.

Charges for electricity, water and sewerage, transport, and motor vehicle registrations have all increased during the past month. Electricity tariffs have increased by 4.9 per cent in respect of domestic consumers (and interestingly by 4 per cent or less for most small businesses). This is well below the inflation rate for Adelaide of about 6.5 per cent. Since 1985, electricity tariffs have increased at a rate less than inflation with an actual decrease of 2 per cent in 1985—not a bad record.

Let us compare that record with the record of our critics. During the term of the most recent Liberal Government in South Australia, electricity charges increased by 12.5 per cent in 1980; by 19.8 per cent in 1981; and by 16 per cent in 1982. It is interesting that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is in the Chamber at the moment because, as Minister, he was responsible for these massive imposts in electricity tariffs. Recently, water and sewerage rates have been increased by 4.4 per cent. Again, this is well below inflation and it is well below the increases in water and sewerage charges made by the previous Liberal Government in this State.

The most common State Transport Authority fares, those in respect of one zone and two zones, have been increased by 9.5 per cent. These are the fares for trips covered by most of my constituents. However, the introduction of multi-trip tickets means that, even with this increase, the trip still costs less than it did two years ago. Again, it is still well below the increases imposed during the term of the Tonkin Liberal Government.

Motor vehicle registration fees have been increased by 6.9 per cent, just slightly above the inflation rate for 1987-88. In talking about taxes and charges, it is important also to remember the services that people are receiving in return. For example, the value of basic services provided for a typical family of two adults and two children amounts to \$160 a week, including \$112 for education, \$33 for health services, and lower amounts for water, electricity, public transport, and police. This represents much more value than the \$100 the Opposition falsely claimed that such a family paid in taxes and charges. Indeed, it represents much more value than the average family actually pays.

So, charges have been increased, but our record is better than that of the Liberals not only in this State but also in New South Wales where a Liberal Government was elected recently. In that State, Nick Greiner's Liberals ran a successful campaign arguing that no charge increase should exceed inflation. That is a worthy ambition and one which our State Government has a demonstrated record in achieving. Nick Greiner recently visited the Liberals in South Australia and shared with them the wisdom in this tactic. I describe it as a tactic and not a policy, because it was not maintained by Greiner's Liberals after they gained power.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** It is interesting that the South Australian Liberals are crowing that Greiner was elected in New South Wales, but I am telling them about Greiner's record. Within a month of their election, Greiner's Liberals introduced the following increases: public transport, 12 per cent; electricity, 9.8 per cent; public hospital bed costs, 15 per cent; and traffic parking fines, 50 per cent. Is this the example that

South Australian Liberals aim to follow? Judging from their recent media statements they seem to be similarly confused. They seem to believe that South Australians will be better off with fewer Government services. Indeed, as recently as 25 July, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that South Australian Liberals would seek to reduce Government activity and to sell some services and facilities.

Which services and activities does the Opposition leader recommend that we do without? Will he follow Greiner's example in sacking 2 000 teachers? I am sure that the Hon. Mr Lucas would have something to say about that. Alternatively, does the Opposition Leader recommend, as this Government is doing and will continue to do, finding ways of reducing expenditure without reducing the level of service. Should we reduce the number of police patrol cars, which cost \$300 000 a year? Alternatively, should we, like Greiner's Liberals, increase charges well above the rate of inflation to pay for more personnel?

Should we, as this Government is doing and will continue to do, follow the advice of the Australian Institute of Criminology that increased spending and personnel will not necessarily decrease crime rates or increase the proportion of crimes solved? Should we act wisely with our revenue and introduce initiatives such as the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and juvenile intervention programs that appear to be a much more cost effective way of dealing with these problems? Do we simply stop building more roads or do we look at better ways of using the roads we already have, as in the case of Flagstaff road, the example that I have already given. Should we follow the example of Opposition members, visit Brisbane and attack the South Australian stand at Expo as being a cheap effort? I suppose that, if more money had been spent on our display, Opposition members would have complained of a waste of taxpayers' money—anything to get their name in the newspaper! Or do we try to balance the cost?

**Mr S.J. Baker:** It's an absolute disgrace.

**Mr TYLER:** The member for Mitcham is one of those about whom I have been talking. He advocates small government, yet he demands that the Government come up with more services. The honourable member cannot have it both ways; he cannot have his cake and eat it too. Some Opposition members make this sort of statement just to get their name in the newspaper. I believe that the State Government has done the right thing with the stand at the Brisbane Expo. It has acted responsibly in providing a stand that is cost effective because it is expected to have over 800 000 visitors many of whom, I hope, will come to South Australia as a result of seeing the stand. The Opposition does the State no good by indulging in negative criticism, especially concerning our display at Expo.

Let us hope that the Leader of the Opposition can decide soon which policy he really advocates: a policy that cuts mindlessly the level of much needed services to our community or the policy of the Bannon Labour Government which seeks to provide reasonable services in return for taxes and charges. The member for Mitcham seems to be confused on this question. Which policy does he advocate? Many people in my district are sick and tired of hearing the Liberals doing nothing but running down South Australia when what we need is constructive and creative thinking by the Opposition about how best to deal with the problems facing this State. Of course, I readily acknowledge, as does the Premier, that there are problems in South Australia, but I believe that, by facing those problems honestly, constructively, and creatively, we can do something about them. There is certainly no cause for despondency about the future of the South Australian economy. Of course,

there is room for improvement in some areas that are a little sluggish and the Government has stressed that fact in its statements about the economy over the past six or eight months.

In particular, the Government is concerned that our unemployment rate is too high even though hundreds of jobs have already been created by the submarine project, which is another project that the member for Mitcham is desperately trying to white-ant. We had the lowest inflation rate in Australia for the 1986-87 financial year, an achievement for which the member for Mitcham does not give the Government credit.

There are also several other positive signs. Recent surveys by the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies and the State Bank show an improvement in the number of housing approvals and motor vehicle sales. In fact, figures show that motor vehicle sales for the first six months of this year have been 10 per cent greater than sales for the same period last year. The State Bank survey also predicted a strengthening of the South Australian economy during the rest of the year with an increase in retail sales as well as a boost in sales of building materials, white goods, furniture and other household goods.

To help this trend there are many examples of the South Australian Government assisting industrial development in this State by means of cash or Government guarantees. Our export record is improving rapidly and business confidence is so high that investment in capital equipment in South Australian companies is 50 per cent higher than in their opposite numbers in other States. Instead of consistently talking down the South Australian economy the Opposition should start to make a positive contribution and give credit where credit is due. The Opposition's constant carping and negativism does nothing to help South Australia come to terms with and overcome the problems that we face.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** The honourable member did not listen. He comes in at the end of a paragraph and decides to be negative. If he reads the *Hansard* report of this speech, he will see the positive signs to which I have referred.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The level and quantity of interjection from the member for Mitcham, in the opinion of the Chair, constitute harassment of the honourable member for Fisher. The honourable member for Fisher.

**Mr TYLER:** It will take a better man than the member for Mitcham to harass me, Mr Speaker. I would like to talk about a subject that is very dear to me, just as it is to many of my constituents. Indeed, I am delighted that the Minister of Recreation and Sport is in the Chamber now because I know that this matter is dear to him as well. I refer to the provision of sporting facilities particularly in the southern part of metropolitan Adelaide. I am sure that my southern colleagues will agree that there is definitely a need for more sporting facilities in that area.

Members will recall a question I asked of the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this place suggesting that his department play a coordinating role in establishing a major multi-purpose sports park for the southern suburbs. Indeed, the House will recall an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 July, comparing the northern areas of Adelaide with the southern areas. I am sure that members from both sides of the House will agree that any objective comparison between the northern and the southern areas must acknowledge, first, that the north has a far larger and longer established population than the south. Despite this, and in difficult economic times, the Bannon Government has responded to the growing population of the south by spending millions

of dollars on human and community services. For instance, in my electorate we have some of the newest and best educational facilities in the country, in excess of \$70 million in capital infrastructure. For this reason I was particularly disappointed by the comments attributed to Mrs Chris Denton in that *Sunday Mail* article, which I quote as follows:

Mrs Denton said there was some feeling that the south was being hard done by in comparison with the north. 'We had a meeting with the Government and we asked why it was that all the sporting facilities were being built in the north. Not one of them would be honest enough to admit that it was because the Government owns a lot of land in the north.'

I do not know why Mrs Denton should choose to take this approach. If by 'a meeting with the Government' she is referring to a meeting with State Government members from southern electorates and representatives of the Southern Region of Councils, her comments were as inaccurate as they were offensive. At this meeting all Government members in the southern suburbs were honest and frank in acknowledging that the south had special needs and that one of them is the establishment of sporting facilities. Other council representatives at the meeting readily acknowledged the frankness of Government members, and that led to an extremely productive meeting. As Chairperson of the Southern Region of Councils, Mrs Denton should be aware that the Government, in conjunction with the region, is establishing a committee to examine the possible sporting uses for a parcel of land on the corner of Majors Road and South Road.

She should also be aware that several Government members, including me, are actively working with the South Adelaide Football Club to establish its home at Noarlunga. We are currently looking at a parcel of land owned by the South Australian Housing Trust which had been set aside for sporting use. The club will be working towards developing a multi-purpose sporting facility on this land in conjunction with the South Australian National Football League as well as State and local governments. Later, I intend to talk more about South Adelaide Football Club's desire to relocate in or around Noarlunga.

However, I believe that Mrs Denton also seems to have overlooked the fact that the location of a major sporting facility is not a decision made entirely by the State Government. Sporting authorities themselves chose to build facilities such as Globe Derby Park, the International Raceway, Angle Park, and Football Park at their current locations. Mrs Denton also seems to have overlooked, somewhat conveniently, that the provision of sporting facilities does not lie only with the State Government. Local councils also have a very important role to play in the provision of local sporting facilities. In fact, many of the grounds on which league football and district cricket matches are played are council ovals. In ignoring the facts and choosing instead to have a cheap shot at the Government, Mrs Denton is doing the south no good at all, in my opinion.

By her comments she displays an inferiority complex which only serves to make the job harder for those of us, whether we be from Federal or State Governments, or local government, who prefer to work towards overcoming the problems and growing needs of the southern suburbs.

As I indicated earlier, I would like to refer to the plans announced a week or so ago by the South Adelaide Football Club in trying to relocate to Noarlunga. I have the privilege of being a member of a six-person working party investigating the feasibility of South Adelaide Football Club's move and, quite frankly, I was particularly disappointed about the reception that the suggestion received in the media.

I might add that I do not include the Adelaide *News* or its leading football writer, Gordon Campbell, in those com-

ments. Mr Campbell has been extremely fair in his comments about the South Adelaide move, but some other sections of the media have been less than complimentary. In fact, some of the commentators around town were downright sceptical about South Adelaide Football Club. I have even heard one report that a league football general manager was quite negative on radio about South Adelaide's proposal.

All of this is very disappointing, I believe, as it displays a distinct lack of vision by some people associated with football. I just wonder what is in the minds of some of the people around Adelaide, our so-called football lovers. I would have hoped, perhaps naively, that some of these high profile football identities would have patted South Adelaide on the back for its initiative and grit; instead they chose to put the knife in once again—the 'kick them while they are down' syndrome.

People also really do not understand what the relocation means for the club or the community. I know that some people are frightened of the fact that the club is talking about a figure of about \$15 million. That sum does not have to be found overnight. I would imagine that the working party will initially look at a development which will cost about \$1 million, and which will accommodate South Adelaide's clubrooms and a training ground. However, as the committee is at its genesis, this detail and a timetable are still being developed. Eventually, South Adelaide Football Club, along with various levels of government and the community, could develop and upgrade the oval so that league football matches could be played in the south. I believe this is still a number of years away and it would have to be achieved gradually.

This has happened at every other league football ground in this State. I might add that many local councils actively support their league football club not only with encouragement and enthusiasm but with direct financial support. Many local government bodies, rightly in my view, look at the benefits of having a successful, high profile league football club in their area. It certainly makes a huge difference to community morale but, perhaps more importantly, there are significant benefits and advantages to business activity. So you see, Mr Speaker, many people believe that politics, sport and business do mix. This is particularly true in the case of league football at the local level.

Our vision to relocate the club to the southern area is not pie in the sky. It is modest and realistic, but it will take a lot of hard work and a lot of dedication and patience from lots of people who love football. The club is taking a very professional approach. Instead of people continuing to kick the club, South Australia's football public should, I believe, rally behind this initiative for the sake of Australian Rules Football. In fact, I would go so far as to say that all of us who love football have a responsibility to support the game by encouraging South Adelaide.

The public needs to realise that, of the 116 league football matches played each season—and that does not include the Escort Cup competition—only seven are played south of Richmond Road. This means that a population of around 170 000 people who live south of Darlington are starved of top line sport. The situation is exactly the same for district cricket and many other sports.

I know the reason that the south lacks this type of sporting facility is historical in the sense that until recently the area was regarded by many as country. However, with a population increase of 30 per cent in the past five years, it is now classed as urban. People are continually telling me that they are amazed at the enormous development that has occurred in recent years beyond Darlington: indeed, 170 000

people live between Victor Harbor and Darlington, and that is a huge population base.

South Adelaide's area has exciting potential as it has a nursery of 72 000 people under the age of 19 years, and a vast majority of these young people are under the age of 10 years. This is about 43 per cent of the population and it is interesting that throughout the State in the past five years there has been a decrease of 3 per cent in the 0-19 age group. However, in the south there has been an increase of 36.6 per cent in this age group. Statistics such as these, I believe, throw out a tremendous challenge for Federal, State and local governments, as well as our community, in coming to terms with the needs of a growing and very young population.

I believe it is vital that we start thinking and planning for the future now, otherwise the southern districts will be left out and left behind. First class facilities must be provided at the centre of local activity, instilling community pride. They also enable our young people to see present-day champions play locally, providing enthusiasm, incentive and leadership. Unfortunately, this is an important ingredient of our lifestyle which is sadly lacking in the southern districts. I fear that, if a move is not made in the near future, many talented young people will be lost to sport and, in particular, to football.

As a community leader in the southern area, I am not thinking short term—this project has to be viewed with the future in mind. I am confident that, if we as a community work together now, we will see league football and perhaps district cricket played in the southern area before the end of the century. This is certainly the task that I have set myself to try to achieve. I know that a number of other community leaders in the southern area have also done this. While I am on the subject, I would like to place on record my congratulations and admiration of the South Adelaide Football Club's leadership, in particular, the Chairman (Mr Colin Francis) and the General Manager (Mr Bob Bache). I believe that they have vision, and I hope that it is rewarded in the very near future.

I would now like to turn to the area of technology and what it will mean for communities such as the one I represent. Members will recall that I asked the Minister of State Development and Technology to investigate the feasibility of establishing a science park for the southern suburbs.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** If the honourable member were to go back and look in *Hansard* he would find that I asked the question in October or November last year, from memory: it is certainly on the record. I also issued a press statement and received quite a bit of coverage at the time. I am, frankly, surprised that the member for Murray-Mallee would bob up again and show his appalling ignorance of what goes on in this place. Voters in his electorate should realise that he spends most of the time interjecting and not listening. If he listened more he would know that I asked that question last year. At the time, I pointed out that the southern area has only a few industries. It especially lacks industries that have jobs for the future in mind.

It was on that basis that I thought that a science park could not work in competition with Technology Park, but would work under the umbrella of the Adelaide Technology Park Corporation. If the new science park at Bedford Park comes about—and I am sure that it will—it will be a huge bonus for people living in the southern part of Adelaide. I am pleased to say that southern members had a briefing on the development earlier this year, and the word was very encouraging. I sincerely hope that by this time next year we

will actually see some companies in place on the allocated land at Bedford Park.

Another very exciting proposal which is floating around is the State Government's task force that is trying to attract a Japanese-suggested multifunction polis (MFP) to South Australia and, in particular, to the southern suburbs. I know the task of convincing the Japanese and the Federal Government to establish the entire facility in South Australia will be difficult, as we face stiff competition. However, I would hope that there would be some spin-off should this futuristic concept be established in Australia. This MFP, if established in the southern area, would centre around advanced telecommunications and is motivated by leading edge technologies, scientific research, education, tourism and leisure. It is planned as a joint venture between Australia and Japan. It would involve other regions, including the United States, Europe and Pacific countries. The study on the viability of establishing such a city or facility in Australia is expected to start later this month and to recommend a site by the beginning of 1990.

As I said earlier, along with other States, South Australia is bidding to attract the massive urban construction, holding our highly regarded educational, technological and industrial resources and pleasant social and physical climate as the trump cards. Although we are up against stiff competition from Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, I believe that Adelaide does have distinct advantages over our opponents. Recent successes in the area of technology certainly put Adelaide in a strong bargaining position. I would sincerely hope that private industry rallies behind the State Government, as it did with the submarine project, and supports the push to have this sort of facility built in South Australia. I must say that I was very disappointed with the way this proposal has been presented by some journalists around Adelaide. It is wrong to suggest that it is some sort of Japanese retirement city. This suggestion gives completely the wrong impression. Although the MFP is a proposal both from the Japanese and from Australian Ministers, it is intended to be an international facility, with people coming from all around the world.

This facility would comprise several thousand experts, I imagine, from overseas at any one time, and it would have obvious employment benefits for the State and, more particularly in my case, for the residents of the southern suburbs. It would not be a migration development. The MFP would act as a blueprint for the future, both economically and socially. It will not be just—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** The member for Murray-Mallee is continuing to interject. I wish he would wait for his opportunity during the Address in Reply. Instead, he continually tries to howl me down. As I was trying to say, this would not be just any old technology facility: it will have ideal living conditions for the twenty-first century. I believe that it will be a very exciting project. It will not be just a giant technology park, either. But there will need to be a central research institute or large facility to give emphasis on developing industry. I would imagine it would be like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston. We would have to work out what Australia's greatest needs are in the industrial area and use the MFP to satisfy those needs. I hope that Australia will be chosen, but particularly Adelaide, because the area to the south of the city has already been set aside for future development—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr TYLER:** The honourable member says 'South Australia'. I particularly hope that Adelaide and the southern suburbs will be chosen, and I speak purely as the member

for a southern area. Indeed, I would like the facility to come to South Australia and, if it means that the honourable member's electorate receives some benefit from that, that is good for the State, too. However, as I said earlier, I am relating it to my electorate, which is a dormitory suburb and lacks industries. Lots of jobs are needed south of Adelaide. If South Australia is chosen, I will try to ensure that part, if not all, of this facility comes south of metropolitan Adelaide because, as I said, the area to the south of the city already has land set aside for future developments of this sort. It would be great for the local population and, more importantly, as I stressed earlier, it will create jobs for our kids.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I have much pleasure in seconding the Address in Reply motion as moved by the member for Fisher. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his opening speech and thank him for his ongoing contribution for the benefit of the people of South Australia. I record my sadness at the death of the former Governor of South Australia, Sir Douglas Nicholls, KCVO, OBE. Sir Douglas was only in office for a very short time but, in that time, he made a valuable contribution to the office, the State and his people, and he made many friends. I offer my condolences to his family.

I also express my sadness at the passing of Arnold Noack who, at the time of his sudden and untimely death, was the House of Assembly's Head Attendant. Arnold was at all times very helpful and friendly. He had a bright personality and will be sadly missed by his work mates, staff and members of this place. I express my condolences to the members of his family also.

I pay a tribute to the two Ministers who retired on 28 July, my colleagues the member for Spence (Hon. Roy Abbott), who was Minister of Lands, Marine, Forests and Repatriation, and the member for Mitchell (Hon. Ron Payne), who was Minister of Mines and Energy. Both were very competent, long-serving Ministers and forward planners. They were not talkers but achievers, and history will show their achievements and contributions in their respective portfolios. They were always very approachable and helpful, and both will be retiring at the next election. In the meantime, their vast experience will be invaluable to the Government, the new Ministers and all backbenchers. I am sure that they will both enjoy the easing of their workloads and the reduction in stress associated with being a Minister of the Crown.

I congratulate the two new Ministers, the member for Mawson (Hon. Susan Lenehan), who has taken over the portfolios of Marine, Lands, Repatriation and Water Resources; and the member for Todd (Hon. John Klunder), who has taken over the portfolios of Mines and Energy, and Forests. Both are very talented people and achievers. I am sure that they will make excellent Ministers, and I wish them both well in their capacities as Ministers of the Crown.

I also acknowledge the contribution made by the Hon. John Cornwall in his capacity as Minister of Health. He was one of the best, if not the best, Minister of Health that this State has ever seen. He enjoys a lot of grassroots support in the hospitals area. During my time in private industry with General Motors-Holden's I found that, if one wanted to assess the performance of the plant, rather than go to the managers and engineers from whom one always did not get the correct information, the best place to go was the workforce, where one finds the people on the line, or on the shop floor.

Likewise, the support that Dr Cornwall has had and is continuing to get from the nursing profession speaks vol-

umes for his performance in that portfolio. They know the hospital system and the day-to-day problems, and acknowledge what has been done by John Cornwall as Health Minister. I also congratulate the Minister-elect, the member for Florey (Bob Gregory), who has filled the vacancy created by John Cornwall's resignation from Cabinet. I am sure that Bob will make an excellent Minister and will contribute greatly to the Government on behalf of the people of South Australia.

**Mr Meier:** What portfolio will he have?

**Mr De LAINE:** I do not know at this stage. Whatever he gets, I am sure that he will do a very good job. I also mention the Hon. Murray Hill who, on his retirement from the Upper House, was the longest serving member of this Parliament. In my dealings with him he was at all times an easy and good person to deal with, and I class him as being a thorough gentleman. I wish him and his wife good health and happiness in their retirement.

In opening the fourth session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament His Excellency spoke of the ongoing achievements of the Bannon Labor Government and of the need for continuing tight controls and forward planning in these hard economic times. In the time available to me I will speak about the forward planning approach and the initiatives being taken by this Government. While most initiatives will have significant impact and benefits for the whole of South Australia, it pleases me that many of them are in my electorate where the benefits are obvious at the local level.

One of the most important forward planning initiatives undertaken by this Government was witnessed recently with the commissioning of the new 275 000 volt powerline and associated transformer and substation facilities at Northfield. The 13 kilometre double powerline from Torrens Island feeds into the Northfield substation and is converted to 66 000 volts via gas insulated switchgear. The new switch yard is right up to date by world standards, with extensive use of computers and fail-safe back-up systems.

I was most impressed on the opening day at the excellent workmanship of the equipment, including the wiring and computer gear. It was excellently finished and was a credit to those concerned with its planning and setting up. In the design of the installation there is also provision for an additional transformer and switchgear in 10 years time, which once again demonstrates this Government's commitment and policy in providing facilities before they are needed.

Overall, the substation facilities are dimensionally very compact, have low maintenance requirements and will result in economical, long-life, high voltage switching facilities that will supply essential power to the whole of metropolitan Adelaide's north-eastern region. The commissioning of the substation was performed by my colleague the member for Mitchell in his then capacity as Minister of Mines and Energy. In fact, it was his last official duty of this type before standing down as Minister. This project is a further example of Ron's foresight and planning and was a fitting conclusion to his outstanding contribution to the people of South Australia during his time as a Minister of the Crown.

Work is continuing on the new Railway Museum which is being built at the old Port Dock railway station yards at Port Adelaide. This major project is running to schedule and will be officially opened on 10 December this year. Some locomotives have already been transferred to the site and are presently being set up inside the large building. The opening of this important establishment will further enhance the Port's growing position as one of the State's top tourist areas. Of course, a big advantage is the Port's accessibility for Adelaide's urban dwellers. The unemployed and low-income earners can get there quite easily, whereas getting

to other tourist attractions in other parts of the State would be impossible for many because of the costs involved in travelling large distances.

Because of the overall confidence in both State and Federal Labor Governments in respect of their economic policies, which are working extremely well, there appears to be the beginning of a resurgence of shipbuilding in Port Adelaide. Shipbuilders are putting their money where their mouths are, are spending large amounts of money on the upgrading and expansion of shipbuilding facilities in the port and are actively searching for work interstate and overseas. Some extremely lucrative contracts have been signed and more are in the pipeline involving a wide variety of sophisticated marine work. Much of the credit must go to the Bannon Labor Government in setting the scene for this resurgence. Initiatives like giving Eglo the contract to build the Kangaroo Island ferry, the *Island Seaway*, gaining the multi-billion dollar submarine replacement contract, building the ship lift and providing the second container crane at No. 6 berth Outer Harbor are just some of the confidence building initiatives.

In addition, projects like the restoration of the *Falie*, the building of the *One and All*, the America's Cup yacht *South Australia* and the awarding to Eglo of the Royal Australian Navy contract to build the four survey vessels have generated much beneficial world-wide publicity and have put Port Adelaide and South Australia well and truly on the map. Port Adelaide is rapidly gaining worldwide recognition as a competitively priced place where the necessary expertise is available to turn out world-class marine work.

Running in tandem with this expertise is South Australia's worldwide reputation for a very low incidence of industrial disputation and its excellent industrial relations record. Put these two factors together and we have a recipe for success. The lion's share of the credit for the excellent industrial relations record must go to the unions and the workers themselves. They will be rewarded for their past patience and commonsense approach in picking up much needed employment opportunities in the future. They have built up a reputation, and they must get the credit.

An example of the increased opportunities for employment in the shipbuilding industry is the fact that one shipbuilder has increased his workforce from 14 to 40 people in the past year. Given the contracts he has in the pipeline, he will be increasing to 80 people during the next 12 months. He is only one of the shipbuilders in Port Adelaide who are doing particularly well.

Another pleasing aspect of these increased employment opportunities is that a number of apprentices will be taken on and trained. This is particularly significant at a time when there is a shortage of skills in Australia. It is great to see apprentices being given this opportunity. This particular employer, I am pleased to say, recognises the importance of training people 'on the job': he has arranged for fully qualified TAFE instructors to teach trainees and apprentices on site. One of the main courses being taught in this way is high-tech marine class aluminium welding. This is in its infancy in South Australia and there will be an ongoing and increasing need for this type of expertise if the shipbuilding industry is to be successful in its resurgence. The employer has spent a great deal of money in the provision of the latest high-tech welding equipment to complement both the training and building aspects of his establishment. The whole program is very exciting indeed.

While talking about apprentices, I point out that plans are well advanced to combine all the attributes of Port Adelaide to develop the historic 'Jenkins' slip and shipbuilding facilities established in 1849 into a hands-on on-

site trade school for shipwrights. The concept involves the restoration of the historic aspects of the facility, together with the training aspects. Hopefully it will be another money-spinner for Port Adelaide which will attract tourists to view not only the historic aspects of this slipway but see the training of apprentices and the building of certain projects by people on site. It will complement the already burgeoning tourist attractions in the Port area.

An area of great future significance for not only the electorate of Price but also South Australia in general is the area north of Gillman and Wingfield, including Torrens and Garden Islands. A few months ago the Dean Rifle Range and overshoot area was placed on the market by the Federal Government as prime industrial land. This decision caused an outcry from local authorities and me. Because of the low lying nature of most of this land, an enormous amount of land build-up would be required before any sort of building work could be undertaken. If this area is built up accordingly, many potential problems would be created. The rifle range portion of this land is the best and least sensitive of this whole area. The range has been in continual use for the past 100 years plus, and over this time it has been gradually built up and improved with no obvious adverse effects. The overshoot area, however, is quite a different situation. It is bounded to the north by the north arm of the Port River and to the north east by the North Arm Creek. It appears visually to be low lying wasteland. This, however, is far from the truth as it is in fact a sensitive and environmentally important area.

Without going into details here, due to lack of time, the area forms a natural ponding basin and acts as protection against periodical severe storms and very high tides. The situation is even more important now when one takes into consideration the greenhouse effect and the expected 500 mm rise in sea level in the Port Adelaide area. Two main stormwater drains run across this land—one to the east of the rifle range which flows into North Arm Creek and one to the west of the range running into North Arm itself. This latter drain in particular is very important as it carries not only stormwater for the North East Drainage Authority from the whole of the metropolitan area into the river and in turn out to sea, but also acts as a crucial buffer zone if any dangerous substances get into the drainage system. The buffer zone played a very vital role in the control of a dangerous copper oxychloride spill at Gillman a couple of years ago. This is another factor that needs to be considered in determining the future long-term use of this land.

The mangrove lined banks of the North Arm and North Arm Creek, Barker Inlet, Torrens Island and Garden Island form vital breeding grounds for fish in the gulf system and therefore this area must be protected at all costs; and the whole area also supports a wide variety of native birds. All of these aspects require careful consideration. Thankfully, however, this large parcel of land was recently purchased by the State Government and the immediate threat to the area was thus eliminated.

The South Australian Government now owns all the land in this region and will be undertaking thorough and detailed studies to ensure that any future use and development will be completely compatible with the ecology of the area as a whole. The studies will look at not only today's requirements and effects but at the future 100 years plus ahead. After the present environmental problems with which I have had to deal in areas like Wingfield, Rosewater, Alberton, Queenstown, Cheltenham, and so on, it is great to know that for the first time in the 150 years since the colonisation of South Australia open virgin land like this will be developed in an orderly, sensitive and sensible way. The potential



uses for this whole area are almost endless and with great care many quite diverse land uses can be made quite compatible with one another. The whole area has a tremendously exciting future if planned correctly. This is also typical of what I said earlier about the Bannon Labor Government looking and planning ahead.

Another example of looking ahead is in the area of State finances. Government entrepreneurial initiatives by the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer include the Convention Centre, Torrens Island Power Station lease back arrangements, the South Australian Finance Authority, the Casino, and Sagasco/S.A. Oil and Gas restructuring. They have all contributed to the State's economy and have enabled taxes and charges to be kept to an absolute minimum.

I hate to think what the financial position of the State would be like now if the 1979-82 experience had been allowed to continue under a Liberal Government. The deficit in 1982 was approximately \$63 million. I hate to think what it would be today had members opposite been in Government.

The Mobilong medium security prison at Murray Bridge was opened in October last year and was completed on schedule and within budget. This new prison is an excellent facility, being well planned and spacious. The chances of much better prison rehabilitation in this type of penal institution are far better than was the case for prisoners in the past who served their sentences at places like Adelaide Gaol and parts of the old Yatala complex. It is pleasing to see that before we enter into the twenty-first century we now have a prison which brings us into the twentieth century.

Some criticisms have been levelled at Mobilong Prison to the effect that it is too comfortable. People saying that are only showing their ignorance of the whole area of correctional services. The new prison conforms only to the United Nations current minimum standards for prisons and so is not exactly luxurious. It contains a wide range of facilities to allow an equally wide range of activities to prevent boredom, which is by far the biggest single problem in penal institutions throughout the world. It must be borne in mind that the real penalty for someone who is convicted and put away is the denying of their freedom. I would much rather live in very harsh conditions and have my freedom than live in a very luxurious environment but be denied my freedom. Freedom is the most important aspect and when someone is incarcerated in these institutions the fact that their freedom is taken away from them is the penalty rather than giving them bad conditions in which to live.

The best part of the opening of the Mobilong Prison was probably the fact that it enabled the scaling down and eventual closure of the primitive and dreadful Adelaide Gaol. That antiquated establishment was built in 1841 and was in fact the first permanent building built in Adelaide—such was the perceived importance of penal institutions in those days. No doubt it was a very modern and up-to-date prison when it was built, but it should have been scrapped 50 years ago as progress overtook it. The prison remained in service continually from 1841 and a total of 40 prisoners were executed within its walls and are still buried there. The last person executed there, in 1964, was Glen Sabre Valance, who was sentenced to death for the crime of murder. Thankfully this outdated and barbaric ultimate penalty has been abolished here in South Australia. The last prisoner was transferred out of Adelaide Gaol in late January, and on 4 February 1988 I was very pleased to be present when that dreadful place was officially closed. It is expected that the gaol will be reopened as a museum at a later date.

In December last year, I attended the official opening by the Premier of the Australian Submarine Corporation's temporary office complex at the old Woodville GMH plant. It was a rather nostalgic visit for me, because the refurbished office is in the same building which constituted GMH's drawing office in which I worked prior to 1958. In looking back and considering the way the place was set up when I worked there, it is hard to imagine how we worked under such appalling conditions at that time. The building was virtually a sawtooth factory built of timber and iron and it was very hot in summer and ice-cold in winter. The only air circulation was by slow moving fans. The accommodation was extremely primitive, but we thought it was quite good at the time. The present Australian Submarine Corporation office bears very little resemblance to the old GMH design office. New cladding has been added both inside and out, the floors are now fully carpeted, the whole place is insulated and air-conditioned, false ceilings have been fitted, and cunning use has been made of some of the sawtooths in the roof to create attractive looking light traps. Overall, it provides a very pleasant environment in which to work—and I add that it is only temporary. The whole operation will move to the submarine site at Osborne when complete.

The office complex is full of computers and other high-tech equipment, and it was most interesting to talk to a young technician who guided a group of us through the establishment. In answering my question as to why such obvious emphasis was placed on computers, he answered that to build complex machines like submarines the computers were absolutely essential, that in fact it would be an impossible task without them. He was so absolutely brain-washed and committed to computers that when I posed the question as to how submarines, ships, aircraft, motor vehicles, etc., were ever designed, built and maintained in the days before computers he looked at me in amazement. Obviously the question had gone over the top of his head.

The submarine on-site infrastructure is progressing on schedule and is starting to take shape. Over the years there will be billions of dollars of spin-off to the local economy from this massive project. An interesting fact about the submarines is that they will be built in the electorate of Semaphore, represented by my parliamentary colleague the member for Semaphore, but as soon as they hit the water they will be in my electorate, the electorate of Price.

**Mr Peterson:** They might move the boundary yet, Murray.

**Mr De LAINE:** Yes, we might. I have been invited to attend the launch of a Neighbourhood Watch program at Cheltenham on 15 August. I am very pleased that the concept of Neighbourhood Watch has been extended to the Cheltenham area, as a lot of housebreakings have occurred there in recent times. I cannot speak too highly of the South Australia Police Force and the manner in which it deals with problems in my electorate. Because of the diversity of such an electorate, there are many problems such as housebreaking, etc., and the Police Force does a magnificent job in this regard. Its resources are always strained to the absolute limit and great demands are placed on it by the community. I know that the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch into areas such as Cheltenham will give added protection for the local residents as well as assisting the police in their thankless task of trying to maintain law and order in the community. I believe that the Cheltenham area will be the ninety-ninth area to be added to the Neighbourhood Watch concept, and that is a remarkable achievement.

**Mr Becker:** There are over 100 now.

**Mr De LAINE:** The member for Hanson says that there are over 100 now, so I am a bit out-of-date there. Another

indication of the forward planning of the Bannan Labor Government was the 'Safe Work' launch, which I attended on 30 November 1987. That is another initiative taken by the Government following the introduction of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, and it is aimed at the elimination of workplace accidents and all the associated pain and suffering which emanates from that area. There are still many unsafe factories within the industrial area, but there are many employees and, thankfully, an increasing number of employers who are very conscious of safety and who are doing the right thing and spending quite large amounts of money in making their workplaces safer for people to work in.

I was pleased on 16 June to represent the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins) at the launch of a book, published by WorkCover, called 'Guide to Occupational Health and Safety Management'. It is a draft book that has been issued for public comment. The venue chosen for the launch was in my electorate at the Wingfield Sheet and Coil Plant of BHP Coated Products Division. It was fitting that this plant was chosen for the launch because it is the only plant in Australia to have achieved the National Safety Council's five-star employer rating for two successive years. The plant, which has 135 employees, including 100 in the factory area, almost eliminated accidents resulting in lost time during 1986-87, and it achieved the award that I have just referred to.

The South Australian Manager of the BHP Coated Products Division (Mr Colin Rosenthal), who received the first copy of the safety plan, said that his plant had proved that, with conscientious application of proper safety standards, workplace accidents could be prevented on a continuing basis. Mr Rosenthal said that, as well as promoting proper procedures to employees and supervisors, employers also had to invest in modern machinery which in many cases helped make the workplace safer.

On walking through the plant, I was impressed by the modern machinery and the way in which the equipment was laid out and maintained. Another good aspect of the plan is that it ensures that full consideration is given to the reporting not only of accidents but also of near misses to ensure that the plant is safe and that the workers are safety conscious. This results in a high morale. The book was aimed mainly at employees with bad safety records and set out to inform employers of the true cost to them of unsafe working conditions. The main thrust of the book is to help employers set up effective health and safety programs. After public comment has been received, the book will, if necessary, be revised and then released. All the initiatives to which I have referred indicate the utmost confidence in the forward planning of the Bannan Labor Government.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan):** Order! The honorable member's time has expired. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** At the outset I express regret at the passing of a former Governor of this State, Sir Douglas Nicholls. I also wish the Hon. Murray Hill a long and happy retirement. His Excellency the Governor's speech follows the usual pattern of recent years as it seems that the Government wishes to put the best face on matters, which is understandable. In the speech we hear the Governor saying that there are signs of improvement in South Australia. The speech is reported in the *Advertiser* and other newspapers, unfortunately, as though it contains the Governor's own words. In fact, they are not the words of the Governor but rather those of the Government's minders who put the speech

together. I realise that the Governor has no option but to read what is put in front of him, but the speech should not be construed as the Governor's own speech: it is a speech prepared by the Government to sing the Government's praises.

**Mr Rann:** That's a cynical statement.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not: it is a statement of fact and members know it. His Excellency's speech is an effort to put the best face on what is really a pretty sombre state of affairs. All the leading indicators show that South Australia has fallen behind the rest of Australia. True, Tim Marcus Clark says that recently we have lent a little more money. We know that we are not back to where we were three or four years ago, but that is eagerly seized on by those wishing to indicate that there are encouraging signs. However, it gives slim comfort to those 25 per cent of young South Australians who are unemployed and who cannot get jobs under the present Administration. Indeed, that is the worst of the indicators that show that South Australia is the worst off of all the States. I refer to one highlight contained in paragraph 6 of His Excellency's speech, as follows:

The largest development in South Australia for at least a decade—

I would say that it is much more than a decade—

the \$850 million Roxby Downs project will progressively come into production, providing more than 1 200 jobs and an important multiplier effect extending through the regional centres of Whyalla and Port Augusta to Adelaide.

If the Labor Party had had its way in 1982, the Roxby Downs project would not have even got off the ground and the Premier would not be able to boast in the Governor's speech that here is this largest project for many years where \$850 million is being invested and 1 200 jobs created. That project would not have seen the light of day. Indeed, it was described by the Premier as a mirage in the desert and, when the select committee reported to this Parliament, the former Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Ron Payne) and the now Deputy Premier (Hon. Don Hoggood) said in their dissenting report that this project should not proceed because the radiological controls were not satisfactory and the uranium would be used in bombs.

Every time this Government parades to public view the bonanza that Roxby surely is, as though it is the Government's project, I intend to remind it that, if the Labor Party had had its way, the project would not have got off the ground. In fact, the timidity of the Labor Party in this State closed down two other uranium mines and knocked on the head for at least 20 years—and maybe for all time—the prospect of a uranium enrichment facility in this State. As a result of the courage of Norm Foster in crossing the floor and forcing the Labor Party to do something, the Party cringed off to its Federal conference and came out with a completely incomprehensible policy of letting Roxby proceed while closing down all the rest—a nonsense policy. The same timidity is being shown by the Government today.

I now refer to a matter that is of critical importance to the human race, although this Government does not yet seem to have grasped its importance—the effects on the human race of the greenhouse effect. In the grievance debate last Thursday I heard a Government member raise this matter, which is the most important by far of all the environmental effects that will impact on the human race during our lifetime and for the next 50 or 70 years. Here again, the Government is being typically shortsighted in its approach to a matter that is of critical importance to us all.

In this regard I refer to an article in the *News* during the week before last, written by Rae Atkey, on the greenhouse effect. The Deputy Premier's only response to that article

was to say that we should lie back and enjoy it. True, he made a few comments about planning laws which only nibbled at the periphery, the very edge, of the problem. Although we must do something about the planning laws, in terms of addressing the fundamental problem the Deputy Premier did not seem to grasp it. He merely told us to lie back and enjoy it!

If the earth's atmosphere warms up by 4.5 degrees centigrade, as most responsible scientists now believe that it will over the next 50 to 70 years, the effects on life on earth as we know it will be absolutely astronomical. The effects could be, and probably will be, absolutely devastating. For the Deputy Premier to suggest that we should lie back and enjoy it showed that he was either not interested in the fundamental issue of atmospheric pollution or that he had failed to grasp the enormity of the problem facing the human race.

I believe that the thinking of the conservation movement, the professed conservationists, will have to change dramatically in relation to the provision of the world's energy needs. In this regard I was pleased to hear Senator Richardson say at the weekend that the provision of nuclear energy on the global scene must be reassessed.

In the Labor Party there is at least one senior Federal Minister who is attempting to come to grips with the fundamental issue of atmospheric pollution. It is a fact of life that nuclear energy used for electricity generation does provide some nasty by-product—not much of it, but what there is is very nasty. It can be processed, solidified, buried and monitored. Indeed, it can be monitored for hundreds of years in rock formations that have been stable for millions of years.

However, if we continue to spew gases into the atmosphere as we are doing now with our major energy conversions, particularly from coal fired power stations, we will have no answer to the greenhouse effect. Emissions to the atmosphere from nuclear power usage are negligible, there being only a minute amount of steam involved and, as I say, other by-products can be controlled. Certainly, these fundamental questions will have to be addressed with some urgency in the next five to 10 years, if not now.

What is the response of the Labor Party when any of its members wish to raise this matter at the Federal conference? What is the contribution of the Premier of South Australia, the present Federal President of the ALP? What is his response? As usual, as always, he wants to sweep it under the carpet and put it in the too-hard basket and not even talk about it. He wants to shove it off to some committee so that the committee can go away and work out some sort of compromise which will let the Labor Party, the Government and the Premier personally off the hook.

Instead of being prepared to face up to those fundamental issues which are of critical importance not just to this nation but to the whole of the human race, the Premier wants to sweep them under the carpet; he does not want a uranium debate. As I say, it is the same way in which he approaches all the problems that beset him here in South Australia. How did he approach the Jubilee Point problem? He sent it off to a committee to give him an answer. How do they solve any of their problems? They do not make a decision, and that is what happened in relation to the uranium question confronting the Labor Party.

Certainly, I believe that we could have had operating in this State by now the safest part of the nuclear fuel cycle, that is, uranium enrichment. We have heard all about the argument, 'We don't want Australia to be a quarry.' We know that the uranium we sell from Roxby Downs will be enriched and used in nuclear power stations. Why on earth

are we not prepared to enrich uranium here? It is because of the sacrifice by the Labor Party in a so-called stupid, incomprehensible and nonsense policy of compromise.

Instead of facing up to these issues the Labor Party turns its back on them and that costs South Australia a major new industry. If we had had our way, as we did with Roxby, the Premier could claim that we are at the forefront of enriching this mineral, enhancing its value enormously and providing fuel for nuclear reactors to make sure that it is used for peaceful purposes. The Labor Party is intent on avoiding controversy and fights. It has scrapped a few of the projects in marginal seats recently because they are controversial. It knocked them on the head. It wants to win at all costs. To hell with opening up a debate on these important topics which will be of great value to the State. It wants to sweep them under the carpet and let events take their course.

Indeed, I believe that the conservation movement may well rue its decisions given a long-term view of their environmental impact. It will rue the decision to oppose the damming of the Franklin River to provide hydroelectric power, requiring the alternative of a coal fired power station. There is no doubt that the least polluting form of energy generation is hydroelectricity, other than wind or some others—but I am talking about large-scale development.

Despite the pleas of the conservation movement that we ought to get more into wind and solar power—and I agree—in the foreseeable future they will be small-scale programs. If we are talking about developing the lifestyle and the standard of living of emerging countries, we cannot talk about wind and solar power; we must consider either hydro, coal fired or nuclear powered stations. Many hydro schemes elsewhere in the world have been knocked on the head in response to conservation and environment arguments. In most cases the appropriate alternative is a coal-fired power station, and the environmental effect from such a development over a period of time will be absolutely disastrous. We know about the effects of acid rain, and we know about the greenhouse effect. Acid rain is caused by acidic oxide, sulphur dioxide, and oxides of nitrogen being swept into the air, dissolved in the rain and forming acids. They have killed off forests and fish and rendered lakes dead. We know the effects. They can be removed at great expense.

About 80 per cent of these effects can be removed by scrubbing—at great expense. We cannot get rid of them all, but we can get rid of many of them. There are many heavy metals spewed into the air, and we can get rid of much of that, but we cannot get rid of the carbon dioxide produced by burning fossil fuels. There is no way known of getting rid of carbon dioxide burning fossil fuels. The decision in America, because of the hoo-ha regarding nuclear reactors, to increasingly supply energy needs with coal fired power stations will be a move in exactly the wrong direction if we are thinking of conserving the environment over a period.

The environmentalists are concerned in this. I think of the Don Chipp of this world, the bleeding hearts and the new boss Senator Janine Haines. They claim that they are worried about the human race and where it will be in 300 years or 400 years down the track. I have heard Chipp on his soapbox many a time in this regard: 'I am worried about what will happen. This nuclear energy is a terrible pollutant and I am worried about what will happen to the human race in 400 or 500 years.' I can tell him about the alternative, and I believe that the only large-scale alternative to nuclear power is coal. In 400 or 500 years what he is advocating will have done enormously greater damage to the human race than will nuclear energy where, although the wastes are

nasty, there are small quantities that can be solidified, buried and monitored. There is no way in the world, once we have changed the composition of the earth's atmosphere, that we can retrieve the situation. Conservationists have taken a very short-term view.

This Government, I believe, also has taken a pathetically short-sighted view and has failed to grasp the major issues and educate itself in relation to the facts. I know that in the Labor Party there are some people who know the facts, but they are too timid to carry the fight. Thank goodness that there are a few people in the Federal Labor Party who have the courage of their convictions. We do not have them here in South Australia, but in the Federal Labor Party there are a few. Even Richardson, who is the Minister for Environment, suggested on Sunday that we need to rethink our attitude to nuclear energy. There are a few who, knowing the facts, are at least prepared to have a go. It is something that we do not see in South Australia and it is something that we will never see under the current leadership of Premier John Bannon, because he ducks for cover on every occasion when there is a problem. He wants to sweep it under the carpet. He does not want to confront the issue and he certainly does not want to try and give a lead. That has cost this State a great deal indeed. One of the people I visited when I was overseas recently was Dr Hans Blix.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Beach erosion—what are you on about?

**Mr Robertson:** The purpose of the trip.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know what that crack by the honourable member was all about, but if he goes and looks at beach erosion, good luck to him. I go away, do some work and try to inform myself. I suggest to members of the Labor Party that if, during the late 1970s and 1980s, they had taken the trouble to go overseas and talk to people who knew, we might not have had the misinformation and the campaign which was waged to try to stop Roxby Downs and which, in effect, has given us not even half a uranium industry in Australia. They would have saved us that nonsensical compromise which meant that the rest of the world does not know where the hell we are. I picked that up on one of these trips where I sought to inform myself. The word which cropped up in more than one place overseas was that we were eccentric. Eccentric, mind you! One of the people I talked to in London was one of those who had come to South Australia pretty regularly since the 1970s when former Premier Dunstan was very interested in uranium enrichment in this State, and the negotiations were opened up with Urenco-Centec before the Labor Party decided to clam up on it.

I talked to Dr Brian Keogh again, and I will paraphrase the conversation. He said 'I don't believe there is any chance of your getting uranium enrichment facilities in Australia at the moment, because you don't know where you're going'—meaning the Australian Government. He rang me afterwards and said, 'I thought that all that sounded a bit pessimistic, Roger. Of course, if Australia was to decide where it was going, instead of the Government in office at the moment toing and froing, it might become a possibility.' What they are doing is, instead of building one here, making a deal with the Americans to build a uranium enrichment facility in the United States.

That was not heard of in the early 1980s when we were negotiating. It would have been here and up and running and, as I have said on dozens of occasions and will say again for members opposite who are not prepared to look at the facts, it is the safest part of the whole nuclear cycle.

But we had scare tactics from the member for Briggs and others saying, 'It will be at your back door. It will be located here.' In our negotiations we made sure that it was not. We have had it all with Roxby and we now have a re-run with all these other facilities. The Labor Party is not prepared to inform itself of the facts and have the courage of its convictions to get on and develop these areas where we had a real potential for earning billions of dollars for Australia's wellbeing. No wonder we have 25 per cent youth unemployment. When we do have opportunities, the Labor Party and the present Premier fritter them away.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Of course, we could have a nuclear power station to do it, as the French do. I strongly advise the honourable member to go overseas when he gets the chance—not to go and look at coastal dunes or to have the water lapping around his feet, but to see Dr Keogh, to go up to Sellafeld, go up—

**Mr Rann:** They've had a few problems there, too—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They told me you'd been there! They were in the days when you were a bigger rabbit than you are now. They told me all about your visit. I heard all about that. We will not go into that. If the member for Bright was to go overseas, and talk to these people and visit these places that I have visited in Germany and England, he might find out that energy usage by this centrifuge method is quite minimal compared to the French diffusion technique. It is in fact the safest part of the nuclear industry, as I have indicated, and it would be a very worthwhile adjunct to South Australia's economy if we had had the brains to grasp our chance and if we had not had all the misrepresentation that was visited on the public and churned out by the member for Briggs and others, who were then working as Government propagandists.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the honourable member went to the south of France he would see six nuclear reactors. I would advise him to go and have a look, even if his mind is closed. There are six nuclear generators side by side in the south of France, some used for generating electricity and some providing energy to their diffusion plant for enrichment.

I did that in 1981 just to convince myself of what was going on in the real world. I suggest the honourable member save up his travelling allowance for a couple of years to do the trip. It will open his eyes. He should go and see Dr Blix, who is the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I want to quote from a speech that Dr Blix made in July this year. His qualifications are impeccable, and to anyone who wants to take him on publicly and refute what he says, all I can do is wish them luck. I have a copy of an address that Dr Blix gave to the International Summer College in Hungary in July this year. He gave it to me when I went to see him at the United Nations in Vienna about six weeks ago. I quote:

The theme of this international summer college is environmental protection and industrial development. While the need for industrial development has long been understood as vital for the achievement of higher standards of living, it is lamentably late in the day that the world has discovered the necessity for environmental protection, and the current situation is in some respects alarming.

I will try to get a copy of this speech into the Parliamentary Library so that all members will have the opportunity to read it. I will read some excerpts which I think are important in this day and age. He said (and this is a quote made before he had the job as Director-General of the IAEA):

When I was a Foreign Minister, I stated in the Swedish Parliament in 1979:

While the arsenals of nuclear weapons threaten the biological life of the earth with sudden extinction, environmental pollution and the plundering of resources forshadow the possibility of slow extermination. Our generation must bear in mind that the world does not belong to us but we belong to it, and that we must not hand on to coming generations a poisoned and impoverished earth.

I will not have time to quote much of this speech but will make it available to the Parliamentary Library. He went on further:

I cannot even guess what the energy demands will be in 2050. But I can see that even with the conservation measures which have been taken in the last decade and which have effectively helped to bring about a levelling-off, and in some cases even a reduction, in consumption of primary energy, electricity consumption has continued to rise. The result has been that the dependence on oil in many countries has lessened, as was desired, and oil prices have gone down. However, as economic and social development demands continue in the future, an increased demand for electricity is bound to follow. At present, the consumption of electricity varies strongly between industrial States. Thus, Norway uses 25 000 kWh per capita and year; Sweden 16 000; France 6 000; Italy 3 000.

Here in Hungary the figure is 2 300 kWh per person and year. Not surprisingly, developing countries emphasise expansion of electricity production as a central element of their economic development agendas. While nuclear power stations generating electricity have often been criticised as large-scale and inhumane installations by modern ideologues, one should note that electricity is exceptionally convenient for small-scale end-use, stimulating grass root activities. There is a lot of demand to satisfy: eight million Swedes dispose of 33 000 MW generating capacity, of which 9 500 are nuclear, and use 16 000 kWh per capita and year, 100 million people in Bangladesh dispose of 1 000 MW capacity and have a per capita consumption of 46 kilowatt hours per year. If Norway has a per capita consumption which is seven times higher than Italy's, the industrialised countries on the average have a per capita consumption which is 14 times higher than the developing countries.

I think we can safely proceed on the assumption that demand for electricity will continue to rise both in industrialised and developing countries. I am not alone in this view. A number of serious organisations such as OECD, IIASA and the WEC have concluded that in the next 20 to 30 years we shall need more energy, especially electricity, than we now use. The report of the World Commission does not recognise that the considerable energy savings which have been achieved in the industrialised world in the past decades to a great extent are due to a change to electricity in end use.

**Mr Robertson:** And you want a nuclear power program here!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is the idiot interjection that I would expect from the honourable member. If he is not prepared to look at the global scene—

**Ms Gayler:** Isn't it Federal Liberal Party policy?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader has the floor.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is also an idiot interjection. I am talking about the global scene and the requirement for electricity. The opponents of nuclear energy are doing the world an enormous amount of damage and the results will be visited on their children and grandchildren. That is what I am saying. I will have to ignore the idiot interjections because I am out of time.

What are the alternatives to nuclear power in the generation of electricity? Dr Blix goes on to discuss wind and solar power, which will make a contribution, but not the significant contribution that will be needed for the development of underdeveloped countries. He goes on to suggest that the movement on the global scene to phase out nuclear power, as some want to do, and bring in coal-fired power stations, which is the only large scale alternative, will be very damaging. It is the wrong decision. The Chinese are moving into coal production in a very big way. They are developing. The greenhouse effect will march on irrevocably unless Ministers of Environment, in particular, are prepared

to say that we must take it seriously and not just lie back and enjoy it.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** I must say that I really enjoy following the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I really do enjoy listening to his old speeches. I am only disappointed that he did not quote his old friends Sir Ben Dickinson and Ron Wilmshurst just to complete the cycle. I would like to know in which electorates this nuclear power station and uranium enrichment plant that the Deputy Leader talks about will be located. Perhaps it is part of his marginal seat strategy for the next election.

Today I echo the member for Fisher and the member for Price in extending my condolence to the relatives of Sir Doug Nicholls. I had the privilege of meeting Sir Doug Nicholls when he was Governor of this State, and I think that he made an outstanding contribution to this country. I also congratulate the members for Mitchell and Spence and the Hon. John Cornwall in another place on their outstanding contribution to the Parliament, to the Government and to our community. I also congratulate the members for Todd, Mawson and Florey on their elevation to the Ministry. I will also be bipartisan in echoing the member for Fisher in paying tribute to Mr Murray Hill. I had the privilege of being a member of the Public Works Committee with Murray Hill, and at all times I found him to be a gentleman and most helpful to new members.

In our bicentennial year, a lot has been said about our pioneers. A great deal has been said about those early Australians who arrived here in 1788. We have seen tall ships and a first fleet re-enactment. I would certainly like to see more attention paid to those other pioneers, to those waves of migrants who have made an outstanding contribution to our way of life in Australia. The great construction programs of the Snowy River and the expansion of our manufacturing industries all owe an enormous amount to the sweat and toil of migrant Australians. In every walk of life—in work, charitable groups, sport and the arts—migrant Australians and their children have made an outstanding contribution to Australia.

I know from people whom I meet in my electorate and from my own family background that it takes a great deal of courage to leave one's homeland, one's friends and family to start a new life in a new nation. That courage is too often undervalued and, of course, there are those who have no choice but to be forced to flee injustice and tyranny. In my electorate, daily I come into contact with migrants making their mark. I see Italian and Greek shop owners who work 18 hours a day to give their children a better chance in life. I see British migrants who came here and contributed to the building of our defence industries and our cars.

I see in places like Parafield Gardens Vietnamese and Cambodian families who, trying to overcome the problems of a new language and culture, daily show us what is meant by hard work in their commitment to their families. Many of the children of those migrants often do not appreciate the sacrifices that their parents have made and are still making. When the real history of Australian migration is told, I am sure that their heroism will become part of our folklore. In many ways the children of migrants in Australia are the sons and daughters of giants.

But, just as Australians are appreciating how multiculturalism enriches their lives, in wades John Howard. In his rejection of multiculturalism he talks about 'one Australia'. His 'one Australia' means a return to racially-based migration criteria, and by singling out Asian Australians John Howard has sought to send a mental telegram to bigots and

racists in our community that he is one of them and that he stands for what they believe in. He is trying to achieve the same kind of divisions and tensions that marked Enoch Powell's contribution to the migration debate in Britain in the 1960s.

No amount of hedging and twisting by Mr Howard can obscure the simple truth that he wants to tug on the responsive chord of racism. In doing so he not only diminishes himself but he also diminishes his Party and damages Australia's vital new markets and its reputation in the eyes of nations to which racism is repugnant. At home he risks breaking social cohesion as he attempts to focus the hostility of ignorance on small groups within our community.

I do not believe that I am exaggerating. Mr Howard said quite clearly that he wanted to slow down Asian immigration—not 'immigration' but 'Asian immigration'. In making that statement he shatters the bipartisanship which has underpinned Australian immigration policy for so many years. Race is the issue which John Howard wants to fan. He wants to signal that the Liberal Party and racial intolerance are cosy bedfellows; he wants to signal to racists that this is their Party. It is a grubby exercise designed to win votes by exploiting ignorance and prejudice.

Today I appeal to our church leaders to come forward and state their position in terms of multiculturalism and of John Howard's stand on migration. It is time for people of principle and goodwill from all walks of life to come forward. I also call on South Australian Liberal Senators and members of the House of Representatives to renounce Mr Howard's stand and to repudiate his position. I want to hear from the likes of Senator Robert Hill, whose father made an outstanding contribution to multiculturalism in this State.

I want to hear from the likes of Michael Pratt, the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide, whose own electorate embraces so many thousands of people who were born in other lands. Where are the Jamie Porters, the Alexander Downers and the Amanda Vanstones? Where do they stand? I challenge them all to come forward and have the guts to say where they stand on John Howard's policy.

Today I want to talk about the State Opposition's campaign for the next election. It is not a question of hearsay, guesswork or crystal ball gazing. The State Opposition's campaign for the 1989 election will be as predictable as it was in 1985. In 1985 it became rapidly clear to us all that the Olsen Opposition, with no ideas of its own, was going to copy holus-bolus the campaign of the Kennett Opposition in Victoria, and I am not quite sure why. After all, Mr Kennett had foot and mouth disease and led his Party to defeat. But, the South Australian Opposition Leader had his strategy, albeit a borrowed strategy, and he stuck to it. We even saw the use by the South Australian Liberal Party of advertisements borrowed in their entirety from Victoria. The only thing that was changed was the name of the State, which they dubbed over, and the name of the Premier.

That is how original this Opposition is. This time, in 1989, we will see a carbon copy of the Greiner campaign. At taxpayers' expense, a senior adviser to the State Opposition Leader sat in on the Greiner campaign from beginning to end. The Leader of the Opposition and his shadow Ministers have been swanning around New South Wales and Nick Greiner has been over here telling us that John Olsen is a good bloke. The Leader of the Opposition's adviser was there to learn from Greiner aides Ken Hooper, Gary Sturgess and Ian Kortling, who have subsequently told journalists that they modelled Greiner's campaign on Bob Hawke's successful 1987 campaign.

I am not quite sure about that, having seen what they produced. But they had much publicised shakedown cruises in which Nick Greiner, his shadow Cabinet, candidates and staff went through their paces acting out what they would do in the hours following the Premier's calling of an election. There was a glossy, supposedly American-style campaign launch and slick video clips of Nick and his family (and we have seen how much the present Leader of the Opposition tries to emphasise that he is a family man) with balloons, tacky razzamatazz and even a rock concert. We will see all that here.

The trouble is that neither the Opposition nor its backers believe that John Olsen can emulate Nick Greiner. They know that this leadership team is not a saleable, winning combination. Every floating voter is still telling the pollsters the same things about the Leader of the Opposition as they told the pollsters back in 1985: that he is a whinger, that he is a knocker, that he is a one-man chorus of gloom, and that he is someone who never comes up with positive ideas. Members opposite know—they see their own polls. Presumably the Leader of the Opposition is frank enough with them to show them his own polling research.

But, there is something new that the floating voters are saying. They are saying that the Liberal leadership in this State is phoney, and that tag will stick like super glue if the Leader of the Opposition's handlers try to make a Greiner out of him. The truth is that the preconditions are not here as they were in New South Wales, and neither is the Liberal talent, and members opposite should not forget that John Bannon is not Barry Unsworth. With nowhere else to go, we will see the Leader of the Opposition attempt to parrot Nick Greiner and his strategy. We will hear this Leader of the Opposition promise to restore confidence to public institutions, the family, the police, and the courts. He will promise to promote open government and to improve the public sector through greater efficiency in allocating public resources, but he will not be talking about the cuts that will come.

There will be law and order scares, and he will promise to make the punishment fit the crime. He will pretend to be tough—we will see a repeat in law and order of 'No ifs, no buts'. There will be this concrete commitment: 'I am as tough as hell. The crims will dive under the bridge,' and so forth. We will also see vain pledges to restore excellence to our schools, bringing back the three Rs and all this sort of thing. But the Olsen campaign will be as phoney as Greiner's with one basic difference—the South Australian Liberals will not win.

In many ways, however, the Greiner Government in New South Wales gives us a model in the unlikely event of what would happen if John Olsen was elected here. I want today to compare Nick Greiner's campaign promises with his performance. Believe me, the only explanation that Nick Greiner could make today is that he did not promise not to break his promises.

Members opposite will remember his central campaign pledge. He went to the people with one central campaign pledge which was highlighted in his policy speech, campaign ads and commercials. On taxes and charges, he said that no charges to the general public will rise more than the CPI in any year of his Government. Yet, in his June mini-budget, Greiner announced increases in electricity, hospital bed, nursing home, irrigation, water and public housing charges ranging from 1.25 times to 2.5 times higher than the CPI. Mr Greiner also promised in his policy speech that capital expenditure will be at a higher level than currently spent by the Unsworth Labor Government. In his June

mini-budget, Greiner announced a 10 per cent real decrease in the New South Wales capital works program.

During the New South Wales campaign (and I know that members opposite have been over there trying to get a bit of the gloss rubbed off on them), he said that all existing State Government concessions to senior citizens would be retained. Greiner's mini-budget also dealt a blow to that pledge with a number of transport and nursing home concessions being abolished. But the Liberal's contempt for senior citizens went further than that. In the lead-up to the March poll, the Liberal transport spokesman, Mr Baird, actually promised to reduce suburban train and bus fares for retired citizens, yet those same fares were increased in the June mini-budget with excursion tickets increased from 60 cents to \$1 and from \$1 to \$2.

**Mr Robertson:** They also scrapped the concession scheme.

**Mr RANN:** That is right. In his policy speech, Mr Greiner also promised—and I will quote it so that there can be no confusion by the member for Bragg:

In Government the coalition will spend all petrol tax revenues on building and maintaining the State's roads.

I am told that this was a very popular pledge. I am sure we will be hearing from the member for Bragg, if he hangs on to his shadow portfolio—which I am told is highly unlikely. In his June mini budget Greiner announced only \$55 million extra to be allocated from petrol tax for roadworks, yet the full petrol tax revenue this financial year is \$175 million. In education the people of New South Wales now realise that they were told a pack of lies.

The member for Fisher has talked about the 2 000 teaching jobs that have been axed, but Mr Greiner spelt out his education promises in a letter to the New South Wales Teachers Federation dated 19 February 1988. I want members to know how accurate it is. He promised to fund new education programs through \$100 million in administrative savings. In reality, however, the Greiner Government's unpopular education policies—bigger class sizes and teacher cuts—have been funded through cuts in non-administrative areas, namely, increased class sizes and staff reductions, abolishing the child protection program and school bursaries. I strongly advise South Australian teachers to look closely at what was promised by the Liberals in New South Wales and what has happened. Perhaps they will then view the claims by Rob Lucas and Bob Jackson with healthy scepticism, if not jaundice.

Mr Greiner made some claims about the running of schools, and South Australian parents might be interested in what he said. In a letter to school staff on 1 February 1988 Greiner said that no cleaning or ancillary jobs in Government schools were under any threat. Yet, in the June mini budget he announced a rationalisation of ancillary staff with 800 full-time positions being abolished. He even let down the kids in private schools! During the election campaign the Liberal education spokesman, Mr Metherell, announced that the free travel arrangements for private schoolchildren would remain untouched, but again in the June mini budget it was announced that there would be a \$50 per term bus pass levy for all school students. I am sure teachers in this State will be most interested if Rob Lucas tries to emulate Nick Greiner by pledging to increase the number of remedial and resource teachers. They will be even more interested to know that, despite that clear categorical promise, Mr Greiner's June mini budget included an announcement of a reduction in the number of teachers for disadvantaged schools.

We all remember the last State election and the PSA running advertisements about privatisation and what the Olsen Opposition would do if elected to government. There

was a great deal of hoo-ha about one part of the advertisement dealing with someone ripping off a sign of the State Bank and the Liberals in this State said, 'No, we would never touch the State Bank.' Nick Greiner said the same thing. He made a promise at the last election that all that the Liberals would do was remove undue restrictions and advantages for the State Bank of New South Wales, yet he recently announced that the State Bank of New South Wales would be privatised. I am sure that the State Bank employees in South Australia will be looking closely at John Olsen's promises.

In New South Wales the Liberals announced that they would ensure that no Government employee would lose his or her job. That was another categorical promise by Nick Greiner. Apart from the 2 000 teachers (and I do not have a full list), 400 jobs have also been lost at the Homebush Abattoir, 200 at the State brickworks, 77 through the closure of units of the Department of Agriculture, and 35 through the cancellation of the Maldon Dombarton line in the Illawarra. There are many more. That is another example of how Nick Greiner's promises were not worth the paper they were written on.

The Greiner Opposition made a series of outrageous promises concerning transport, and I have every expectation that someone as shallow as the member for Bragg will follow them. For example, it was said that there would be a swag of new services and new lines and, to win hearts and minds in the Hunter Valley, the Liberals promised to initiate immediate moves to build a direct rail link between Dubbo and Newcastle. They promised a swag of new suburban services. In his June mini budget, however, Greiner announced a review of country and suburban rail services and an \$80 million reduction in the State Railway Authority's capital works budget.

Surprise, surprise! One of the first things to go was the Dubbo-Newcastle rail link they had announced a few months earlier because it was considered not feasible. It will be very interesting to see what the member for Bragg will announce if he does keep his shadow transport portfolio.

Mr Greiner also made much play during the election campaign of his promise to de-politicise the New South Wales Public Service. In his policy speech he said, 'The coalition will rejuvenate the Public Service by placing its management back in the hands of public servants.' That is an extraordinarily noble thing to say. He was going to get rid of all these political hacks. Yet, staffer, Ian Kortling (whom I talked about earlier), staffer Garry Sturgess, and Liberal MLC, Peter Phillips, have all been appointed within weeks to plumb Public Service positions. But Nick Greiner's promise about de-politicising the Public Service went further than that. He said that, to ensure Public Service decisions were impartial as regards Party politics, Government boards would be staffed with competent and experienced managers rather than the Party faithful. We have seen a swag of Party hacks appointed to Government boards in New South Wales, including Leon Punch, Jim Clough, Lloyd Lange and John Barraclough.

Even sport has taken a nosedive in New South Wales. Again, there was a fundamental pledge to maintain capital and recurrent funding for sport, but the June mini-budget brought down severe real cuts in capital expenditure right across the board in areas of recreation and sport. They have even sold out their mates among the shooters. The Greiner coalition promised to repeal those elements of any legislation requiring a shooter to show good reason why he should be provided with a shooter's licence. Last month, however, Greiner announced new legislation requiring every new

applicant for a gun licence to complete an approved course in gun safety at a cost of \$50.

I could go on and on, but there are two Greiner promises that I believe even people in South Australia have heard about. Two categorical promises: one was to get the monorail out of the city centre and the other one was to look at an alternative to the Sydney Harbor Tunnel. Both of those promises have been categorically broken. Both projects are continuing. Mr Greiner is a phoney; his promises are phoney, and the Opposition in this State will soil itself in a desperate attempt to out-phoney Greiner.

In the meantime, it will be very interesting to see when and how the Leader of the Opposition will reshuffle his shadow Cabinet. It is quite clear that he is suffering from political paralysis. We know that he is under close scrutiny not only from Party members in this House but outside, and from the business community. He has been criticised inside and out by members of his own Party, including his own shadow Cabinet. I know, and this House knows, that the President of the Party, Bruce McDonald, does not respect John Olsen's leadership and is determined to put his own mark on changes to the shadow Cabinet. So, there is a tussle going on.

Who will succeed, Bruce McDonald or John Olsen? Will John Olsen have his way with his shadow Cabinet changing. We know that Bruce McDonald is concerned to secure the elevation of the member for Victoria to the shadow Cabinet, preferably into the deputy leadership. The Leader of the Opposition knows that his front bench is not performing. He says so in off the record briefings to journalists. There are members opposite who will be very interested to know what the Leader of the Opposition says about them to journalists, off the record, behind their backs. He knows for instance, that his Deputy Leader, despite flashes of bile, is tired, tiresome, and is widely perceived as yesterday's man.

His industrial relations spokesman is just too lazy to really crack it, and I think the member for Bragg obviously knows that he is on the skids, as well. We should feel sorry for the member for Coles—she has her eyes on the Deputy's prize but I am told that the blokes just will not wear it.

The Leader cannot show leadership. He is frightened to move on the Deputy's position because he is nervous that he will not get his own way. He is scared of getting rid of the deadwood in case he loses more support and is subjected to another round of white-anting. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to show us whether it is he or Bruce McDonald who runs the Liberal Party. Let us see him test his strength by getting his way in the shadow Cabinet. On that point, I would like to thank members opposite for their courteous attention. The member for Bragg has been particularly attentive. He wants to know what he is going to get and where he is going to go. He wants to know what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying behind his back. I am quite happy to give him an off-the-record briefing following this speech.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I support the motion before the House. At the outset I commend His Excellency and Lady Dunstan on the magnificent way that they are undertaking their responsibilities and duties for this State. I pay respect to Murray Hill, who has now left the other place after a very long career in State Parliament, to begin a very well earned retirement. I wish both Murray and Eunice good health in a long retirement. Murray has been of considerable help and strength to me in the 13 years that I have been a member. He has always been seen as the godfather of the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** He has always been very happy to help in any way that he can and he has always been prepared to look after the—

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Do you mean 'grandfather'?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Perhaps 'grandfather' is a better word. Certainly, as a younger member I well remember the support that he was able to provide. I am aware, because I served with him, of the magnificent contribution that he made as a Minister in the Tonkin Government.

Of course, he served as a Minister prior to that time but I was not a part of that Ministry. I have also appreciated working with him in latter times when he was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee. I hope that the Hills enjoy a very long and happy retirement.

I want to refer to a number of issues that His Excellency the Governor put to us in his speech at the opening of Parliament last week. We all recognise, of course, that the speech is prepared by the Cabinet; it is delivered by the Governor but the content of the speech is prepared by Cabinet. I suggest that the speech now before us is more about what is not happening in the State rather than the setting out of a program of State activities for the current session, as is usually the case. For example, it is usual that we determine from the speech given on the opening day what legislation is to be introduced and other directions of the Government. The speech contains very little reference to any legislation and there is very little direction shown. It suggests to me that we have a stagnant Government, a Government that has run out of ideas, which has lost its direction and which has nothing to offer the people of South Australia.

If members read the speech, that is made blatantly clear. The speech of His Excellency the Governor states:

My Government continues with the proper management of the State's economy as its prime commitment, but in the knowledge that South Australia is now able to consolidate advantages made possible by earlier fiscal responsibility.

That is the first point with which I would like to take issue. The speech continues:

The budget to be brought down later in this session will reflect the continuing emphasis on responsible management.

If the majority of people in South Australia were asked, they would tell you how responsible that management is and, if it is the prime commitment of the Government and the Premier of this State, I feel very sorry for the people of South Australia. There is serious concern about the Bannan Government's performance in a number of key areas. There is increasing public concern about the standard of basic services such as health, education, community safety, public transport, and so I could go on. The representations that I have received make it quite clear to me that people are worried about the economy and the general future direction of the State. There is a lot of concern in the community about those factors.

It is generally recognised that, in recent years, we have slipped behind. Time after time reference has been made to that fact, and statistics have been provided to back up the case that the Opposition presents. There is no doubt that South Australia has slipped behind faster and in a more significant way than any other mainland State in Australia. We realise that much is said about, and recognition is given, to the submarine project, the Grand Prix, and the ASER project. I do not think that any honourable member would deny that those projects are beneficial for South Australia, but they are certainly not sufficient in themselves to remedy the problem of unemployment and to provide the State with a healthy economic future, which is what the people of South Australia are looking for from the Premier. On numerous occasions it has been very hard to find the Pre-



mier, particularly when things go wrong; he is never available. When something is happening and he wants to unveil a plaque to open something, or to bring good tidings, we see him on television but, when things get a little rocky, or when we start to worry about the economy of this State, he is never to be seen.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** He's a fair weather Premier.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** My colleague, the member for Chaffey, describes him as a fair weather Premier, and I think that that is probably a good description. When things go wrong in South Australia, he is not to be found.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** He is elusive with his answers.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am very appreciative of my colleagues who are helping me to present this contribution today. As the Member for Light says, he is certainly elusive with his answers. Again, in Question Time today, we had plenty of evidence of that. He has either nothing to say or, when he does decide to say something, it is usually fudged, to the extent that it makes little sense and, certainly, in the answers that he provides to the members of this House—he makes a very poor contribution to this Parliament. There is widespread anger (and that is really what it is) about increasing Government taxes and charges.

Today a couple of speakers on the other side referred to the situation since the Greiner win in New South Wales. I suggest that we could learn a lot from what is happening in New South Wales as a result of that win, and it is unfortunate that Government members who have spoken in the debate have not taken into account the serious situation in which we find ourselves in South Australia. Obviously, they are quite happy to gleefully ride over the immense problems that we have in South Australia. However, there is widespread anger with respect to the taxes and charges that we are experiencing in this State.

While the Premier has increased Government revenue from record increases in taxes and charges—and statistics will clearly back up this argument—South Australians are quite rightly asking themselves, "But what about the basic services? Rather than improving, why have they declined markedly in standard?" If people are forced to pay more to the Government, they believe that they are entitled to a much higher standard of basic service than they are receiving.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** What kind of services have you in mind?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I have already mentioned many of the services that have declined in recent times, like education, health, public transport, community services, community safety, and so on. If the member for Light would like to see me afterwards, I will be happy to mention the other services. The Labor Party has had more than enough opportunity to change South Australia for the better. When we look at the time it has spent in office and the little good it has achieved for South Australia, it is clear that it has had adequate time to make an improvement. The cold hard facts are that it is time for a change—

**The Hon. H. Allison:** It's long overdue.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, it is long overdue, and I am sure that at the time of the next election, whenever that may be—next year some time—the people of South Australia will recognise that that is the case and will see the need for a change and bring about a change in Government in this State. Let me press on with the speech presented by the Governor. Paragraph six refers to Roxby Downs. My colleague the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy, the member for Kavel, has referred to this. Indeed, it is largely due to the effort that the member for Kavel put into this project that it has reached its present stage. I reiterate what

he said earlier: if it had not been for the support given to the project by the Tonkin Government, Roxby Downs would not have got off the ground. Certainly, if the Premier and the present Government had had their way, and if it had not been for Normie Foster who crossed the floor in another place, we would not have Roxby Downs.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Did he get expelled?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, he finished up getting thrown out of the Labor Party. As a result of that, he is a person for whom I have considerable respect, and I still see him occasionally. I commend the strength that Norm Foster showed when he crossed the floor. What pride he must have, as do all members on this side of the House, because of the support given to that project. Reference is made in the speech to Roxby Downs and the Premier boasts about it, yet he has no reason to boast, because he opposed Roxby Downs all the way. The Governor refers to 'the largest development in South Australia for at least a decade, the \$850 million Roxby Downs project'.

I do not know how many members on the other side of the House have had the opportunity to see Roxby Downs. I have not seen it for a while and I am looking forward in the near future to having another look at it. The Roxby Downs project is something that we in South Australia can be proud of and I think that it is important that we recognise that it was the Tonkin Government which put it there—started the project off and gave the support that was very much needed to put the project where it is at present.

I will now turn to some of the other matters referred to by the Governor. He stated:

My Government believes in encouraging tourism within national parks . . .

I could not let that statement go by without again expressing my concern about the Mount Lofty development, part of which is to take place in the Cleland Conservation Park. As I expressed in the House last week, there is a considerable fear in the community that the Government is committed to supporting the Mount Lofty development, including the cable car project, despite the outcome of the environmental impact assessment. The majority of people are of the opinion that the Government is so hell-bent on going ahead with this project that it does not care about the environmental effects or any of the other problems that will be caused if the project proceeds in its present form.

As a result of considerable representation in recent times I have been made more aware of the immense amount of opposition to the proposed development on the St Michael's site adjacent to the 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 the detrimental effect of the development on the Cleland Conservation Park, which in itself is a very special area, I would suggest to all South Australians, make the project in its present form totally unacceptable. Representation that I have received suggests that the Government has already committed itself to the project proceeding. It sees the development as being of utmost importance to the tourism identity in South Australia; the project is seen by the Minister, and I believe by the Premier, as the State's tourism flagship. They see the importance of having it up and running at the time of the next State election. I suggest that that view is extremely shortsighted.

There is concern on the part of a lot of people that other people in the community have not taken the trouble to ascertain the details regarding the scale of the project and the impact of the development. We have learnt that the developers hope that they will be able to attract some 850 000

people to the development each year, if it gets off the ground. What impact will that number of people have on a sensitive area like the Mount Lofty summit and its environment? Personally, I have continued to express the view that I am not opposed to a reasonable project on the St Michael's site, but I am strongly opposed to the proposed development in its present form. I can only hope that the Minister responsible—and, after all, he is responsible for the State's environment—will recognise the very real concern that is being expressed in the community about this project.

While referring to the Mount Lofty project, it is interesting to note that recently I received correspondence from a constituent who has had extreme difficulty in trying to erect a shed in the hills face zone. This case is particularly interesting, because the site on which the shed is to be erected is within a stone's throw of where this development is supposedly to take place.

It is within the hills face zone, and the Planning Commission was consulted. It consulted the Country Fire Services in relation to fire hazard. We are told that that is essential. Yet I am still not convinced that if the Mount Lofty development proceeds adequate precautions have been taken regarding the fire safety aspects, particularly in relation to visitors to the development. The commission assessed the external appearance of the proposed building—and we are talking about a toolshed—against the provisions of the development plan applying to the hills face zone. We realise that the Mount Lofty development which the Premier and Minister of Tourism have been talking about does not fit anywhere into the hills face zone plan. The letter from the Minister for Environment and Planning continues:

While clearly a shed is a minor structure, care must be taken in the hills face zone about the design and siting of sheds, as even small buildings can have a major visual impact if sited and constructed poorly.

When one realises the concern that is being expressed about the type of building, the structures and the scale of those structures which, we are told, are to be built on that site, only a stone's throw from this development—the toolshed that is being built as compared with this monstrosity—one also realises how hypocritical the Government is. The Minister goes on to refer to the impact of access tracks to sheds in the hills face zone and says that that can be a problem, particularly if excavation works are required, yet consider the excavation work that would be required for the project up there. He goes on to say:

The commission granted its approval... approximately six weeks after receipt of the application [to build the shed]. While this period may be of concern—

and this is the classic, Mr Deputy Speaker—the importance of the hills face zone to the State warrants careful attention to all buildings.

I hope that the Minister recognises that in relation to his responsibility as Minister responsible for the State's environment and in regard to the application currently being considered and passing through the environmental impact procedures. I hope that he will take a very firm hand when the time comes for the final decision to be made. I could continue in that regard.

The Governor referred to his Government's commitment to maintaining a modern public transport system. I could not let this opportunity pass without reminding the House that it is now 12 months almost to the day since the Bridgewater railway was closed. We see the hypocritical situation where the Premier in Cabinet, in preparing the speech, boasts about the Government's commitment to maintaining a modern public transport system, yet a considerable number of people in my electorate are being dis-

advantaged by the pig-headed approach of the Minister of Transport and his Cabinet colleagues in closing down what could have been a very viable service to that area. People still feel very strongly about that matter and will continue to feel strongly about the removal of that service some 12 months ago.

We also read in the Governor's speech that specific programs to respond to the findings of the Primary Education Review should further strengthen the quality of primary education in this State. I do not know about other members in this place, but I have been inundated with correspondence from primary schools in my area, and I wish to refer to three of those letters. The first is from the Aldgate Primary School to the Minister of Education, and states:

We write as a representative body on behalf of some extremely concerned parents. A situation arose at Aldgate Primary School this year which caused extreme anxiety amongst a number of the school community and we are worried that it reflects a rather universal trend in the educational priority of the present Labor Government. Two areas of the allocation of teaching staff lay at the heart of the problem: that the school is staffed in February using estimates made some eight months earlier, and that the formulae used are too rigid to cater for individual school needs.

While we appreciate the need to use enrolment figures as a basis for staffing allocation, the collection of data so early in the year has led to inappropriate staffing levels in February. We live in an area where there is considerable population movement, reflected in the large annual turnover of property sales, particularly in the summer months. The issue of enrolments of five-year-olds at reception level is also difficult, since the area has no geographical feeder zones—parents have access to a large number of schools within easy commuting distance and generally do not decide the school at which they will enrol their child until the last minute.

For some years now the above factors have made it impossible to determine class structures until very late in the planning process, and changes are still required several weeks after the commencement of the school year. We are concerned that this is unsettling for the children and that it affects their overall progress. The second area, that of rigidity in staffing formulae, makes no allowance for the spread of enrolments at year levels and leads to the necessity of forming mixed-year level groupings. We feel that splitting groups of children can cause social and educational problems, particularly if the class consists of non-adjacent year levels, or if the size of single sex groups causes two or three children to be shifted away from the mainstream.

While we can understand the need for economic restraint, we are frustrated by the lack of educational opportunity afforded our children. We ask for clarification as to how the staffing formula meets in with the aims of your Government's social justice strategy.

We have also received recent information from the South Australian Institute of Teachers regarding the staffing of schools on an average figure obtained from the annual 'estimate', rather than using the October figure as the base. This concept is causing us further anxiety and would appear to make the issues stated above even more critical. We fear it will only worsen the situation. We therefore ask:

1. Why estimates of enrolments can not be made later in the school year—say at the commencement of Term 4?
2. Why humane responses can not be made regarding the enrolment spread of children at various year levels viz. staffing be based on social and educational needs rather than on numbers and dollars?
3. Whether Government intends to staff schools in 1989 along the lines suggested by SAIT and, if so, why?
4. That you guarantee to maintain educational opportunity by supplying top-up staff when school population increases.

I have also received correspondence from the Stirling East Primary School, as follows:

At present primary schools are staffed on the anticipated enrolment at the beginning of fourth term. At Stirling East we are able to have small class numbers for children in their first year of schooling early in the school year. As there are additional intakes throughout the year, the class numbers increase. We firmly believe that initially the children benefit greatly from the low pupil-teacher ratio.

If we have less staff (and probably less teacher assistant time because of a 'reduced' enrolment), we will be faced with a dilemma on deployment of staff. Either we will have to increase the number

of students in junior primary classes or we will have to cut staffing in a specialist area, such as music or drama.

We can also envisage a situation where we would, according to the formula, be entitled to an additional .5 staff appointment and indeed receive the same. Such an appointment would not give us the opportunity to form another class.

The South Australian Institute of Teachers is concerned that a policy of staffing on averaged enrolments will result in a lowering of the quality of education and that such a policy is only concerned with economic savings, rather than welfare of the children.

Another letter to the Minister from the Echungga Primary School reads as follows:

It has recently been brought to our attention that you intend to introduce to schools a staffing formula based on enrolments averaged over the year.

At our school, there is an intake of children into the reception year at the beginning of each term. Therefore, the number of students is always lower in term 1 than in term 4, which I am sure, is the case with most primary schools in South Australia. Consequently, our school council is very concerned about the future of this system, and ask the following questions:

1. Is a return to the system of admitting children to reception year only at the beginning of the year envisaged?

2. How will such a staffing arrangement be implemented without a reduction in the quality of education, which you have promised will not occur?

At the beginning of this school year, due to unforeseen factors, the enrolment at our school was below that predicted in 1987, the Education Department very quickly re-acted to this in decreasing staff time, but after two terms the number has increased from 87 to 97, but there has been no such quick reaction to increase staff time.

We are becoming deeply concerned that you are making many changes in the whole education system at present, and these changes are to be implemented at the school level by staff, who are expected to accept increasing responsibilities both in and out of the classroom situation. The consequence of this surely must be a lowering in the standard of education of our children, as we fear the limit has been reached, in many cases, where staff are able to function effectively and efficiently.

Surely, when so much change is expected to be implemented, it is not an appropriate time to reduce staffing at the school level in any way.

My time has run out, but I could cite a considerable amount of further representation that I have received from schools in my electorate. These schools have taken up the matter with the Minister of Education and they all anticipate replies to that correspondence. I urge the Minister to give his serious and urgent consideration to the matters that are referred to in this correspondence. The schools, as does the community, recognise the importance of appropriate education in this State, and it is important that the Minister make a commitment in this regard.

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** I add my regrets to those of other members at the passing of Sir Doug Nicholls. The sentiments expressed by both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition on the opening of Parliament last Thursday indicate the contribution Sir Doug made to the development of just racial policies and to social justice for Aborigines.

Like other members I, too, pay my respects to the contributions that have been made in this House over many years by the retiring Ministers, Mr Abbott and Mr Payne. They made a major contribution to the development of this State and are well respected by their colleagues both on the front bench and on the back bench. I congratulate the member for Mawson, the member for Todd, and more recently the member for Florey, on their elevation to the front bench. These three members have already made a major contribution to their Party and to the development of policy which has been adopted by the Government in this State now for six years, and they will, I am sure, make a major contribution to the future development of South Australia.

Members have also paid their respects to the Hon. Murray Hill for his contribution to the development of a multicultural South Australia. I, too, add my support to those sentiments and, in doing so, welcome Mr Giuliano Stefani to the Parliament of South Australia.

The speech by His Excellency the Governor in opening the fourth session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament began, quite properly, with statements about the management of the State's economy. The future of South Australia is completely dependent on the way in which a Government manages the economy, the way in which it is able to attract new investment and the way in which it ensures that optimism in the future of the State is maintained. The Governor's speech contains no fewer than 14 major development projects being undertaken by the State which are an indication of the optimistic future that exists in South Australia.

After the dinner adjournment, I will concentrate my attention on the condition of the State's economy, and I will then refer to some aspects of inner suburban areas, particularly my own electorate.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr DUIGAN:** Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was referring to the contribution His Excellency the Governor made to the opening of this session of Parliament. He was by referring to the condition of the South Australian economy. I believe that there are some very important and encouraging signs on the horizon concerning the South Australian economy and an optimistic future for investment in South Australia.

The Governor's speech identifies no fewer than 14 major works programs that will be undertaken in the next 12 months, beginning with the Roxby Downs development, the investment coming from Iron Duke near Whyalla, and the major gas pipeline from Port Pirie to Port Bonython. There are also references to the impact of the submarine replacement program, the activities to attract defence and aerospace industries to the State, initiatives being taken by the Minister of State Development and the Minister of Marine in terms of attracting international shipping services to South Australia, and the increasing level of exports leaving our State.

There is also reference in His Excellency's speech to the major developments within the Adelaide central business district, the development of the Northern Power Station, the development of the Happy Valley water filtration plant and a number of major developments in the health, education, welfare and transport areas. Those contributions are being made to South Australia's economy predominantly by the public sector, but it is not just the public sector which is making a major contribution to the South Australian economy. There are optimistic signs right across the board, and I refer to some of the sentiments expressed in the 1988 June quarter report on the Australian and South Australian economies by the State Bank. Both the report of the State Bank and a report prepared by the National Australia Bank on the world economy, again for the 1988 June quarter, indicate that there has been a major turnaround in the international economy since the October share market falls late last year.

There was growth in the December quarter, and this has flowed into this year, having a major impact in the Australian and, more particularly, the South Australian economy. It is important to note that one of the major fallouts of that crisis in the international economy late last year has been a readjustment of the focus of attention in the world economy. No longer is the United States the predominant feature of the international economic order.

It is important, as has been acknowledged by the policies being pursued by this Government, that the Asian sector and, more generally perhaps, the Pacific rim areas provide an enormous scope for our exports. It is important that we develop our very strong relationships, particularly with the Japanese economy and other parts of Asia. The German economy also is making a major contribution, and it is important, in terms of the structural adjustments that are having to be undertaken by the national Government in macro-economic terms, that we recognise the effect of these changes on the international market.

There has been in Australia since that crisis period late last year a revitalisation of business confidence and investment which has led to a further rise in housing and construction and an improvement in new motor vehicle sales. There had been a fall-off in both areas—motor vehicle sales and private house construction—late last year as a consequence of both the share market crash and the increase in interest rates following the very high levels at the beginning of 1987. That is now starting to recover and is having a major flow-on effect in the regional economies of Australia. Employment growth is picking up after that flat period which we experienced through late 1987 and employment is starting to rise again after falling to a very low level, in fact, the lowest level since 1982 as a result of that crisis of confidence caused by the share market crash late last year.

There are very good signs at both the international and Australian level that a growth in domestic demand is being matched by a growth in confidence and in the level of exports at both the national and regional level in South Australia. There are signs here in South Australia of an improvement in employment, housing, and new motor vehicle registrations, and that is likely to continue. The development of the submarine project will obviously make a major contribution to the State's economy throughout this year, and it is expected that that will have a flow-on effect in terms of motor vehicle sales and housing activity.

Indeed, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already referred to comments made by the Managing Director of the State Bank, Mr Marcus Clark, in his assessment of what is in store for us in the South Australian economy. Mr Marcus Clark was commenting on both the analysis undertaken by his bank of the prospects for 1988-89 and the actual level of borrowings in which his bank has been involved, in both the private housing sector and the small business sector. In the small business area the level of loans has increased over the last financial year by more than 100 per cent—a significant increase, representing a significant boost in confidence by the small business sector in the future of South Australia. It is not a statistic to be taken lightly, as it indicates a substantial increase in confidence in South Australia as well as in the extended financial services being offered by the State Bank.

Additionally, the other feature referred to by the Managing Director of the State Bank in his statement yesterday was the significant increase in the amount of loans provided for private housing, which have now increased to half a billion dollars for this financial year—the highest level achieved by the State Bank and a significant indication of the confidence individual home owners have in South Australia, a reflection itself of the level of interest rates and, more particularly, of the confidence that South Australians have in their own State Bank.

A number of features of the South Australian economy bear examination in addition to those that have already been commented on by the Governor in his opening address. One of the matters taken up by the State Bank in its report, in a reflection on why retail sales have not grown as dra-

matically as otherwise would have been expected, relates to the extension of trading hours. The report states:

On the question of extended trading hours, the Retail Traders Association estimated permanent all-day Saturday trading had the potential to create the equivalent of more than 1 400 new full-time jobs. With the cessation of Saturday afternoon trading at least 1 000 people were expected to lose their jobs or suffer a significant reduction in hours worked.

The most disappointing aspect of the decision is that it comes at a time when tourism is being heralded as one of the major sectors of growth for the local economy. Extended retail trading is one service tourists demand.

I could not agree more, Mr Speaker, with the sentiments expressed in that report, but the report also goes on to identify a number of other major developments that will be happening in South Australia and will have an impact on employment. Perhaps employment is the most disappointing of the economic indices that have come out over the past three months. But it is not an entirely pessimistic or gloomy figure at all, as the projects which are coming on stream will indicate. There will, of course, be the contribution to employment that will come about as a result of the much delayed, long-awaited full opening of the Adelaide Hyatt Regency Hotel. There will be further growth in manufacturing employment as a result of Holden's Motor Company continuing to recruit for its Elizabeth plant in anticipation of its merger later in the year with Toyota and the release of the new Commodore.

Increased employment will also flow on, as the Governor said in his opening address, as a consequence of the coming on stream of the Roxby Downs development. There will be a significant number of jobs in the tourism and tourism-related industries as a result of a number of major projects, such as, the \$50 million Wilpena Pound resort project, the \$40 million hills cable-car project, and the \$6 million Granite Island re-development, as well as all the developments that are associated with the ASER site. I point out that the Adelaide Convention Centre recently reported that bookings that have been made at the centre have exceeded all expectations, and it recently announced the one thousandth booking it has taken in a period of less than 12 months operation.

**An honourable member:** Outstanding!

**Mr DUIGAN:** Absolutely outstanding. That will be added to quite substantially as a result of the development of the new exhibition centre planned farther down North Terrace. These major developments will be taking place within the city and I might mention one or two of them again in a moment.

Before I leave the State Bank's report, it is important to refer to the private dwelling commencements in South Australia. Table 2 on page 20 of the June quarter report of the State Bank identifies that in 1986-87 there were 5 350 dwelling commencements, a drop from the previous year. However, it is important to look at what has happened in subsequent years. In 1987-88, it had risen 12 per cent to over 6 000 dwelling commencements and it is anticipated that it will rise a further 20 per cent in the current financial year to over 7 200. I think that what we will have to look at more particularly is the September quarter figures and all of the economic indicators for the September and December quarters to find that we have in fact started to lift out of the trough in a number of areas and that the South Australian economy is again seen to be very much on the move.

It is important also that this development is occurring right across the board not just in private dwelling commencements, in the non-residential sector development, but in the prospect for increased retail sales and motor vehicle purchases and registrations and also in the rural economy.

The bank report concludes with an analysis of what is happening in South Australian agriculture and refers to a report of the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Research Economics, which predicts a 43 per cent improvement in the cash operating surplus, on average, for Australian farmers this year. It refers in particular to the increases in wheat prices, the increases in wool prices, and the substantial increases that have taken place in relation to wine and wine grape prices for 1988 over previous years. I think that indicates that the Managing Director of the State Bank had good cause indeed to say that there had been, as he described it, a dramatic recovery in the South Australian economy and that the prospects for the future were very bright. Indeed, that sentiment was picked up by the editorial opinion in today's *News*, which commented that:

... Mr Marcus Clark did South Australia a service with his remarks because it is worth accenting the positive.

He was not, the *News* editorial said, 'proclaiming the end of all our problems'. He was identifying the optimistic features of our forecasts for the future and saying that we have nothing to be sad about, that we have nothing to be sorry about and that there is a mood of confidence and optimism in both the private and non-residential building environment, and that we should look to this in a very optimistic way.

Members should also recognise that a number of other projects are on the agenda for South Australia, which indicates that in both the private and the public sectors an enormous amount is happening, from which jobs will flow and from which people will get a feeling that South Australia is very much on the move. I have not mentioned the East End Market development, the development of the tram barn site on Victoria Square, the Remm-Myer market development, let alone the possibilities for the Port Adelaide industrial land. I might remind members that the Minister of State Development and Technology, in answer to a question last Thursday, spoke very optimistically and enthusiastically about the possibility of developing some of that land for the Sarich plant.

Also there are continuing discussions about the prospects for marina development on our gulf. There is the development of a number of features of the cultural boulevard of North Terrace. Further, there is a development within the parkland areas of the Adelaide Gaol, in relation to which a conservation study is currently being undertaken. Also, there is the development of the tropical conservatory at Hackney, and a number of other major developments are happening within the inner part of Adelaide as well as through other parts of South Australia, both private and public, separately and together. This indicates that we have in fact a very bright future ahead of us.

I shall take the opportunity on another occasion to look at the way major developments are taking place in other cities in Australia, trying to better utilise inner urban land, and compare those with some of the developments which have taken place and which are able to take place within the inner Adelaide area, as I took the opportunity during the winter break to have a look at what is happening in Hobart, Sydney and Brisbane. I believe that we can learn things from those cities about being better able to use under-utilised public and private land in inner city areas. However, for the time being and in the remaining moments that are left to me this evening I would simply like to refer to some specific issues in the inner city area and draw one or two policy conclusions from them.

Within the inner city area a number of matters are affecting residents, whether they live in the Adelaide electorate or in the inner western, the inner eastern or the inner

southern electorates. First, there is the problem of through-traffic and the impact that the through commuter traffic has on the residential integrity and the character and calibre of the residential environment in those inner suburbs. At the same time, there has been somewhat of a housing renaissance in those inner suburbs which is leading to an enrolment boost in the inner city public schools. A number of initiatives have been taken by local development authorities, councils, and the South Australian Housing Trust, sometimes operating separately and sometimes together, and by a variety of private housing developers in trying to extend the range of housing choices that are available within the inner suburbs.

As a consequence perhaps of this new style of development and new people being attracted to the inner suburbs, some conflicts have been created. We have seen these conflicts between new and older residents and between new and old style objectives. We have seen these come to the fore within the inner city area, in the south-eastern corner of Adelaide in the debates surrounding the St John's Shelter, and in the south-western corner in the debates surrounding the St Lucas Shelter and the role that Whitmore Square should play in the redevelopment of that area. This is a conflict between, if you like, the old and the new, between people whose objectives for inner city living have been determined by the new apartment style living of the 1980s and those people whose past 70 or 80 years have been spent living in working class cottages in the city. Rather than comment, I will simply list it as one of a series of items that are on the inner city agenda.

Also included on that agenda are matters such as neighbourhood security and the protection of the living environment. There are already nine inner city Neighbourhood Watch schemes, with a number of others planned. Also on the agenda are issues about local government boundaries and the capacity and ability of those councils to provide a greater range of services to the increasingly diverse groups of people who are living within their areas. On the agenda also are questions about community centres, the nature of the community programs that ought to be developed by those centres, the nature of the environment and the use of open space.

I think what is needed is a coherent, integrated and long-term inner city development plan. There are pressures for structural change in the inner city and we must not be immune to them. We must have some strategy for dealing with the conflicts which will inevitably arise. There is much under-utilised land in the inner city areas, both public and private, and we need to coordinate its development. There must be a complete and comprehensive policy which would do a number of things. First, it must take into account both the Government's and local government's policy objectives. A number of initiatives have already been taken in the inner western suburbs, in various parts of the adjacent suburbs and, indeed, in the square mile itself, so they must be coordinated.

Secondly, we must be concerned that the investment decisions that are being made by private and public authorities are oriented and directed towards some common social, community and local goals. There must be a balance between the investment decisions that are being made and the social objectives that we have for our city.

Thirdly, there must be a greater degree of coordination between the development authorities themselves, be they private or public, and the residents and the users of inner city areas. I believe that the inner city is now very much back on the political agenda. Under-utilised or derelict land must be used. Inner city developments are symbols of our

strength and confidence in our future. There are new developments, and we must ensure that those developments and their bad environmental effects or their unjust social consequences are limited. We must ensure that our inner city developments will serve the broad interests of South Australians for a long time to come.

An inner city development policy must answer questions about the sort of housing and social mix that we want in our inner cities, and we must be able to say who should benefit as a result of these development policies. We should be able to say who should be living in the inner suburbs and the access they should have to the programs that should be available. Our vision for the inner city, from devising strategies to reviving so-called run-down areas, must be fuelled by clear objectives which have clear community, local government and State Government support.

I believe that it is necessary for all local councils in the inner city area, for the State Government, for State Government developing agencies and for a variety of housing groups and those involved in social agencies—to identify their objectives for the future of the inner city, to coordinate their funding programs, to identify their social development objectives, to indicate how they wish to transport people to the city, to identify the impact that will have on people who live in the city, to identify the sort of housing and recreational programs that are needed within the inner city and, more importantly, to identify the sort of future that we want for our city, and the sort of statement we want to make about South Australia's future. I believe it should be—and can be—an optimistic one.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Just before the election of 6 November 1982, the then Opposition Leader John Bannon released a pamphlet in which he stated:

South Australia needs a new direction. It needs a new start. It needs new opportunities, it needs new developments and new vigour.

He then went on to preside over the greatest attack on living standards that ordinary South Australians have experienced in this State since the last Depression. Under John Bannon, job creating businesses have openly walked out of South Australia. Unfortunately, under the Bannon Administration South Australia has become a branch office State. We now lead the nation in unemployment, and bankruptcies have soared. We lead the nation in many other economic indicators. South Australia now has the highest level of poverty in this nation. Consumer confidence is low; indeed, not one member would deny that, regardless of the State Bank report put out this morning.

Retail sales, car sales and house sales have been in the doldrums under the Bannon Administration and I defy any member to claim otherwise. Under Premier Bannon investment in equipment, plant and machinery has declined, and again I defy any member to claim otherwise. These investments are designed for one thing, that is, to create jobs. The slide started in 1982-83, and it continues to this day. In 1982, John Bannon said that he wanted South Australia to win. Under his leadership we have become an economic desert in this Commonwealth and we have seen the other States creeping slowly, and then faster and faster, ahead.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** It's an economic desert now. The oasis has dried up. The waterhole is dry.

**Mr OSWALD:** Yes, an economic desert. I take the point made by the Deputy Leader. Since John Bannon took over this State we have seen the ranks of the poor increase, and we have seen South Australia top the Commonwealth in crime rates for breaking and entering. I was disturbed to read in the *News* of 1 August that South Australia has the top crime rate for burglary. The article, quoting Australian

Institute of Crime figures, states that South Australian police reported 20 675 burglaries in 1986-87, at the rate of 1 495 for every 100 000 people. In fact, the article states:

And the Insurance Council of Australia today put the cost of stolen household goods in S.A. in 1986-87 at more than \$50 million.

S.A. also tops the list of larcenies, which include thefts against people and shoplifting, among the States, with 57 318 reports at \$4 145.82 every 100 000 people.

The article goes on to say that only the Northern Territory has a higher rate of burglaries. The Insurance Council's Manager, Noel Thompson, said finally that he expected burglary figures to increase in the next financial year. I point out that that will be under the leadership of Premier Bannon.

We have also seen more street kids than we have ever had in this State, and more people, in a state of disillusionment, are turning to crime. We have seen the Labor Party support the unions and those fortunate enough to have a job in this State at the expense of the pensioners and the superannuants who do not seem to come into the scheme of things under this Labor Administration. We have seen the aged finding it harder to make ends meet whilst, as I said, poverty amongst all groups continues to rise: a sore and sorry situation in what was once a very prosperous State in this nation.

During the past six years John Bannon has pretended that these problems do not exist. He has let the people of South Australia down badly. A clear picture has emerged behind the facade of the Grand Prix and the Casino, that John Bannon presides over a State of high unemployment and poverty as well as declining standards in health care, education, public transport and community safety—those areas where the public sits back and expects its Government to look after them. What has happened—and I will demonstrate it in this speech—is that this Government has failed dismally in looking after those basic areas of Government management and it stands condemned for it. The Premier, who leads this Government, must stand beside it and be condemned, as well.

Let us examine some of those areas. The *Advertiser* editorial of 21 June observed:

Health care in South Australia appears to be getting into a mess.

After analysing the areas of public concern the editorial concluded:

But, above all, the whole picture must have the appearance of cohesive purpose from the Minister, and more persuasive leadership and open communication.

Those concluding words refer to the health industry. The buck must finally stop at the desk of the leader of the Government, the Premier of this State, with respect to the management of the health industry. It is no wonder that the community regard the Premier as 'Mr Invisible', because he is never around when there are problems in the health industry. During the controversial health debate, when we have seen growing queues for surgery in hospitals and continuing crises in staffing levels, Premier Bannon has hidden behind the ex-Minister of Health, the Hon. John Cornwall.

The reality is that one cannot run a hospital service in this State without the support and commitment of doctors, and one cannot run a health service in this State if the Government constantly interferes with the doctor-patient relationship—something that this Government and the former Health Minister specialised in doing. Personally, I am deeply concerned that 42 out of 46 surgeons at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, in response to a questionnaire in June

of this year, expressed concern at the health system in terms of morale, the standing of the health system, public respect for the health system and the quality of care for patients. It shows that there is something radically wrong with the health system. I repeat: 42 out of 46 surgeons took the time to respond to the questionnaire. Where has the Premier been during this debate over the leadership and future direction of the health industry in this State? When I say 'health industry', I refer particularly to the health and care of people who in the past have relied on the Government without having to worry too much about whether it would be there when they needed it.

Those figures are very significant, and let us look at them in a little more detail. There are 67 per cent of doctors who are dissatisfied with their hospital appointments; 97 per cent believe there is poor morale; 76 per cent are concerned with media attacks on them from various sources; and 84 per cent of doctors currently holding health positions have considered resigning.

Surely those are figures which warrant the intervention of any State Premier worth his salt, and where has the Premier been in regard to all of these health problems—and when we are talking about health care—he has been invisible. We do not know. That is because it would associate him with being unpopular. That is why he is not there. He hides behind his 70 per cent popularity, and to come out and try to do something about the problems of the health industry would mean that he would be associated with something which, in his view, perhaps would be unpleasant. But he is the leader of the Government and he has a responsibility to come out and do something about the problems in the health industry.

The problem at the moment is that too many senior people in the health industry are running around covering up the Government's problems, and we cannot allow the Premier and his Government to stay silent and invisible for too much longer. He really must come out of hiding, take charge, and accept the responsibility which this State has imposed upon him as the leader of the Government.

Another health industry issue has been raised, and I would be interested to learn why the Premier has not considered it important enough to come out of his office and become involved. In the *Advertiser* of 21 June 1988 an article headed "Frustrated" young doctors stop work' stated:

Trainee doctors at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, 'angry and frustrated' with long working hours, held a two-hour stop-work meeting yesterday. The doctors, all recent graduates, told a union representative at the meeting that it was not uncommon for them to work up to 34 hours in one shift—often without sleep. It was also not unusual to work up to 90 hours a week without receiving overtime payments.

One of the doctors, who did not want to be named, said he knew he had made mistakes in his care for patients late at night when he had been working for more than 30 hours straight. 'That, more than anything else, is what I am worried about,' he said. He said there was a general frustration and anger among trainee doctors (registered medical officers and interns) at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and elsewhere over working conditions and that some trainee doctors may consider withdrawing services in the future if conditions did not improve.

The article further states:

The South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association industrial officer, Mr Michael Huxtable, who met the doctors yesterday, said conditions at most hospitals in South Australia were 'very bad' in this respect.

He was talking about patient care. It further states:

'The Lyell McEwin is by no means the worst, but recently things have degraded there because of a number of resignations,' he said. 'It is inevitable that mistakes will be made and all these factors build up resentment and anger in young doctors who then move out of the health system.'

Members would be advised to take careful note of the sentiments expressed in that article. Once again, there has been considerable amount of public disquiet at the standard of bedside care under the Bannon Administration. The issue was raised again on the Channel 7 news of 1 August 1988, which members may recall as it is only a matter of days ago, in a report of a stop-work meeting at the Modbury Hospital. This item on Channel 7 appeared six weeks after the report to which I referred regarding the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

In the meantime, I asked a question in the House, 'What is the Health Commission doing?' It had an opportunity to do something about this appalling situation at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, where the surgeons were working 34 hours in one shift, and six weeks later we found from the media that the Premier had not become involved; no-one in the Government had become involved. The Modbury Hospital complained about the same issue. On the program that went to air on Channel 7 it was stated:

Services in some of Adelaide's major hospitals will be disrupted because of a decision by trainee doctors to step up industrial action.

These doctors are now up in arms over the same type of staff shortages and patient care about which their colleagues at the Lyell McEwin Hospital had cause to complain.

On this occasion, the doctors claimed that they were fed up at having to work exceptionally long shifts. They claimed that they were often on the job for 36 hours straight, which is interesting, because it was a repeat of what was happening at the other hospital. They also claimed that they were not replaced when someone called in sick, which meant that the remaining medical staff had to soldier on and work longer hours to make it up.

I believe that the general run of doctors in hospitals do not want to strike. They are not that type of individual. They are there because they enjoy working in the professional field of medicine. They are not interested in striking. However, they have been driven to desperation. They have reason for complaint yet the Bannon Government has chosen not to do anything about it. I bet anything you like that the Premier has not come out of his office and said, 'Let me talk to these people and find out what is going on.' He has hidden behind his Ministry because, if he did come out, it might influence his popularity rating which, I assure members, is absolutely tenuous at the moment.

The doctors are tired of the deaf ear that is being turned to them all the time by the Premier and his Government. Traditionally doctors do not resort to industrial action but they have felt and are justified in thinking that the Health Commission could do something about the hours that they work. I say it again: I just wonder where Mr Invisible Premier has been during this whole debacle.

I will briefly address another medical issue that has been in the news. Interestingly, the Premier has come out of hiding to take charge and try to resolve the issue. That issue is the closing of three country hospitals in Laura, Blyth and Tailem Bend against the wishes of local residents. The former Minister of Health, as we have all heard, said that the Bannon Government's decision was irreversible. I have no doubt that the decision was taken in consultation with the Premier in Cabinet, so I also have no doubt that the Premier was involved in the decision to close those three hospitals. One of the biggest factors that Premier Bannon has overlooked in the closure of these small, community, acute care hospitals is that it is not only a matter of life and death for the residents of these small communities but it has a devastating flow-on effect into those particular communities.

Take Laura as an example. If the acute care beds in the Laura Hospital are lost, the town will also lose the doctor and the chemist, and Laura will start to fold up and die. The same argument can be transposed onto these other small communities. Another interesting aspect of the Channel 7 report on the closure of the three country hospitals—and I pricked up my ears as it came to air—is that, although the Laura Hospital was to be closed on 1 July, a subsequent interview with the lay superintendent of the Crystal Brook Hospital revealed that that hospital had not received official word about when it was to take over the acute care role from the Laura Hospital. It had no idea when it was supposed to take over that role. I quote from the television interview with the superintendent, as follows:

After all this time, you would think that something definite would be in the pipeline. As I said today—

'today' being 1 August—

we have not received anything official from the Health Commission.

The interviewer asked him whether he thought that that was extraordinary. The lay superintendent of the Crystal Brook Hospital replied:

Yes, you could say that.

It is extraordinary that a nearby hospital, which was to take over the acute care function from the Laura Hospital a month after the closure of that hospital, had not been contacted by the South Australian Health Commission about what those arrangements would be. Once again, there was chaos in the matter of the three country hospitals. I ask the House, 'Where is our up-front Leader of Government?' He is hidden in Victoria Square, keeping himself away from where he should be, which is looking after the provision of services for the people of South Australia.

One of the reasons why the Health Commission targeted Laura for conversion to a nursing home is the alleged low occupancy of the hospital. It was interesting to note that when Channel 7 visited the Laura Hospital on 1 August this year it was almost full of patients. So be it for the argument that the hospital was on its last legs and that no-one was using it for acute care! That was the pattern for the whole time that this investigation was going on.

The three hospitals and their surrounding communities are being squeezed into submission by a decision endorsed by the Premier. It is both sad and outrageous. I attended and was proud to stand amongst and support in Victoria Square a rally of some 2 000 people from those three areas. They asked that the Premier come down and address them, but he was nowhere to be seen. It is noteworthy that the Leader of the Opposition was prepared to come forward at the rally and put the view that if he was the Premier of the day those hospitals would not close.

What worries me is that if the Premier gets his way it will only be a matter of time before Laura, Blyth and Tailem Bend follow in the wake of the Kalyra Hospital at Belair. The same sequence of events, bulldozing tactics and decisions behind the scenes are taking place. The people who, over the years, set up those hospitals are being overridden as if they do not exist.

It is with a great deal of sadness that we read in the *Advertiser* of 9 July 1988 Barry Hailstone's account of the valedictory luncheon that was held at Kalyra Hospital. I will refer briefly to a couple of the paragraphs because it typifies the strongarm actions of this socialist State Government—a Government which has always purported to have the interests of the needy in the community at heart and has purported to worry about the provision of health care services. 'Sad farewell to hospice that lost the right to

exist' is a wonderful headline, which certainly captured the feelings of the people who were affected. The article states:

It was a sad day at a place accustomed to sadness. Staff, volunteers, and friends gathered at Kalyra Hospital yesterday to say goodbye to the 50-bed convalescent-rehabilitation hospital and the 18-bed hospice which has succoured and comforted the terminally ill and dying for a decade.

Faded *Save Kalyra Hospital* banners still hung around the tranquil surroundings of the old limestone buildings on the eight-hectare grounds at Belair were a reminder that the staff and friends of Kalyra had fought a battle for Kalyra's life and lost.

The article continues to describe how the Government had closed it down. This is typical of the way in which this Government has been operating. Only time will tell the worth of this redeployment of resources. The rationale behind the decision in relation to Kalyra and the country hospitals clearly demonstrates to me, at least, that Premier Bannon lacks a human side to his personality when it comes to preserving institutions which were created by the community as a result of community dedication and devotion and which the community genuinely wants to retain.

I would have thought that government in this State should be about retaining services that the community wants to retain. Let us be frank: most of the hospitals to which we are referring were set up and paid for by the communities, and goodness knows how many trading tables, donations from local governments and the like helped put those hospitals together.

Time will prevent me from taking up the issues of the deploring decline in education and public transport standards, but I am sure my colleagues will refer to them. In the few minutes I have left I will refer to the disquiet that exists in relation to public safety and law and order in this State, and to some of the frustrations that are clearly building up in the Police Force and in the Department of Correctional Services as a result of the lack of support and sympathy for the roles that these people play in what are really very difficult situations.

I think all of us would have sympathy for those who are running the prisons from within and also for the Police Force. Ever since Don Dunstan turned this State of ours into a social engineering laboratory and imposed his brand of socially accepted behaviour on this State and subsequent Labor Governments came in and further curtailed the effectiveness of the police and modified the standing orders within gaols, the conduct of those institutions and services by prison officers and prison warders has become an unenviable task.

The public would like to know also what the Premier will do about a few other matters. First, what will he do about the low morale that is starting to exist in the Police Force? It is gaining momentum and we cannot turn our eyes from it. The low morale in the prisons and the complaint of a lack of support in enforcing discipline within Yatala is also of concern. It applies not so much to the Remand Centre, because I hear extremely good reports on the discipline and high morale there. However, at Yatala there is a different set of rules with a different set of standing orders, and it is quite a different situation.

I mention also the overcrowding at the Adelaide City Watch-house. If members had read the papers recently, they would know exactly what I am talking about. The problems have existed for a couple of years with the City Watch-house being filled with remandees. We have now the highest rate in Australia of prisoners being held without bail awaiting trial—the highest rate in Australia. I do not think that should escape us, either. We have some people waiting up to a year in many cases for their trials to come to fruition. What is the Premier doing about the drugs that are getting into our gaols and institutions?



*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** What is he doing? I cannot answer that, because I do not believe he is doing very much. But, he will have to do something about it, and perhaps the member for Fisher, who is interjecting regularly, might like to throw his two bob into the House because we are all interested in it—it is a problem. I am sure we could all try to address it. What is he doing about the rapidly increasing crime rate amongst juveniles? Perhaps members opposite who have gone silent might like to take 10 minutes in the grievance debate tonight to tell us what he is doing about the increasing crime rate amongst juveniles and the way in which kids who are caught for house breaking receive bond after bond after bond.

Perhaps, too, they might like to tell us of the frustrations that are building up in the Police Force when its members apprehend these people, who receive bond after bond after bond. Let no-one in this House be fooled that that is not the situation, because we know that it is. What will the Premier do about this frustration of the police who claim that the whole system in this area of juvenile crime is a joke? Let no-one in this place deny that the police do not say that the whole system regarding the administration of juvenile crime is a joke, because it is a joke.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** Perhaps the member for Fisher could take 10 minutes tomorrow night to tell us what the Government will do about this whole question of juvenile crime. When will the Government come to grips with this whole question of teenage drinking, the closing times of hotels and the role of the police in controlling community behaviour, particularly the problems of intoxicated young people running around the streets in the wee hours of the morning until the sun comes up?

The people of this State have every right to expect that the Government will do something about securing a comfortable and safe lifestyle for the people of South Australia. The people in this State know that that is getting further and further away from them. While we once experienced a comfortable lifestyle, we know that under this Labor Administration, that lifestyle is deteriorating at an alarming rate. It is about time our invisible Premier came out of hiding and did something about these services that have declined, including the health services and the transport services. He should also do something about community safety, law and order, and young people.

Just last week we had reports that the Labor Party has nothing left to offer young people. It has not much to offer the middle class Australia, and it does not seem to have very much left to offer the aged in the community. South Australia is losing its comfortable lifestyle. There is more to South Australia than the Grand Prix and the Casino, and it seems that John Bannon has not realised that yet.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence):** I have great pleasure and privilege in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor on Thursday 4 August, the motion having been so ably moved by the member for Fisher and seconded by the member for Price. At the outset I join with all members in expressing sympathy to the members of the family of Sir Douglas Nicholls in their sad loss. Sir Douglas was a great ambassador for the Aboriginal community during his lifetime. He was also an outstanding footballer, and as a former player myself it was always a great topic whenever I had the opportunity to meet with Sir Douglas. I also extend my condolences to the family of Mr Arnold Noack. Arnold was always most obliging and ever ready to assist

all members. He will be very sadly missed not only by the parliamentary staff but by all members of Parliament.

Before I come to the matter on which I wish to concentrate, I take this opportunity to congratulate my three colleagues—the members for Mawson, Todd and Florey—on their elevation to the Ministry. I know that they will do an excellent job, and I wish them all a very long and successful career in their respective portfolios. It is also appropriate at this point that I thank all members for their support and cooperation during my six years and three months as a Minister, first for a very short period in the Corcoran Government and then for almost six years in the Bannon Government. It was a task that I enjoyed very much indeed. Certainly you have your ups and downs but I think that I had more ups than downs.

I also wish the Hon. Murray Hill a long and healthy retirement after serving many years as a Parliamentarian in this State. I first worked with Murray Hill 13 years ago on the then Land Settlement Committee and again for a short period on the Public Works Standing Committee, and he was always very dedicated to the business before those committees. I congratulate the Hon. Mr Stefani on his election to the Legislative Council and wish him well during his parliamentary career.

I was delighted that His Excellency the Governor in his opening speech addressed the important link between the provision of international shipping services to South Australia and the expansion of trade opportunities that that will mean for South Australia. A new era has opened for South Australia/Japan trading relations. Growth in business cooperation between the two countries, increasingly evident over recent years, has been given a major boost by the decision to double shipping services between Port Adelaide and Japan from 1 July this year. The Australia Northbound Shipping Conference decision has been hailed by South Australian industry, Government and union circles as a major breakthrough with potentially millions of dollars expected through invigorated existing trade links and new opportunities for the State. The move also offers further reason for confidence in the stability and expansion of the State's existing industries, particularly in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors.

The benefits to the State of South Australia will be far-reaching. The decision to increase shipping services to Adelaide followed South Australia's major trade mission to Japan last April when a Government industry delegation met the Japanese Conference Shipping Lines to discuss the need for additional services. I was both pleased and proud to have been a part of those negotiations at various times. The latest success, of course, followed the introduction of the first direct Japan-Port Adelaide shipping service during 1985 in which I was also directly involved. That was a monthly call. Now we have a fortnightly call, and this offers an excellent service for South Australia's exporters and importers.

There was tremendous cooperation all round in achieving this service, and I take this opportunity tonight to place on record my appreciation to a number of people. It would not have been possible without the enthusiasm and the dedication of the present and past Directors of the Department of Marine and Harbors. Together with the Directors and staff of the Commercial Division of DMH, they played a key role in preparing the case for improved shipping links. In an extremely competitive business, the research, the costs, and the amount of work and data involved had to be spot on. The relationship and pooling of resources between the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and DMH was first-class and I sincerely thank in particular Mr Karl Seppelt,

the President of the Chamber, and Mr Lindsay Thompson, the General Manager, for their backing and invaluable support.

Then there is that good friend of everybody, a person for whom I have great respect and admiration, Mr Alan Crompton. Alan is Chairman of the South Australian Shipping User Group and without him we just would not have been successful. I had the pleasure of accompanying Alan Crompton on two occasions to Japan and he is as good a negotiator as any that the Japanese could put up. Mr Crompton's support was magnificent and very great credit must go to him.

We also had the support of many others such as the importers and exporters associations, the shipping agents and the trade unions, and employees at the container terminal. Our good industrial relations record is very important and very attractive to the Japanese. The turnaround time for shippers is also very important, and I believe that due credit must be given to the rank and file for the record times that they have created in the unloading and loading of containers.

All this helped, and it was a real team effort. I think that great credit is due to the rank and file for very few industrial disputes on our waterfront. Certainly, South Australia has the best record in relation to our waterfront. I must say that that is an advantage to the Government and the Department of Marine and Harbors in its negotiations with the shippers on a worldwide basis.

Let us consider just how important Japan is to South Australia as a trading partner. Last year South Australia exported produce to Japan worth \$301 million, and we have imported Japanese goods to the value of \$570 million. During the 1986-87 financial year the State exported produce worldwide valued at more than \$2 billion: 20 per cent went to Europe, 10.4 per cent to North America, 6.9 per cent to New Zealand, 20 per cent to the Middle East, 13.3 per cent to East Asia, 9 per cent to South-East Asia, 5.4 per cent to other areas, and 15 per cent to Japan—making a grand total of \$2 013 million worth of exports from South Australia. For the same year, when we imported goods to the value of \$1.5 billion from various parts of the world, more than one-third—in fact, 38 per cent—of those imports came from Japan.

Until now, however, a sizeable portion of the trade has come through ports other than Adelaide and thus the extra service will mean that 90 per cent of container shipping traffic between Japan and South Australia will now be handled through Port Adelaide. In actual container numbers, this means that Port Adelaide's share of Japanese container traffic is expected to double, to more than 9 800 full containers per year, and that is without allowing for the extra trade which is expected to be stimulated by the improved shipping service. This is a significant increase on the estimated 42 per cent of Japanese containerised exports and 29 per cent of imports handled at Port Adelaide for 1987-88. These figures are substantially up on the 1985-86 levels of activity namely, 38 per cent and 26 per cent respectively, thus strongly supporting Anson's commercial decision to increase traffic between Port Adelaide and Japan.

Certainly, with increasing overseas trade, which has become evident at Port Adelaide over the past few years, the more frequent Japanese calls herald a further major boost for the port of Adelaide. At this juncture I want to point out that the efforts of the Government will not stop at the success of the Japanese service. Efforts are currently under way to see the doubling of European services. We would like to see more frequent calls from North America, from both the west and east coasts of America. We have

made attempts to hook into the New Zealand shipping trade and we will continue to press for calls from that area.

If the New Zealand service called at Port Adelaide, either on the way to Fremantle or on the way back to New Zealand from the west, there would be great benefits to the State. I will support the Director of the Department of Marine and Harbors, together with commercial personnel from that department, in their intended visit to Europe later this year for the purpose of seeking additional shipping from that area of the world to Port Adelaide.

All this justifies the building of the second container crane, which was commissioned at Outer Harbor on 27 March 1987. Both cranes have been employed on at least one shift for 10 vessels, all since 13 June 1987. A record handling rate of 239 containers, or 29.9 per hour, was achieved by both cranes for the evening shift on 27 August last year when the *Anro Adelaide* was in port. A four year comparison of container crane operations indicates that, since 30 June 1983, the total number of containers handled by the crane operations at the terminals has increased over that period by 12 204. The additional revenue associated with this increase in container traffic amounts to \$1.624 million.

For the year ended 30 June 1983 the number of containers handled by the crane at Outer Harbor was 8 215 and the revenue raised from that was \$983 000. For the year ended 30 June 1984 the number of containers handled was 9 144, which is an increase of 600 containers, and the revenue raised was \$1.255 million, plus \$71 000. For the year ended 30 June 1986 the number of containers handled was 15 604, which is an increase of 5 860, and the revenue raised was \$2.102 million, which was an increase on the previous year of \$847 000. For the year ended 30 June 1987, which is the final figure that I have in my possession, the number of containers handled by the cranes totalled 20 419, which represents an increase of 4 815 and the revenue raised was \$2.607 million, which was an increase of \$505 000 on the previous year.

Members can see from those figures that there has been an increase in the number of containers handled each year and a significant increase in the revenue received. I anticipate that, following the introduction of the fortnightly direct Japanese service (which incidentally will be celebrated tomorrow at Outer Harbor with a call from a Japanese vessel), those figures will increase quite significantly.

Australian National Line (ANL), our national carrier, also wants to be part of Port Adelaide. It has been calling at Port Adelaide, but that link was recently severed because of certain coastal shipping changes. ANL is now discussing prospects about being more directly involved in South Australia and it is very keen to become part of our development, and I support that move strongly. The future is bright for South Australia, particularly in the Port Adelaide area.

I want to conclude my comments by briefly referring to wool storage and the shipping program in respect of that product. The Marine and Harbors Department's Commercial Division is actively involved in encouraging and facilitating the storage and shipping of increasing quantities of wool to export markets through the port of Adelaide. The department has been promoting storage and handling of more wool at Gillman. If more wool is held in Adelaide, it will be in the shipping lines' interest to increase direct calls.

In 1984-85, 36 per cent of greasy wool sold in South Australia (127 200 bales) was shipped through the port of Adelaide. By 1986-87, direct shipments increased to 46 per cent (192 828 bales). Negotiations between the European and Japanese shipping conferences and the wool industry have led to the cancellation of centralisation of wool from

Portland to Melbourne. These arrangements commenced on 1 September 1987 for Europe and apply from 1 January 1988 for Japan. This creates the opportunity for the redirection of wool produced in the South-East of South Australia, west of Penola and Millicent, away from Portland and to Port Adelaide stores. In turn, this increases the prospect of more wool being shipped through the port of Adelaide rather than the port of Melbourne. The Government's target for 1987-88 was to increase wool received by Port Adelaide stores by 500 containers or 50 000 bales, and wool shipped through the port by 300 containers or 30 000 bales. This redirection of wool exports from the port of Melbourne to the port of Adelaide would represent an increase in market share of some 5 per cent in 1987-88.

In order to encourage the redirection of wool to Port Adelaide, the department proposed a continuing campaign based on factual information regarding shipping and the costs associated with road transport of wool. Such a campaign will be coordinated through direct contact with the Department of Agriculture, agricultural bureaus, United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Inc. organisations and prominent industry leaders in the South-East. Appropriate media coverage will back up that program.

In the process of contact with industry leaders it would certainly be beneficial for senior officers to maintain some contact with the member for Victoria, as he is a wool grower of quite significant importance to South Australia and I think that we ought to look forward to his support in this effort to promote the port of Adelaide and South Australia.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Mr Acting Speaker, I share the concern of my colleagues at the death of Pastor Sir Douglas Nicholls; he was one of the world acclaimed Aborigines to make some contribution on the political scene. He obviously died all too soon and was removed from office by his sudden illness before he had time to justify fully his appointment and the confidence that the then Dunstan Government placed in him. It is a sad state of affairs and we commiserate with his family on his demise.

I also have some regret at the resignation from the Upper House of the Hon. Murray Hill and express the fond hope that Murray and Eunice will enjoy a long and happy retirement after Murray's extensive and well recognised service to South Australia, supported very ably by his wife. In particular, I believe that it is appropriate to join other colleagues who have pointed out the appropriateness of Murray's replacement in the Upper House by Julian Stefani, who is Italian born and already widely recognised for his service to the South Australian community. I am sure that he will continue to do all ethnic communities a great service in his capacity as a member of the Legislative Council.

Mr Acting Speaker, I am pleased to see that you are in the Chair this evening. You gave me some merriment a little earlier this afternoon when you regaled the House with your Address in Reply. I could not help thinking that it was one of your better comic addresses, although I did detect a little acid on the liver probably as a result of not having achieved ministerial status once again.

**An honourable member:** You'll have to be careful not to reflect on the Chair.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I am really reflecting on you, as member for Briggs, Mr Acting Speaker, but it is wonderful to have a captive audience which will not interject at critical moments. I felt on listening that the member for Briggs was attacking the Liberal Party's involvement in New South Wales a little injudiciously, particularly when I recall his own involvement in New Zealand when he recom-

mended everyone to put the New Zealand ALP 'up there where we belong', whatever that may mean. Yet one now observes that the New Zealand ALP has descended to the throes of socialist induced depression: how have the mighty fallen in so short a space of time. However, there is one member in the House who was not completely put off by the member for Briggs's address. That is enough of the member for Briggs. I know that he is close to the seat of power and is in a good position to detect any winds of change in the future which may blow him good fortune.

However, I did object to his comment with regard to the member for Kavel, who was very responsibly reporting on his mission to London where he spoke with members of Urenco-Centec. I also spent some four weeks in the United Kingdom over the past two months examining the impact not only of nuclear power but also of coal-fired power stations in that country, and in France, Germany and Holland.

It concerns me that the honourable member misinterpreted the member for Kavel by, first, implying that the member for Kavel wants a nuclear power station in Australia. Of course, that is simply not the case: there is no need for a nuclear power station in Australia. We are blessed with plenty of coal to use and to export, although perceptive people within the British coal industry did point out that I was in a very poor position to be critical of the way in which they consume coal in their power stations when South Australia is one of the world's major pollutants in burning extremely poor quality sub-bituminous coal or lignite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** You may say that it is rubbish, but I will turn to the problems with good quality coal and that will remove any thought that South Australia has any problems. In 1975 the CoSmopolis convention in the US highlighted some problems the world was having in burning fossil fuels, and it pointed out that in the US in that year there were 50 000 illnesses—pulmonary, bronchial and other—which were induced by the burning of fossil fuels carcinogenic in nature. It also attributed between 500 and possibly 5 000 deaths in the US in any one year to the burning of fossil fuels and their carcinogens—over a lifetime, of course, not quickly—taking effect in people by being ingested and creating these terminal illnesses.

While we are prepared to accept that sort of illness and death rate from burning fossil fuels, it would seem rather unfair of the world to attribute death and destruction to nuclear power when, essentially, it has been the atomic bomb (which we all fear) which has been the major cause of death in the world today. The nuclear power industry has a very good rate in comparison with others. While I was in the UK there were 260 deaths on an oil derrick in the North Sea, and there were 65 deaths in a coalmine in West Germany. This pattern has been perpetuated year after year.

I am not passing judgment: I simply point out that we should be fair and realise that, no matter what form of energy we choose to generate in the world today, there will be problems. The nuclear industry has gone to extreme lengths—and I am sure that all members will appreciate this—to try to ensure 100 per cent retention of nuclear wastes, whereas the coal fossil fuel industry is far less efficient than that.

I think that the member for Kavel was really saying that Australia has missed the boat with uranium enrichment. One of the things that I think he was trying to point out is that in this, our bicentennial year, Australia is really left with a very large number of holes in the ground. Let us look at a handful of commodities where Australia produces

the raw materials and the value is added overseas. Other people gain the benefit of using Australian commodities. Wool has been exported for 200 years and high quality wool, worsted yarns, and other materials have been imported from the UK, and now from Singapore and Hong Kong, back into Australia. The fine gold work on jewellery is essentially done overseas, as it is with silver, Australian opals and Australian diamonds.

Australia does not have a reputation as one of the leading cutters or manufacturers of fine quality jewellery. That reputation lies in other places such as London, Amsterdam, Hong Kong, Nairobi and a host of other cities across the world, while we produce the finest quality raw materials. Wheat, coal, iron ore, bauxite and beach sands—the list is virtually endless. The point that the member for Kavel made was that 10 years ago we did have the opportunity to enter into a uranium enrichment program with the United Kingdom.

Discussions were held with Urenco-Centec, which is a British, French, Dutch, German and Italian consortium. That consortium was at least talking with South Australia at that stage. However, over the past eight years we do not seem to have done very much at all, to the extent that Britain is now collaborating with the United States on the centrifuge process. Italy, France, Holland and Germany are researching the centrifuge process and the new laser technique which is known in the United States as Avlis, while in France it is known as Silva (which is Avlis backwards). That technology is still some distance down the track. In the Uranium Information Centre pamphlet, which all members would have received today, it is revealed that, this year, Japan has gone into the uranium enrichment business with its pilot plant half completed and due to be finalised by the end of this year.

Once again, Australia exports very high quality uranium but with little or no value added. If members think that the value added in the uranium industry is insignificant, let me point out that the world's first nuclear reactor (the Magnox reactor), which was built at Sellafield in the Lake District and commissioned in 1956 and expected to work for 25 years, is still working profitably and safely 32 years later. The Magnox reactor will soon be decommissioned, but on that site a massive nuclear waste reprocessing plant is being established. It is already working well but it is being enlarged.

Over the next 10 years, £(St)3.6 billion will be spent in the industry. Almost 8 000 staff are attached to the nuclear industry and another 8 000 work for construction companies, making 16 000 workers in all. That gives members some idea of the magnitude of the industry and the extent to which value can be added to that simple uranium oxide which is exported from Australia. It is not a commodity that we should just export and ignore. As other major industrial countries across the world have realised, tremendous wealth is to be won in the enrichment of nuclear fuels.

Another point that was made obvious to me as I travelled around the United Kingdom visiting various nuclear establishments was that, while many people have been led by conservationists to believe that nuclear power will be phased out by 2030, in fact, nuclear power stations are constantly being designed and constructed, and the latest two in the United Kingdom are due to come on stream in 1997. France already produces over 70 per cent of its power from nuclear means and, with the number of countries using nuclear power steadily increasing from the present number of 20, obviously the limiting factor in the use of nuclear power may not be the intention of countries to phase it out but that the supply of uranium is limited. The indications are that, by the year 2000, the demand for uranium will be

60 000 tonnes, while the known world reserves at that time will be producing about 32 000 tonnes. That indicates a shortfall to the world's nuclear power plants of some 28 000 tonnes.

I have no doubt that Canada, Australia, Africa and other countries will find more uranium and that the reserves will be brought up to meet the demand. Nevertheless, that is the current position. Should that increasing demand not be met, there will be a problem in trying to phase out the massive amounts of nuclear power generated across the world. There will be an increasingly rapid move towards the fast breeder reactors which use plutonium. That tends to engender fear in the mind of listeners because of its relationship to fissile material in atomic bombs. Nevertheless, I stood on the Dounreay reactor—the fast breeder—and I was advised by the technologists that a great number of fail-safes are built into the operation of that reactor, as, indeed, there are in all UK reactor operations. It is probably one of the safest reactors in the world because it does not work at pressure. All of the other reactors in the world are cooled by pressurised sodium, pressurised water and pressurised gas, so, if anything happens to the plumbing of those reactors, radioactive material will escape at much greater speed and will travel much greater distances. If anything goes wrong with the fast breeder at Dounreay it shuts itself down; it is not closed down by human involvement as was the case at Chernobyl where human error was attributed to be the main cause for the failure.

The member for Briggs seemed to be rather cynical or sceptical about the impact of fossil fuels on the environment. Oddly enough, the Drax booklet—this is the latest power station in the United Kingdom which of its own accord uses 11 million tonnes of coal a year, or one-eighth of the total British consumption of 80 million tonnes of coal a year for power stations—mentioned the installation of a flue gas desulphurisation plant. It removes sulphurous and nitrous oxides from flue gas in order to prevent acid rains which fall over Europe and which destroy pine trees and it prevents nitrates from falling into the oceans where eutrophication causes algal growth and damages marine life. The booklet stated that, while those sulphurous and other emissions would be reduced by 90 per cent and acid rains from that plant would be prevented, at the same time there would be a slight emission of about 1 per cent more sulphur dioxide, which would create no problem to the environment.

This does not line up with the work that has been done over the past eight years by Britain's Central Electricity Generating Board. Since 1980 it has been conducting its own research on the greenhouse effect—the very greenhouse effect which the Cosmopolis conference in the United States in 1975 pointed out was a major threat to the world environment. British research reveals (and I refer to the document which all members received today) that the greenhouse effect is the process whereby heat absorbing gases in the atmosphere, such as water vapour and carbon dioxide, raise world temperatures. Increases in the global concentration of CO<sub>2</sub>, due primarily to the combustion of fossil fuels—coal, oil and gas—over the past 150 years, and more recent additions such as chlorofluorocarbons (which we are worrying ourselves silly over but which really constitute a minority group) for use as aerosol propellants and refrigerants, are all likely to have a significant impact on global climate patterns during the next century if left unchecked.

So, the member for Kavel was right on the ball when he commented that by comparison with the massive quantities of emissions from coal plants the nuclear industry had a relatively good record, and that is setting aside this open

fear that all of us have of nuclear radiation—and I am not blaming anyone, I share that fear. I have been into several nuclear plants and have experienced the extent to which they control emissions of any description. Oddly enough, the protective clothing I wore—a cap, a white linen coat and a pair of plastic galoshes—was exactly the same protective clothing that I wore in Britain's largest cheese packaging export plant at Oswestry.

There was no difference between the two. But in the case of the cheese plant, it was I who was the contaminator. Having been into nuclear plants and having recognised that the majority of the senior staff have been in the industry since its inception in the late 1940s and early 1950s, people who are acutely loyal to the industry, in which there is a very low turnover of staff and about 70 per cent of the staff are in fact intellectuals—that is, people with degrees and technological qualifications—it is hard to imagine people of that calibre being misled and not understanding the full implications of an industry. I say that without bias but to point out that these are the facts of the British nuclear industry.

The Central Electricity Generating Board, which burns 80 million tonnes of fossil fuel a year, has been sufficiently concerned for almost the past decade to have a look at the emissions. One of the statistics is interesting. Eighty million tonnes of coal in the United Kingdom produces about 200 million tonnes of CO<sup>2</sup> in a year. That is a massive amount of carbon dioxide, but it is only about one per cent of the world's total. Members should realise that the burning of fossil fuels today is generating masses of carbon dioxide which cannot be extracted by flue gas desulphurisation or any other cheap method, and Britain alone is putting this flue gas desulphurisation plant into only one of its power stations because the cost would be astronomical to clean up all the rest. In other words the world, which is burning fossil fuels, is year after year doing very little at all, because it cannot do much, about taking CO<sup>2</sup> from the atmosphere. The greenhouse effect will be compounded year after year.

Another issue which has not been considered by the member for Briggs or any other member on the Government benches is that the underprivileged Third World has as yet not even begun to whet its appetite for power. It is underdeveloped industrially, and it will start to awaken. When China, for example which I also visited a couple of weeks ago, with a population of over one billion, a country that is just beginning to awaken to the new privatisation or commercialisation and industrialisation and wants to attract industry from across the world to help it develop, begins to burn its billions of tonnes of coal a year from massive reserves in the Shensi-Shansi plateau in the interior, there will be another massive contribution to the world's greenhouse effect.

I suggest that we should not be decrying the nuclear industry as strongly as do the opponents in the Labor Party. They should be looking positively towards finding solutions for the safe and speedy disposal, for the long term, of those high and medium radioactive wastes in much the same manner as the United Kingdom has been doing for the past 20 or 30 years. It is very well advanced, using the vitrified waste method in much the same way as Australia is trying to introduce its own patented synrock method. In fact, Australia is discussing the synrock method with China at this very moment. So, I ask the member for Briggs and his colleagues not to go to Europe, as the member for Briggs apparently did. They remember him with some affection at Sellafield as one of the few rabbits that returned to England from Australia. They at least gave him the credit for having a closed mind. They could have done worse than that. It is

a pity that he and others do not go to these nuclear institutions across the world with a more open, constructive and positive approach.

It really is a crime, a sin, for the world to be burning petrol, oil and gas to create static forms of electricity to run factories and industries when that is really the only source of automotive energy that we have left to us. That will disappear long before the other fuels disappear. We will have plenty of coal. Britain has enough coal to last for 900 years on present known methods of extraction.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** I'm fascinated by your approach to the subject.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** My colleague the member for Alexandra said that he is fascinated by my approach to the subject. I went to the United Kingdom with a critical and a fearful mind thinking that the nuclear threat was very massive because that is the way that we in Australia have been indoctrinated to think. When I arrived in the more sophisticated, more open-minded cities and countries of Europe and the rest of the world I found them to be far more realistic in that they are approaching the problems as they should be approached—constructively instead of destructively and in a worrying frame. The conservationists have played a very large role in alerting the world to a wide number of problems, but to induce pessimism into the world is doing a great disservice, particularly to the Third World, which still has to find adequate power sources for its industry.

If we burn oil and gas for industrial power generation we will find ourselves very short of automotive power in the near future and we will have to go into advanced hydrogen and other technologies. It was suggested to me a few years ago by none other than Sir Mark Oliphant when he was in Mount Gambier that the technology of fusion rather than fission would be a much cleaner source of power. In extensive discussions with John Collier, the Chairman of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, and with the managing directors of power plants around the United Kingdom—both fossil and nuclear—it became obvious that, while the physics—the theory—is workable and sound, the engineering technology that would require plasma at temperatures of about 1 million to 3 million degrees centigrade to be contained in man-made equipment really presents massive problems. The engineering problems are not readily soluble, so that anyone who is looking for a less dangerous form of radiation is really engaging in pipe dreams at least for the next 100 years. I do not think that, based on information that I gleaned from my recent overseas visit, nuclear energy will be phased out before the year 2100.

I suggest to members that, instead of resorting to ridicule and trying to inculcate fear into the hearts and minds of Australians, we should be looking broad mindedly at the world's power problems. The sophisticated Westernised world and the unsophisticated underdeveloped impoverished Third World will both be desperately in need of power in the decades to come, and we should be analysing the types of power we have, and the uses to which they will need to be put, and making a world decision on how best to harness all the power resources that we have.

As a final word, I also looked at wind power, hydroelectric power and solar power. I have been studying those problems, as have other members, for the last decade or two, and it is patently obvious that if we are to harness the sun—the largest nuclear reactor in the universe, after all—we will need acres and acres of solar cells and masses of ground to produce an indeterminate, unreliable amount of power simply because the sun is not shining in any one

part of the earth for 24 hours a day and the wind is not reliable in any part of the earth for 24 hours a day.

The noise generated from wind power is excessive, and the wave power that can be generated in some bays and inlets around the world is significant locally. However, when looking at the vast quantities of power needed to melt down our metallic ores, for example, we realise what a weak, specious argument is being presented by those who say, 'Let's go solar, wind or wave.' It is a very weak argument when we look at the vast amount of power which the world demands even now and which we could very well be denying to the Third World if we do not look far more pragmatically at the whole range of power sources available in our universe.

Mr ROBERTSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Last year, the then Minister of Water Resources introduced into the House a Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, and during the debate on that measure I cautioned that the Opposition would watch closely to see what regulations were brought in under the amended Act. In due course, new regulations did come in under the amended Act, and one of the amendments was to provide for a \$1 200 fee to be charged by the Engineering and Water Supply Department where land was being subdivided for the purpose of creating new allotments for housing. So, there would be a \$1 200 contribution for the existing mains or for any new main that needed to be laid to enable the service to be provided. Fundamentally, the Opposition supported that contention. It seemed a fair and reasonable way to evenly distribute the cost across all prospective home builders into areas where existing mains or new connections were required.

However, the Government has seen fit to apply that regulation into the irrigation area at Loxton. Not only has that irrigation area an irrigation distribution system but also the growers get a domestic supply from the Engineering and Water Supply town mains at Loxton which provides water under the Waterworks Act for domestic purposes. The Government and the department have now seen fit, when an irrigator wishes to retire from the industry and to subdivide his or her home from the irrigation property, and such a person applies to subdivide that house from the property so that they can continue to live in that house and sell the remaining irrigated property which is already serviced by an irrigation connection, to require a \$1 200 contribution to be made before the department will give approval for the subdivision to proceed. In this instance, no new connection is required; the new subdivision is not for the purpose of housing and no new domestic connection will be required because no additional house will be built on the land. The land is already serviced by an irrigation connection, and that is the purpose for which the land is to be used. It will not be used for further housing development.

Consequently, to refuse to allow the subdivision to occur unless the \$1 200 is paid is really obtaining money under false pretences. It is straight-out extortion, and that was not the intention of the legislation or the regulations as we understood them. On numerous occasions since the intro-

duction of the regulation, I have endeavoured to have the Minister of Water Resources review the situation and issue a directive to the Engineering & Water Supply Department that it does not apply in that particular circumstance. However, I have been totally unsuccessful in getting the former Minister of Water Resources to adopt any position on this whatsoever, and the matter has been going on for months.

The purpose of the Tonkin Government's decision, taken way back in about 1981, that growers be able to subdivide their house from their property at retirement was to enable a former fruit grower to remain in his home and then sell the primary producing property and retire with some capital. This was achieved as a result of negotiations with the Federal Government. The Federal Government of the day agreed that that was fair and reasonable and that the growers should have the opportunity to do this. Now the present Government is using this opportunity for subdivision to extract a fee of \$1 200, for which it is providing no service whatsoever, before it will give approval to enable a fruit grower settler to remain in his home after retirement. Following numerous representations to the Minister, on 31 March 1988 I eventually wrote to the then Minister of Water Resources, as follows:

Further to our conversation yesterday regarding the \$1 200 subdivision charge being applied under the Waterworks Act in the Loxton irrigation area, I enclose a copy of a letter from Mr Peter Nicholas which prompted my remarks in the House earlier this year.

In the main, the subdivision of a grower's house from his horticultural property is not for the purpose of creating another housing allotment for which a domestic supply will be necessary. In the event that, sometime in the future, a further residence is built on the horticultural land, I do not disagree that a capital contribution at that time would be reasonable.

However, to require a payment of \$1 200 by the grower in order to obtain the approval of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to a subdivision application is totally unreasonable under these circumstances, and is not in the spirit of the intention of the regulations as you and your officers outlined them when the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill was before the House last year.

I have still not received a response to that letter. As a result of no action being taken by the Government, Mr Nicholas is still unable to subdivide his property and retire from the industry. He is now 70 years of age and desperately wants to retire from the industry but he feels that it is totally unreasonable that he should have to make a donation of \$1 200 to the State Government to enable him to retire. I totally agree with the situation as described by Mr Nicholas. He is being stood over by the Government, as is any other irrigator in the same district who is in the same circumstances. As I have said, that was not what the then Minister led us to believe was the intention of the legislation or the regulations when they were introduced into this House. For the Government to proceed down this path and enforce the regulations in the way that it is doing is, as I said earlier, nothing short of extortion.

This evening I am calling on the new Minister of Water Resources to issue a directive to the Engineering and Water Supply Department that regulations under the Waterworks Act regarding the payment of \$1 200 prior to departmental approval being given to an application for subdivision not apply to a house being subdivided from an irrigation property in the Loxton irrigation area where an additional domestic supply is not required.

I only hope that the new Minister will give this matter serious consideration and make a decision. I hope in that way she will display, not only here in the metropolitan area but also to all South Australians generally, that she will tackle the responsibilities of her job fairly and squarely. I trust that that action will be taken.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Members will recall that during Question Time today I raised a question as a consequence of correspondence that was forwarded to me by a constituent—and, indeed, following representations made by many constituents in my electorate—pertaining to the fact that no third party appeal rights exist under the planning authority specifically relating to West Lakes.

I do not intend to impose my will or to tell local government how it should conduct itself. However, a councillor rang me at 8.15 this morning and expressed concern about a matter relating to consent to operate a passenger motor vessel on the whole lake system at West Lakes. I further understand that this proposal was also the subject of an application to the Licensing Court for the granting of a general facility licence. This councillor, who does not wish to be named, informed me that he was unaware that the local council possessed a legal opinion, which I understand was given by a Commissioner Buttrose some 10 years ago. As I understand from talking to the councillor, this 12 page document indicates that, under the West Lakes Indenture Act, residents living in that area have no third party right of appeal.

This councillor was somewhat bemused and confused by the fact that he, as a representative of that council, and (he informs me) other councillors had not been made aware of this judgment relating to this application. I understand that only people in the Albert Park electorate, and perhaps in the areas of Golden Grove and the City of Adelaide, are subject to this type of indenture. Whilst I do not intend to talk about the City of Adelaide or Golden Grove—I will leave that to my colleagues—I understand that, in relation to the West Lakes Indenture Act, the developer can lodge an objection, but the residents cannot. The developer is the first party, the council is the second party, but the ratepayers are the third party and, as such, they are not entitled to appeal provisions.

This has caused considerable distress among many residents in the electorate, and today I was provided with a letter from Dr Walter Woods of 10 Sunlake Place, Tennyson. It states:

This proposal is also the subject of an application before the Licensing Court for the granting of a general facility licence.

He goes on to state:

In accordance with regulation 7 of the West Lakes regulations, made by the Minister of Marine under the West Lakes Development Act 1969, council gave notice to lakeside residents, since it perceived that these were likely to be affected by the proposed development. Over 50 residents objected and these objections were considered by council at its city planning committee meeting on Monday 8 August 1988.

He points out:

I was amongst the objectors and the speakers at that meeting. From my observations at that meeting I am convinced that council is considering matters other than those specified in the West Lakes regulations which are:

Part III 8 (3) In reaching a decision whether to grant or refuse its consent or upon what condition or conditions its consent should be granted the council of the area shall have regard only to the following matters, namely—

- (a) the purpose for which the various zones have been created as indicated by the seventh schedule to these regulations;
- (b) the orderly and proper planning of West Lakes;
- (c) the preservation of the character of the locality; and
- (d) the amenity of the locality.

He also states:

Discussion at the council meeting concerned many other matters, in particular I allude to liability for work already put in hand by the applicant, council's liability in having in December 1987 granted to the applicant a licence to operate on the West Lakes system, the fact that council was not fully informed of the applicant's intentions at the time of the earlier consideration (specifically with regard to the consumption of intoxicating liquor on

board the vessel), that council has not given its permission for such consumption of liquor, that an annual licence fee of \$1 300 only was insufficient offset to council for the loss in rates due to the devaluation of properties on the lakefront through the loss of privacy caused by the granting of the licence to operate to say nothing of council's function in protecting the character of the locality through the West Lakes regulations.

My constituent continues:

Finally, the item was deferred on the motion of the Mayor, Mr John Dyer, in order that further information could be sought regarding:

- (1) the Minister of Marine's opinion of liability for damage to the lake bank protection,
- (2) whether the lake surface has reserve status and could be nominated a dry area,
- (3) clarification of clause 6 of the licence agreement between council and West Lakes Cruises Pty Ltd regarding repairs to moorings, and
- (4) opinion be sought from the relevant Minister to confirm that third party appeals against council's decisions under the West Lakes regulations are not allowed.

My constituent continues then with a number of other matters. I point out that I have received from other constituents expressions of considerable concern about this matter. In addition, I received a request in writing from a past member of Federal Parliament for a judicial inquiry into this matter. I consider that to be a serious request, and I have conveyed it to the Premier and the Minister of Local Government, asking them to investigate the charges and allegations made in the correspondence received by the Hon. Clyde Cameron.

As I indicated previously, I do not intend to reflect or to try to impose my will upon the council. It would be improper for me to do so, but I believe that, until such time as the matters raised in the correspondence by the Hon. Clyde Cameron and by Dr Walter Woods have been resolved, no final decision should be made on the matter by the council.

Also, I take into account that the proponents of this application have made a significant investment, so it is important that the matter be investigated speedily. I understand, from the information provided to me last Friday, that that is being done.

It is important that I should raise the matter in this place to put on public record the concern of not only myself but more importantly of all those constituents who have written to me—I think that the number is in excess of 50 of my constituents in that area. I believe that it is a very important issue and one that I hope both Ministers will look at with a view to giving advice on what appeal provisions or other opportunities are available on this matter.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** This evening I would like to address the important and controversial subject of the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons in the community. As members would know, the chlorinated hydrocarbons include the chemicals aldrin, dieldrin, heptachlor and chlordane. Not long ago they were banned as insecticides in the agricultural area. Subsequently, some thousands of hectares of countryside in Australia, particularly in this State, were closed to agricultural use. Also, a scare happened in the beef export industry some time ago when the fat levels of aldrin and the other chlorinated hydrocarbons built up to such an extent that they were detected in the United States and the whole of the Australian beef export industry came under threat. Subsequently, chlorinated hydrocarbons were banned from use and the export beef industry got back underway.

The reason they were banned is that in the United States the expert opinion is that the chlorinated hydrocarbons are dangerous in animals. It is alleged that there is evidence that they are carcinogenic. Of course, if there are chlorinated hydrocarbons in the fat content of animals exported from

Australia those countries will cut off Australia as a supplier. Expert opinion in the United States resulted in the product being banned. No doubt expert advice was also given to the Australian Government on why the chemicals should not be used in the agricultural field in Australia.

As far as their use in the spraying of insecticides in the building of domestic properties on the Adelaide Plains is concerned, expert opinion is somewhat divided. It is as a result of that division of expert opinion on the Adelaide Plains that we still see chlorinated hydrocarbons, particularly aldrin, being pumped into new building sites around Adelaide. It has been said that the use of aldrin is quite safe provided it is pumped below ground. Indeed, the Shell Company in its pamphlet claims that to be the case.

On 27 May of this year I was invited to visit the home of Mr Reg McColl and his fiance Dr Lin Seow, who live at 48 Ridgehaven Drive, Bellevue Heights. There I was briefed on Mr McColl's allegations concerning the use by a contractor of aldrin and other chemicals to treat his home. I subsequently took up the matter with the South Australian Health Commission because Mr McColl provided me with a lot of evidence which indicated that he had been infected by the chemical. A blood test, which was done by the South Australian Department of Chemistry, showed that the fat which was contaminated with aldrin was three times or thereabouts the level of the contamination that had already been banned in the export of beef.

It seems strange to me that if this chemical is alleged to be safe and is supposed to be sprayed under the ground, how can a person have it in his system? The Department of Chemistry which did the test is a Government agency, an authoritative agency, so there is no doubt that this man did have levels of aldrin in his fat tissue. I go back to the public concern. These chemicals have been banned in the agricultural arena but are used domestically. In this case there is no doubt that somehow or other—and I will come to it in a moment—aldrin got into this gentleman's bloodstream and lodged in the fat tissue.

If it is happening to this particular gentleman, it is conceivable that it is happening to many other people. One could argue, I suppose, that anyone who has had their home sprayed—and perhaps it is a long bow to draw, but Mr McColl picked it up in his blood level, tested by our own Department of Chemistry—could find it in their bloodstream if subjected to the air levels of this chemical. I was asked by Mr McColl to take up with the Health Commission a report which goes back to July 1987 and which is numbered GJ 0013(08/123/189). The three officers of the Health Commission who prepared the report conclude:

It is very unlikely, considering both the location and the amount of Aldrin likely to be present, that there is any significant health risk.

That was the feeling of the Health Commission, the experts advising the Minister of Health. There is a conflict because, subsequent to that, a Dr Mary O'Brien visited Mr McColl's home at the same time as she visited the Streaky Bay school.

Dr O'Brien is an authority in the US on pesticides and advises one of the environmental agencies there as well as advising the Government. Evidence gathered in the US indicates that there is such a thing as residual air levels caused by chlorinated hydrocarbons, to wit, Mr McColl's blood level. I asked the Health Commission to re-evaluate the report it brought out saying that it was unlikely that

any problems would have been caused to Mr McColl, and to look at it in light of the evidence from Dr Mary O'Brien and given the fact that subsequent blood testing shows that Mr McColl does, in fact, have high blood levels of that chemical.

Time will not permit me to read into *Hansard* the contents of that letter. The contractors sprayed some of the chemical under the house but the fumes came up through the floorboards. They drilled holes around the interior of the house and pumped the liquid down into these holes, and it came up in gaseous form. It was pumped in around his sauna and, of course, it came up in gaseous form and the fumes filled the house. As a result, I believe that he had yellow sputum for a considerable time afterwards, and a feeling of illness. They told him at the time to simply turn on the hot spray in the shower as that would dissipate it but, of course, it did not. They then used the wrong gas: there was a mix-up, which had to be resolved, between pestigas and insectigas. There were many other problems which, unfortunately, I will not have time to bring to the attention of the House.

Another matter which concerns me is an incident which happened subsequently at the Regency Park Centre School. We are all acutely aware of what happened at Streaky Bay, and I think that the public was right in asking questions there. I refer to a letter dated 17 June that I wrote to the Principal of the Regency Park Centre School. It is now 9 August and I have had no reply. The letter states:

I have been making an effort over recent months to research the use of the chlorohydrocarbons and their use as insecticides. . . I understand that an incident occurred at your centre recently that involved a pest control contractor . . . coming on site to spray and initially being stopped by a member of the staff.

I am advised that he did in fact spray the area and I would be grateful if you would be good enough to advise me as to:

1. The circumstances surrounding the spraying and the reasons for the actions by the staff;
2. What chemical was used, and
3. What type of insects were being exterminated.

I would appreciate a reply, if possible, before 28 June.

I have subsequently written again asking whether the reply could be expedited. The problem there is the great unknown. They might have sprayed pyrethrum: if they did, fine, let us know. But it is this great unknown, that around Adelaide at the moment companies are spraying chlorinated hydrocarbons. We have experts in the field saying that they are safe, and three officers of the Health Commission said not 12 months ago that they are perfectly safe to use.

We have all the public disquiet at the moment about agricultural chemicals getting into food, and we know that many people like free-range chickens because, for example, they do not contain antibiotics. Others are concerned about what gets into our food source. World experts in the United States have banned the stuff and it is banned in agricultural areas. The farming community is supersensitive about the export of beef in case the pesticide gets into fat tissue. Mr McColl and his fiance are contaminated with the stuff, yet the Health Commission says that it is not dangerous. I am simply asking the Minister present in the Chamber to take up the matter with the Health Minister and Cabinet to expedite a review of the report so that everyone knows what is going on.

Motion carried.

At 9.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 August at 2 p.m.