

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 October 1988

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

## EXPIATION NOTICES

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** I move:

That this House notes with concern the directive to police officers that they may only enter one offence per expiation notice for cannabis related offences, and requires urgent action to allow multiple offences per notice to apply in the future as it has in the past.

I bring to the notice of the House at this time a matter of considerable community concern relative to all matters relating to drug use. I do not want to stray into the area of recent court cases relative to personalities, but I do want to draw attention to the cannabis expiation provisions provided by this Parliament under considerable pressure and concern a little over 12 months ago and the fact that by directive the ability for the police to effectively bring to justice, albeit by way of expiation notice, offences against the cannabis legislation are being put into jeopardy by a directive which says that only one offence can be placed on each individual notice. The notice, which is used by the police in relation to a variety of offences, has a number of positions allowing for the placement of individual offences and the amounts pertaining thereto. A general instruction to police officers indicates only one offence is to be recorded when the notice is used for cannabis and general offences, whereas three traffic infringement offences may be recorded.

The long and the short of the situation is that the police are required to fill out on the expiation notice the name of the person, their date of birth, address and occupation, the time and other information, and details relative to the particular offence. Where they are prevented from putting a number of offences on one expiation notice (as they have done in the past), the pressure is put on the officer to record each additional offence on a separate notice. The point which has been made to me by officers in the field is that, with the sorts of pressure under which they are required to work, there will be a tendency, albeit against their responsibility in full justice to their task, to record the most serious of the offences and not proceed to write out a series of additional expiation notices.

I can accept the situation in which they find themselves. The completion of so many forms makes a mockery of bringing offenders to justice. In that sense, I encompass more than just this cannabis infringement notice. At this stage, we should take the opportunity to reduce the unnecessary workload on police and allow the proper registration of offences, with the minimum amount of unnecessary police activity. Such a method would not jeopardise the rights of individuals who are caught in the net. Computer coding indicates the number of different offences included on the one notice, which overcomes the gross duplication of detail required for one single person. If a person is charged with, say, six cannabis offences, police work could be considerably reduced if they have to fill out only one or two forms instead of six.

If police have time constraints placed upon them, it is possible that they will select the most serious offence, which requires the completion of only one form. I do not criticise them for taking a realistic approach to the problem, but one would normally expect them to uphold the law and to process all offences. Let us be realistic and accept that,

given that the cannabis infringement notice is the same form used for traffic infringements, it should be possible to list three offences on the one notice.

My colleague in another place, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, has already brought this matter to the notice of that place. I hope that this problem will be given its due regard in both places. If members of Parliament genuinely want to assist the Police Force to protect the community, we should provide it with a system of reporting that reduces the workload and allows it to be more effective in the field.

**Mr HAMILTON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## WORKCOVER

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**: I move:

That this House urges the Minister of Labour to launch an independent investigation into and assessment of WorkCover as a matter of urgency.

I bring this motion before the House because I have been made aware, as I am sure have other members, of the considerable problems with WorkCover since its inception on 30 September 1987. In fact, the in-basket in my office is overloaded with WorkCover complaints, and my file of the very wide-ranging complaints about its operation—complaints which I am sure every member of the House has received—is two feet thick. I know that the unions are not happy about the operation of WorkCover, and even members opposite could comment on the way in which it has operated.

The areas that I believe should be addressed are as follows. The first is cross-subsidisation. I know that the small business community is quite irate about having to pay excessive workers compensation premiums to subsidise high-risk areas. Many small businesses are fighting for survival and cannot afford to pay bills for which they are not responsible. In this House we have heard time and time again of this deliberate policy to subsidise particular areas of industry which involve import replacement or are export oriented.

I suggest that, if that is the principle, the Minister should look at the firms which are being subsidised. I cannot understand how the building industry, which has no import replacement or export potential, is being subsidised by small business. Will the Minister explain why employers in this State in low-risk areas are subsidising the building industry? Can he say why they are subsidising the forestry industry and motor workshops? That is not on. In fact, it is high time that this Government took a very responsible attitude to workers compensation and got rid of all the anomalies. If it believes that there should be a cross-subsidisation principle, let us spell it out, debate it, and treat it on its merits. Let us not have this blanket coverage, as presently occurs, which is killing off small business in this State.

Secondly, the matter of older employees has not been resolved. WorkCover extracts premiums from employers on the basis of the salaries, wages and allowances paid. It collects full premiums for all employees, irrespective of their wage, but when it comes to paying out it is a little reticent to cater for older employees. I would not mind if there was a consistent set of principles or if WorkCover said that, at the age of 60 years for females and 65 years for males, it was no longer appropriate to apply a workers compensation blanket. This would leave the employers of those people free to take out other forms of insurance for sickness or accident, not workers compensation sickness or accident.

As the situation presently stands, if older employees are injured in the workplace they are not covered and are

without income. As members opposite would realise, because these employees have been receiving that income they are not eligible for pension payments, and some months go by before that eligibility can be established. So, older employees are discriminated against. The rules need changing.

The third item is the move by WorkCover to make employers pay wages and salaries beyond the first week. It has been suggested that this practice is by negotiation, but I say it is by intimidation. Pressure has been applied to employers, particularly in rural areas, to maintain the income of injured employees on the basis that WorkCover will reimburse the employers. Employers are bearing the brunt through increased overdrafts and late reimbursements of up to two months. That situation must change.

The fourth item relates to casual employees. People not in regular employment are having to wait inordinate times to receive weekly wage compensation. WorkCover insists that the first week's payments be forthcoming immediately from employers, but there have been a number of cases where employees have not received a cheque from WorkCover for one, two or three months. Because social security benefits cannot be claimed in these circumstances, families are left without any income or support.

Members of this House would readily understand that probably about 15 per cent of the work force belongs in that itinerant or casual category. I know that there is difficulty in assessing those cases, but people cannot be left without income. They still depend on that money to pay the weekly grocery bill. WorkCover's attitude is, 'We will get around to assessing you at some stage and somehow you have to survive in the meantime'. That is not good enough; those anomalies have to be eradicated from the system, but WorkCover has done nothing to redress that situation.

My fifth area of complaint relates to fines and legal action. WorkCover is using heavy fines and court summonses to penalise late payers. In a number of cases employers have requested WorkCover to provide relevant documents, such as pay booklets, but have been ignored. WorkCover's response to late payment under these circumstances has been less than constructive. I am talking about penalties of 100 per cent, 200 per cent and 300 per cent which have been deemed to be payable by the board. That means that, whatever the reason for late payment, there is a surcharge. Often the reason for late payment can be sheeted home to liquidity difficulties.

Nowhere else in the system are there penalties such as those in this area. One would have thought that employers were committing some crime and that surcharges were laid down to reduce the incidence of such horrendous criminal activity. It is not, I might add, that WorkCover has not performed; indeed, if WorkCover is to impose penalties, it should penalise itself. I would like a system of penalties applied to the administrators of WorkCover. If they make mistakes, who pays the penalty? The employers and employees pay the penalty. Has the Minister done anything about that? If someone has not been paid for a month, who is penalised? I know that the WorkCover agencies and the employers do not pay the penalty—it is the poor employee. If the employer has not been reimbursed for extended payments of wages and salaries, who pays the price? It is not WorkCover or the Workers Compensation Corporation—it is the poor old employer. Yet, WorkCover has said, 'That's all right, I don't give a damn what my performance is like, but I am going to hit you between the eyes with these penalties'.

In relation to self-employed people, an article late last week stated that building workers had gone on strike because

a subcontractor was not covered by workers compensation. I have been on about this issue for 10 months. The Act provides that a self-employed or subcontracted person can take up a separate commission under the Act, but that provision has not been invoked because WorkCover has not got off its backside and done anything about it. The taxi situation is horrendous. *Ad hoc* decisions are being made day after day because WorkCover and the Workers Compensation Corporation has not done a thing about it. It is simply not good enough.

So, we are facing a situation where these anomalies occur and where people who are injured will not have a blanket, because the Minister has deemed that no-one else can provide cover; no-one else can provide workers compensation. The Government has cut off all the other avenues and said, 'We are not going to cover you and we don't give a damn about you'. I continue to receive letters from the corporation saying, 'We are still looking at it'.

What about the subbies, the building subcontractors, the taxi drivers and the self-employed? I am pleased to note that at least the situation in relation to priests has been resolved satisfactorily, although we have not seen the amendments in Parliament. The corporation determined that, because priests are servants of God, they could not be covered by workers compensation. It has now reversed that determination to allow certain religious orders to take up workers compensation, but that decision has not yet been endorsed by this Parliament. So, again, nobody has got off their backside and done the right thing.

Regarding superannuation and allowances, it would be fair to say that almost every employer in this town is upset by the fact they must pay premiums on amounts that have been set aside in superannuation and on allowances such as travel allowances or clothing allowances. Everybody in this House recognises that these allowances play no part in the mainstream of benefits from WorkCover; they simply have no part to play. Yet, it has been deemed that they shall be subjected to premium. However, we know that the premium base of the corporation has been extended by some 10 per cent to 15 per cent through this little rort, a rort that was clearly never endorsed by this Parliament. The rules are being made behind closed doors.

A further downside of the board's decision to include such payments relates to auditing the books. I have received numerous complaints about WorkCover agents carrying out audits on employee payments. The attitude of some of these agents has been quite disgraceful, dictatorial and rude. When a mistake has been located—and it is invariably in this allowance area—demand has been made for a cheque to be made out on the spot under threat of heavy fine. This is the way that the jackboot tactics are employed by WorkCover.

Regarding bureaucratic incompetence, reports are still being received that employers are unable to receive responses to their inquiries when they have approached WorkCover on matters of premiums or claims. The same applies for employees. People ring me up and say, 'Mr Baker, I have tried and tried but I still do not know what is happening. I keep getting passed from one person to another. Nobody can give me the answer.' I could have expected that in the early days of WorkCover, but it is continuing to happen.

One of the problems with WorkCover is the number of personnel who are on contract and are not part of the permanent WorkCover operation. Many people working for WorkCover have been dragged in from Drake Personnel and, although that is no reflection on Drake Personnel, I ask the House to reflect on what ability any employee has if he is contracted on a casual basis to fulfil a role within

an organisation. It might be all right if someone is away and a replacement is required to do the work in the interim to ensure that the ship stays afloat. However, I question very seriously whether the whole of the workforce should be operating on this basis. What commitment do you have to the operation; how effectively can you ensure that everybody has all the information available and can impart it; and how well does the organisation run in the process if you have this casualisation and temporary nature of employees? That is one of the reasons why WorkCover is such an abysmal failure: because there has been this difficulty from the very beginning and it has never been fixed up.

I was critical earlier in the year about the premium review. It fixed up some anomalies but created further anomalies. Now, the corporation is saying that it will take at least two years for all the information to come to hand so that a decision can be made on whether the rates are too high or too low. We do not know when the bonus and penalty system will be introduced. It is just being waved as a flag in front of the employers, who are told, 'Somewhere down the line we will give you the benefit if you have been a good employer,' or 'We will penalise you if you have been a bad employer in terms of safety and injuries to workers.'

That is not good enough. Why should we have not only cross-subsidisation in the system but also a maintenance of bad practices in the WorkCover scheme? If there are very good employers, let us reward them. The attitude is that, if there are bad employers, they will be penalised. Those involved say, 'Do tell these employers that we will do something about it, but not for two years,' as the corporation is doing at the moment.

I will briefly refer to WorkCare because, as everybody will remember, the South Australian legislation was based on the Victorian legislation. Indeed, it also took parts from the Canadian and the New Zealand legislation. We have had these quite vociferous statements that the scheme in South Australia is absolutely different. Every scheme on which WorkCover was based has gone broke. They have all got horrendous debts. So, WorkCover will not be any different. It may just take a little longer for the sums to be done and the real results to come to the attention of the public.

WorkCare has just produced a draft report which it did not release before the Victorian election because it thought it would be damaging. I happen to have a copy of that draft statement which they were holding back, and it shows quite clearly that the net long-term liability of the scheme is \$2.1 billion. That is the difference between the net effect of the assets at the disposal of the corporation, which incidentally lost \$200 million on the share market crash, and the long term liabilities which have been assessed at \$2.9 billion. We know that South Australia will do better than that, and we also know from bitter experience from WorkCare, and the New Zealand and Canadian schemes, that the costs will escalate just because of the very nature of the scheme. However, I will not spend time on that.

The final item that I wish to canvass in this House is the problem with computers. One difficulty is that, when people ring up and somebody puts their name or registration number into the computer, quite often the records are not up to date. There have been difficulties with payments. Three weeks ago I sent a complaint through to the corporation concerning a chiropractor. Of the last seven payments which had been made by WorkCover for services that had been delivered to injured workers, six had been wrong. Most of them were over-payments. When the chiropractor queried them, they said, 'Sorry, we have over-paid you, we will

cancel the cheque.' Every cancelled cheque incurs a penalty, and that penalty must be borne by the practitioner himself. So, they are not receiving their money on time, they are receiving wrong amounts of money, and then they are bearing the penalty for cancelled cheques.

I know that certainly things are improving in that area, but they are still not good enough in terms of payment, in terms of edits or in terms of being able to readily dial up a system and ascertain the status of every employer and employee who is on that system. It has been a debacle of monumental proportions, and who pays the bills? It is not the Minister, not WorkCover, not the employees of WorkCover but employers and the employees. This is the scheme that was supposed to improve the situation of injured people in the workplace.

It is a long and serious list that I believe requires attention, and I call on the Minister to launch an inquiry. We cannot have a situation in South Australia where this continues; we simply cannot have it. As it is at the moment, the corporation is in charge of its own affairs. As Minister Blevins says, 'This is between the employees and the employers.' In practical terms, it is not possible for any part-time member of a board to be able to control the operations of that board. We know that the information which is provided to that board is always siphoned and put through the filter, because the people who really know what is going on will not tell the board members.

They will not tell the board members if mistakes are being made, if they have received complaints or if someone has come in and tried to assault staff because they have not been paid for two months, as has been the case on occasions. The people running the scheme will not tell the truth to the people who are supposed to be ultimately responsible—the corporation—because it would reflect on them. The only way we will get some real reform in this area is if the Minister conducts an independent inquiry, and I call upon him to do so.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I have listened with great interest to the member for Mitcham outlining what he considers to be the deficiencies of WorkCover. I was very interested to hear him say that it is not possible for part-time members of a board to know what is happening. I want to know whether that applies to private enterprise, because what he has just said means that every board which operates in Australia has part-time members who would not know what is going on. That is what he implied.

He is saying that Michael Shanahan, the past President of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, a person in what is fondly known in the farming community as agripolitics, a very knowledgeable and respected person, does not know what he is doing; that Alan Crompton, past President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, who is currently on a trip overseas selling the ports of South Australia and Australia does not know what he is doing; that Robert Hercus, a member of the committee of management of the Engineering Employers Association and ex-General Manager of R.W. Hercus Pty Ltd and currently owner and Manager of Applied Machine Tools does not know what is going on; that Ms Gabrielle Kronberger, a partner with the huge firm of chartered accountants, Peat Marwick Hungerfords does not know what she is doing; and that Garth Challens, a Senior Personnel Manager with the State Bank would not know what he is doing.

The honourable member is really illustrating his own ignorance in this matter. I will refer to a couple of things he commented on. He referred to people who are late

payers, and perhaps we ought to dwell on that for a moment. The late payers under this scheme have an enormous advantage. I will remind the honourable member of the person who was recently complaining about WorkCover, whose workers compensation bill dropped by 50 per cent but who, instead of paying in full, was paying in 12 monthly instalments—in arrears, not in advance—and then was complaining.

Under the previous legislation, if that employer employed people without providing workers compensation—in other words, he paid the insurance company late—he would have suffered the penalties of the court, because he would have committed an offence. What is happening here is that people who are chronic late payers have to pay a penalty—and rightly so. They should not be able to freeloader on other people. It is also interesting to note that when the insurance companies were operating this scheme (the 46 or 43 companies or whatever the number was), the employer always paid the worker the workers compensation and then reimbursement was made. Of course, the member for Mitcham would not know that because I do not think he has ever worked in industry. He would not understand that.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** A lot more quickly than six or seven years to settle claims, and where people had a dispute with their claim and waited up to six or nine months before they knew whether they were entitled to workers compensation. Never once did the member for Mitcham stand up in this House and complain about that iniquitous system when all the employers were lining up in the Industrial Court lodging objections, hoping that employees would not persist because they would have to wait for six to nine months (and, in some cases, longer) to have the matter settled.

He makes no acknowledgement here that within two or three weeks people will know whether or not they will be on workers compensation. The member for Mitcham ought to apologise for making those aspersions when he does not know what he is talking about. He tried to say that WorkCover in South Australia was very similar to WorkCare in Victoria. I notice that his Liberal Leader makes out great differences between the Liberal Party in South Australia and the Federal Liberal Party on the basis of the immigration policy.

Apparently those differences are all right in that case but, when it comes to WorkCare and WorkCover, they are exactly the same. I suggest that, when he has some money in his parliamentary travel scheme, the honourable member should go to Canada to see just how broke the Canadian schemes are. At least 10 or 11 schemes operate in Canada—not one, as he said.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Tell us about Toronto.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I will tell you about British Columbia and Alberta.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Oh!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The honourable member does not understand, because those schemes are very well funded and well managed. They are not broke.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** He knows a lot more about workers compensation than the honourable member does. For starters, the honourable member would not know what work was if he came across it. He does not do anything to get injured, anyway, so he would never be involved in it. All he can do is criticise eminent people in our business community for their inability to control and manage WorkCover. The honourable member has not made any comparison of the late payment and non-payment that used

to happen with workers compensation. It must be realised that approximately 1 000 claims are made per day and up to 6 000 payments are dealt with in a week. Monthly levy receipts from in excess of 50 000 employers are being made. In the first 11 months, approximately 144 000 accounts have been paid to the value of \$15.7 million. All in all, when members see the first of WorkCover's annual reports, they will realise that it has been quite successful and well managed.

I am satisfied with the quality of people on the part-time board. They are competent, and are doing their job well. I am not of the view of the member for Mitcham that they do not know what they are doing. They are managing the system very well because they are managing it for themselves. I condemn the approach of the member for Mitcham and I will not launch an investigation, because I see no need to investigate something that is working extremely well. His problem is that he fantasises each night about WorkCover. He collects letters over a long period, bundles them altogether and recycles them. In the Estimates Committee he recycled a complaint about a mythical woman and I suppose that, in a couple of months time, he will raise the matter again. The House should treat this motion with all the contempt it deserves.

**Mr OSWALD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FEDERAL REFERENDUM

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That this House deplores the reduction in school maintenance, upgrading of hospitals, commitment to better roads and other vital essential services caused by the State and Federal Government's wasteful spending of limited funds on an ill-conceived and thoroughly discredited referendum exercise which cost in excess of \$40 million.

Thankfully, the people of Australia resoundingly said, 'No, no, no, no' to the recent referendum questions. It was one of the most deceitful campaigns that this country has seen in its constitutional history. Although the Government put forward four questions, in fact, it sought 33 significant changes to the Australian Constitution and that, in itself, was the height of deceitfulness. It tried a variety of wily tricks to try to convince the people that they should vote 'Yes' to the questions but the people were not fooled and did not come to the Government's party.

One of the highlights of the Government's tricks was that voters could cast a formal or informal vote. Those people voting 'Yes' were allowed to use a tick in the square but if a voter wanted to vote 'No' that person could not use a cross.

Surely any person who has come up through the primary school system would realise that, since time immemorial, a tick has represented 'Yes', or approval, and a cross has represented 'No', or rejection. However, the Hawke Government wanted to ensure that the 'Yes' vote was maximised. It did not work: thank goodness! It is quite clear that the people saw through the questions. However, what really disturbs me is that over \$40 million was wasted. In fact, I do not know that the final figure has been calculated. Political journalists seem to vary in their estimates from just over \$40 million to \$48 million. Whatever the final figure is, we can say that more than \$40 million was wasted.

Let us consider the questions. The first question sought a four year maximum term for both Houses of Parliament. The Federal Opposition would have been happy to support a four year term for the Lower House, but seeking to take the Senate out at the same time made a whitewash of the

whole question. Mr Hawke and his colleagues well knew that the Opposition could not support that. The second question was about fair and democratic elections. All but one State in Australia have fair and democratic elections and it was a little ironic that in the case of the Senate, for instance, supposedly fair and democratic elections would not have occurred anyway.

The third question sought to recognise local government in the Constitution, and the Opposition was quite happy to support such recognition. However, the wording had to be appropriate and had to give local government something. The wording that the Hawke Government decided on gave local government nothing, other than a few words in the Constitution. The fourth, and last question, included three questions: the right to trial by jury; to extend freedom of religion; and to ensure fair terms for persons whose property is acquired by any Government. That all sounded very nice. However, by and large, all of those rights are already protected in our State Constitutions.

We should be aware of the work of the Constitutional Committee through publications such as 'Australia's Constitution—Time to Update' and through the variety of background papers issued, which, in themselves, are a cause for concern. Background paper No. 12 mentions the various options for amending the Australian Constitution. What are two of the suggested options? One is a method whereby both Houses of Federal Parliament could pass a proposed amendment and, if it were approved by a majority of State Parliaments it would become part of the Constitution. That is very dangerous and takes away people's rights.

Then there is a classic suggestion for amending the Constitution: a method whereby both Houses of the Federal Parliament could pass an amendment and it would become part of the Constitution. In other words, the Constitutional Commission itself has subtly suggested that we could leave it to Federal Parliament to change the Constitution. I recognise that that is supposedly a long way down the track but, thank goodness, a few weeks ago the people of Australia rejected out of hand the subtle questions put before them.

What disturbs me so greatly is, as I mentioned earlier, the \$40 million-plus that has been wasted when the Hawke Government knew that it could not succeed. Even Mr Bannon, our Premier, knew the referendum would not succeed. What a low profile he took as Federal President of the ALP—we hardly heard a bark about the Constitution. I remember that the member for Briggs asked a question and there were chuckles from the Government side of the House suggesting that the Opposition could be shown up for supporting the wrong side of the campaign. How the tables have been turned! As Federal President of the ALP, Mr Bannon knew that the questions would be defeated; he knew they were the wrong questions; and he knew that the people would not be deceived. I am amazed that he was not able to use his power and exercise his authority to stop a very misled and misguided Federal Government from going ahead with this.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** Let's hear your explanation about Victoria.

**Mr MEIER:** The honourable member mentions Victoria. Unfortunately I have limited time in which to speak, so that members from both sides can have a fair say during private members' time. However, I am happy to debate that issue at any other time. As members will notice, the effect of my motion is very clearly aimed at schools, in the first instance—the lack of money being spent on schools.

It is interesting that earlier this year the International Association of the Evaluation of Educational Achievement said that Australia's standards in science education have

slumped dramatically in the past decade. The association's findings show that Australia's education system is declining. Of course, we are all well aware of which Government is in power federally and in most States—although that will not be the case for much longer. In fact, the association said that Australia's plunging standards deserve further serious investigation by education and school authorities and that there are grounds for concern. Australia has dropped from third in 1970 to below the international average, in 1983, and performance by Australia's children has been condemned as being poor at primary level. The report outlines more damning facts about how our students in Australia are not performing at all well compared to the rest of the world. Surely some of the \$40 million-plus referendum outlay could have gone towards education.

I continually receive requests from the 29 schools in the electorate of Goyder for further funds to maintain those schools. The shadow Minister of Education, the Hon. Robert Lucas, visited the area only the other week to have a look at some of the key schools, and he certainly appreciates the problems that some of the 29 schools in my area are facing—let alone the many hundreds of schools in other areas. The Government would have been well advised to spend some of the \$40 million-plus on schools.

The second part of my motion refers to upgrading hospitals. We all know what has happened in the hospitals area. Thankfully, the former Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, was dropped from Cabinet and no longer holds the health portfolio.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Look at what we got in his place!

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, that is very true but, nevertheless, what a poor performance the Hon. Dr Cornwall gave this State. I have been amazed to see letters in the *Advertiser* saying that perhaps Dr Cornwall should be reinstated. However, one knows where they have come from—surely, from his own friends. He has got them writing to the paper, and we have seen Dr Cornwall in the corridors of this place, trying to get on with backbenchers, and saying, 'Come on, give me the vote next time.' For a long time he did not seem able to even say 'Hello' to me if we passed in the corridor, while suddenly we are now on a talking basis. However, I must not get personal, and I want to refer to the way our hospital system deteriorated so dramatically during the previous Minister's time in office.

*Mr Robertson interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Did the honourable member say that the former Minister has foot in mouth disease? It is interesting to hear a Labor backbencher say that about Dr Cornwall: it is not for me to say, but I guess the honourable member is probably right. Anyway, one aspect of health services in this State that has been mentioned so often concerns the deterioration of country health services. But there is much more to it than that. It is interesting that only recently the Australian Medical Association indicated that South Australia is facing a crisis in the management of its health care services.

I refer to comments made by the outgoing President of the Australian Medical Association, Dr L.L. Hoare. He claimed that there were 'deteriorating standards in public hospitals and decay in the State's health services'. He is in a position to know. He knew exactly what was going on, and he could see through the facades that Dr Cornwall was putting up all over the place. In fact, he made specific criticisms of former Health Minister Cornwall. Dr Hoare also said that policies generated by the Health Commission

and Dr Cornwall 'are not policies which have been developed in association with the AMA or the medical profession', and went on to detail aspects of Laura and Blyth Hospitals. He indicated that the Health Commission:

... had quietly pushed aside country and metropolitan doctors. So much of treating the sick and maintaining the health of the population would be left in the hands of social workers, community health workers, and family planning people, all of whom were barely trained.

That is the direction in which this Government is heading. It is an indictment particularly of the former Minister of Health, but also the present Minister unless he changes the situation quick smart. We have experienced hospital delays for many years and they are to continue. An article in the *Advertiser* of 1 September stated that a top level committee investigating waiting lists in South Australian public hospitals said that people will have to learn to live with those delays. As a member of the Liberal Party, I say that we should not have to learn to live with such excessive delays. The report, which provides a new perspective to the problem, states that it is not the number of people on the waiting lists for non-urgent surgery that is important but the time they spend waiting. It identifies 700 people who have had to wait 12 months for non-urgent surgery and says that this time is unacceptable. We would all have to agree with that.

The third main point in my motion refers to the lack of money spent on roads. How much of that \$40 million-plus could have been spent on South Australian roads, let alone on other roads in this country? Time will not permit me to go into full details in this area, but I urge members to heed the RAA advertisements currently being screened, aired and printed. We appreciate that approximately \$7 000 million is taken out by the Federal Government in taxes on fuel and crude oil, yet it will spend only \$1.245 million on road maintenance this year. In fact, spending has decreased by 25 per cent over the past three years and only one-fifth of the amount collected from motorists is spent on roads. It is a despicable situation because there are many fatalities and serious injuries on our roads. The Federal Government is quite happy to continue operating as it is, and I have not heard this State Government cry and scream out for more money. In fact, it is happy to see the present untenable situation continue.

The referendum itself was a reflection on the way the Hawke Labor Government has operated and on the way Labor Governments generally are prepared to be deceitful and not look after the best interests of the people. Given the classic example of a Labor Government spending over \$40 million on a wasted exercise, I do not want to hear the Premier or any other member opposite accuse members on this side of asking for items for their electorates and of therefore being big spenders. I will continue to push for services in my electorate to the value of \$44 million at least.

Mr ROBERTSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 18 August. Page 362.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support this Bill (introduced by the Independent member for Elizabeth) which sets out to define for the courts the levels at which penalties should apply for offences under the Act. The current law has evolved

without any clear direction or reasons as to why there should be three different categories of offences. The three categories are as follows: first, the offence of possession of small quantities for personal use, with the penalty of an expiation fee or a small fine; secondly, the small-scale dealer, for which the penalty is \$50 000 or 10 years imprisonment; and, thirdly, the large-scale trafficker, for which the penalty is \$500 000 or 25 years imprisonment. The practicalities are that nobody has been prosecuted for contravening the third category. Many offenders have been prosecuted, but that has always been for contravening the first or second categories.

Part of the problem relates to the interpretation of a 'small-scale dealer'. In his wisdom, the Minister of Health, or his department, arbitrarily defined the dividing line between a 'small-scale dealer' and a 'large-scale trafficker' as cultivation of 1 000 cannabis plants, possession of 100 kilograms of cannabis, or possession of 25 kilograms of cannabis resin. Members would know from press reports about the confiscation of plantations of marijuana that that dividing line would bring all offending persons into the large-scale trafficking area. However, many have been deemed to be small-scale dealers, even though the confiscated crops have a street value of \$1 million. I do not think that anybody could reasonably assume that, if a person is dealing in or growing plants worth \$1 million, they could be classified as a small-scale dealer.

This Bill proposes to amend the number of growing plants from 1 000 to 100. It would differentiate between a small-scale dealer and a large-scale trafficker. It is a relatively minor amendment, but I believe it is necessary and that it demonstrates to South Australians that this Parliament is prepared to take a stand on this issue and not to allow the present situation to go virtually unhindered. The fact that there have been a number of prosecutions which have been classified in the small-scale dealer category would clearly indicate that the people who deliberately breach the law know what they are doing because, so far, all prosecutions have been for plantations of less than 1 000 plants; in other words, they have been able to grow up to 999 plants and still be considered a small-scale dealer.

If the number of plants was reduced to 100, we would differentiate between the person who is growing marijuana for his personal use and the person who is dealing, and in turn between the small-scale dealer and the large-scale trafficker. I have pleasure in supporting this Bill. I believe it is a measure that the House should support in totality, and I trust that due consideration will be given to it along those lines.

Mr ROBERTSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House views with concern the performance of the Government in discouraging investment in and development of this State and notes specifically:

- (a) the enticement of entrepreneurs to spend \$2 million on a feasibility study for Jubilee Point;
- (b) the lack of action taken against building unions which have continually disrupted and damaged major construction projects;
- (c) the lack of action against dissident elements on the Australian submarine construction site, resulting in multi-million dollar contract losses to this State;
- (d) *ad hoc* policies on development which have left investors no clear operational guidelines and created a climate of great uncertainty;



- (e) encouragement of the Myer Remm development despite the likelihood of exorbitant building unions demands;
- (f) the closure of Beverley and Honeymoon uranium mines;
- (g) special benefits and assistance provided to enterprises of poor potential to the exclusion of other projects;
- (h) lack of expertise within the Government tendering system which has resulted in huge outflows of money interstate and overseas to the disadvantage of local firms; and
- (i) taxation practices which have acted as a disincentive to investment.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 553.)

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence):** I want to make quite clear from the outset that I am totally opposed to the motion moved by the member for Mitcham. To say that this Government is discouraging investment in, and development of, this State is outrageous, to say the least. Nothing could be further from the truth and the member for Mitcham knows that only too well.

The honourable member asks, 'What has really changed over the past 12 months or, indeed, over the past five years?' If the member for Mitcham cared to open his eyes he would see what has really changed. Significant construction development has occurred since this Government came to power in December 1982. Ever since the disastrous days of the Tonkin Government, which was a period of total inaction and stagnation, South Australia has gone ahead. The Tonkin Government set the State back many years; it was a period when we did not see one single construction crane pointing skywards—not one! Since then, however, the City of Adelaide skyline has changed, and people talk about this. Visitors and tourists have noticed the big changes and there have been many supporting articles and reports in the mass media on the great progress which Adelaide and this State is making.

It was not uncommon to see as many as 14 or more construction cranes pointing skywards where building construction was being developed, and we can still see many of those today. It is unfair of the honourable member to say that the inescapable fact is that Premier Bannon has failed to exercise leadership. No Premier of this State has worked harder or done more than Premier Bannon to encourage cooperation with the private sector.

The Premier has always claimed that much more can be developed and much more achieved by joint effort—by cooperating and working together with all sectors of the community, including local government, and there are ample examples of where this has happened. One of several that come readily to mind is the Lincoln Cove development, a magnificent development that was undertaken in conjunction with the Port Lincoln council and the local community. It is a world class facility and is of great credit to Port Lincoln, the local area and the State Government. Further examples are the tooling facility at GMH Woodville, the ASER development, the O-Bahn interchange development at Tea Tree Gully, and the recent Flinders Ranges development proposal. One could go on and on with many other examples of where a cooperative joint development of that nature has occurred.

Although South Australia continues to have a very low share of national retail sales and new motor vehicle registrations, other indicators are showing signs of significant improvement. Full-time employment has been increasing rapidly in 1988 and there has been strong growth in other indicators such as property transfers, energy sales and business telephone sales. The local economy will match the reasonably strong national growth rate in 1988-89 as the benefits of Roxby Downs, the submarine project and further major non-residential construction projects take effect. It is

not my intention to speak on all the items that were listed by the member for Mitcham as no doubt other members will want to take up specific issues.

With regard to the member's claim about the lack of action taken against building unions which have continually disrupted and damaged major construction projects, I inform him that the Government has contributed greatly towards developing strategies and solutions to problems within the building industry. After representation from the building unions and the Master Builders Association, the Government provided, through the Minister of Labour, money for the setting up of a panel of independent arbitrators within the industry to quickly resolve disputes.

The Minister is also in constant touch with the Master Builders Association and the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors and unions over issues relating to the building and construction industry. Two recent agreements involving the ABCWF, the BWIU, the Plasterers Federation, and the FEDFA should prevent any further demarcation disputes between those parties.

On the matter of the Myer-Remm development, according to Mr Merv Jackson, the Industrial Relations Manager, talks between the parties are progressing well and there is absolutely no substance to the allegations made by the member for Mitcham.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** That's normal.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Exactly. I received a letter dated 26 August this year from Mr T. R. Carroll, Assistant State Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union and Plasterers Federation of South Australia, referring to some of the criticisms levelled at that union by the member for Mitcham. The letter reads:

Dear Sir,

In reply to Mr Baker's statement re 'union antics on building sites', he said the lunacy had flexed its muscle again over manning of the State Bank site by demanding that a person be employed to hold a ladder while another person worked off of it. This principle in fact saved the erection of a scaffold, and was not promoted by the unions as it is deemed an unsafe practice. The stoppage quoted on the Pirie Street site has been exaggerated by Mr Baker, as there was no stoppage.

The matter of the threatened bans because unions wanted local material used just shows Mr Baker's concern for local manufacturers. In fact, because of the insistence by the union that local materials be used, the State Bank gave a grant for the setting up of a body to investigate the feasibility of producing a local tile which could suffice the requirements of the building industry not only in South Australia but elsewhere. The industry here is now in a position to do just that, and all reports show it will create more jobs in this section of the industry.

Our change towards overtime has only changed because of the amount of work that has been generated through the present State Government. As for his statement about the overtime, I suggest he reads the award provisions in respect of overtime; as previously stated the building industry is only in its present buoyant position because of Mr Bannon's ability to influence the right people to build and his goodwill with the union.

I note that the member for Mitcham recognises the superior industrial relations record that the Labor movement has developed in South Australia, and of course that is a big worry to the Opposition, which has no idea how to handle or manage industrial relations. The Liberals would dearly like it to be the other way: chaos and strikes. On the matter of lack of action against dissident elements on the Australian submarine construction site, resulting in multi-million dollar contract losses to this State, I can only advise the member that this allegation is pure bunk. No days have thus been lost on the submarine site due to industrial disputes; no contracts have been lost to this State. The construction site is progressing on time and, up until now, a good relationship has existed between all the parties. The member and the Opposition need have no doubt at all about the Premier's capacity to meet the challenges ahead.

There is every reason to expect that within the next five to 10 years Adelaide and its environs will become the place in Australia to live and work, and strong State leadership will continue under the present Government.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I support the motion. I wonder whether the honourable member who has just completed his remarks was either in South Australia or was permanently asleep during the time of the Tonkin Government; otherwise he would not have made such rash and irresponsible statements indicating that there was no development and no growth during the time of the Tonkin Government, because the situation is to the contrary. I remind him of the Stony Point development, which the Labor Party did its best to frustrate with all sorts of delaying tactics, and the Roxby Downs indenture, which has led to the development of the largest uranium, copper and gold mine in the world and has the potential to provide hundreds of millions of dollars in royalties, jobs and investment in this State for many years to come. Of course, there is the Hilton Hotel. Premier Dunstan spoke about an international hotel, election after election and actually did nothing. They are just three projects and, of course, there are many others.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** There's O-Bahn and Technology Park.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, the O-Bahn, which is one of the leading transport systems in the world, is operating efficiently and effectively as a result of a Liberal Government initiative. Technology Park (which I passed this morning) is another initiative of the Liberal Government.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** And the international airport.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, for years there was a kerfuffle about international airports, and it was the Tonkin Government which managed to convince Prime Minister Fraser that it was necessary to have direct access to the overseas tourist market. Therefore, it agreed to establish—

*The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Let me continue, because these are just a few of the important projects that come to mind. With his motion, the member for Mitcham has drawn to the attention of the House, and hopefully the Government, the difficulties that it has caused by its own actions; its failure to stand up to the unions; and the effect that its taxation policies and those of its Federal colleagues are having on future investment and on those people who have a desire to develop this State.

May I also point out to the honourable member that it was the Tonkin Government which negotiated successfully the winding up of that white elephant, the Monarto development—the city that never was. That involved some \$25 million.

*The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Members opposite have sold all the land for the north-south corridor, so we will have a bottleneck in the metropolitan area. I think that the honourable member ought to be very cautious in his criticism of the previous Liberal Government. There is one thing wrong with South Australia: it would be a far better place and there would be far more jobs if there had been many more Liberal Governments in the past 25 years in this State. That is a fact which cannot be disputed. With those few comments, I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Duigan:  
That this House:

- (a) affirms the principles of non-discrimination and integration embodied in the politically bipartisan approach to immigration and multiculturalism which has existed in Australia since the Whitlam Government and has been supported by successive Liberal and Labor Governments; and
- (b) calls upon the Federal parliamentary Liberal and National Parties to re-affirm previous commitment to these policies, and, further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament.

(Continued from 18 August. Page 368.)

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I move:

In paragraph (a) of the motion to strike out 'has existed in Australia since the Whitlam Government and'; and to strike out paragraph (b).

The reason for my amendment is that Liberal Party policy is and has been for a very long time both non-discriminatory and bipartisan. For example, it was the Holt and Fraser Liberal Governments which paved the way for increased non-European migration. That very non-European migration policy is currently at the contentious heart of the motion moved by the member for Adelaide. It was also the Malcolm Fraser Liberal Government and the Tonkin Liberal Government in South Australia during the years 1975 onwards at Federal level and 1979 onwards at State level which grasped firm hold of the idea of multiculturalism in this nation of ours and which promulgated the idea throughout the schools of Australia. The South Australian Education Department under my ministry—I take some credit for that—put out a national multicultural education kit, which was circulated throughout Government and non-government schools with some considerable success throughout Australia. It was also sought overseas as an example of how multicultural integration could be achieved. I recall sending a copy of the kit from the Education Department to the Queen of the Netherlands upon request.

The Liberal Party has no reason to hang its head on the issue of immigration. I ask members who listened to the mover's lengthy but somewhat repetitive address to recognise that this motion contains more than a small degree of political opportunism. One cannot really blame political Parties for that but I am quite sure that the general public would recognise both that opportunism and a high degree of cynicism in the honourable member's speech. It is like the old-fashioned bathing costumes which concealed far more than they revealed. That is so with the Australian Labor Party's immigration policy.

One has only to look at the document published by the Federal Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs entitled 'Points Test for Migrants: How the System Works'. I have a copy of edition No. 3 of January 1987. If members of this House have had experience of trying to assist applicants to migrate to Australia, they would realise the very substantial difference that the 1987 points scheme made to those applicants. I had some difficulty getting intelligent, educated, experienced workers from the United Kingdom into Australia under the old points scheme where 60 points were needed.

The new points scheme requires a total of 70 points, and I will give the House some idea of how difficult it is to score 70 points. Under the heading 'Employability' anyone who is immediately employable in a highly skilled, professional or technical occupation, as designated by the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations as one in which there are good employment prospects, can score 25 points. That is a little over one-third. Anyone with a sound and continuous employment experience requiring absolutely no training can score 20 points. Anyone requiring no training, but with limited employment experience, and anyone whose employment has been arranged by a sponsor at the



request of the overseas office—and this has to be confirmed by the Federal Government—can also score 15 points.

Under the heading 'Skills', recognised professional, technical or trade skills can score 20 points. Professional and technical trade skills which are not recognised can score 10 points. Clerical and administrative—semi-skilled—can score 10 points. Under the heading 'Education' there is a score of 20 points if one has completed tertiary studies; 15 points for completion of secondary studies; and 10 points for completion of the first part of secondary studies—that is, at least eight years of schooling. If one adds the 25 points for the top employability, 20 points for top skills and 20 points for top education, one gets a total score of 65. Obviously there must be some other criteria that would enable people of almost genius ability to come into Australia.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable member and I share a common bond. Obviously we both came into Australia with little other than native intelligence to back us. In fact, I have to admit that I am not sure how the member for Briggs managed to get into Australia. When I applied to immigrate in 1955 I was promptly informed by the interviewing officer in the United Kingdom that my lack of skill was certainly not required in Australia. I had to come to Australia as a nominated migrant. The only way I managed to get here with my high degree of competence—modesty forbids me to say more—was to be nominated by resident Australians.

If an applicant scores in the top three in each of those categories of employability, skill and education, he or she can score 65 points. The requirement to be accepted is 70 points. Therefore, of course, anyone applying for migration to Australia must have additional reasons for coming here. There is, therefore, an age criterion: anyone between 20 and 34 years of age—in the halcyon years of life—can score 15 points but anyone younger than 20, even a youngster with great skills, can only score 10 points. Anyone 45 years old or over scores absolutely zero.

So, Australia is extremely selective in the range of migrants that it is currently accepting. Anyone on the other side of the House who moves a motion of this nature and suggests that the Liberal Party is being in any way racially discriminatory is completely ignoring the fact that, for the vast majority of coloured people applying to migrate to Australia, the chance of scoring 70 points—in fact, the chance of even scoring 40 or 50 points—is just not there.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Do you think they are doing it for political reasons?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The member for Chaffey suggests that there may be a political motive behind this. I will develop that a little in the course of this debate. As I said, it is difficult even for an educated European with extreme fluency in the English language to pass. I have had a great deal of difficulty in obtaining permission from the Immigration Department for migrants from the United Kingdom, even upon appeal, to pass. In one case I had a migrant who scored just fewer than 60 points. Her relatives in Australia decided that they would become naturalised (which I did many years ago) and, upon her relatives becoming naturalised, her point score was increased to 70. Therefore, even the naturalisation of her relatives in Australia has not achieved a pass mark for her. In its wisdom, the Government is exercising considerable discretion, simply by means of the January 1987 point score, in preventing migrants from coming to Australia.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Which makes an absolute farce of their attack on the Liberal Party.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** It does make an absolute farce of the Government's motion and of the high degree of politicisation involved, given the Federal Government's attack on John Howard in Federal Parliament. The Government's own criteria militate very strongly against coloured migrants from overseas. If one has limited employment experience and one needs extensive training, on the ground of employability one scores absolutely zero; if one is unskilled, one scores absolutely zero; if one has fewer than eight years of schooling—and I would suggest that this applies to the vast majority of Asian and African migrants, as well as many South American migrants—again, one scores absolutely zero; and, as I said earlier, if one is younger than 20 years of age or older than 45, one scores absolutely zero.

So, the vast majority of people who are anxious to come to a country such as Australia, with its marvellous lifestyle—I think an unequalled lifestyle by world standards—would simply be left sitting on the fence looking enviously and anxiously inward. For that reason, if for no other, I ask members to support my amended motion, which simply calls for the continued bipartisan approach towards establishing a multicultural Australia.

But there are other reasons, too, which I would ask members to consider and to analyse. Inherent in the member for Adelaide's motion is an implication that the Australian Government should not really be exercising any great degree of control over the people who wish to migrate, that we should have virtually an open door policy. How many other countries in the world have such a policy? I ask members to consider the situation pertaining to Japan, one of our leading trading nations, a country which since the Second World War, along with Germany, another defeated nation, has emerged as one of the world's great trading nations.

Japan inculcates into its children and into its entire population the idea of Japanese supremacy and absolute superiority, a principle for which the former British colonists were condemned. However, of course, at this stage Japan does not have colonial ambitions in the sense of territorial aggrandisement. Instead, Japan is successful in the trading corridors of the world, and it has huge financial interests in Australia as well as in other nations. When I was in Britain and Europe in the past few months, I noticed that Japanese names were prominent in relation to developments that were going on.

How would one manage to get into Japan? I will not further enlarge on that: I simply ask members of the House to do their own research and to discover for themselves how easy or how difficult it would be to migrate and become a Japanese citizen. Consider China which, with its population of 1.2 billion, already has sufficient people to look after, to feed and clothe. I wonder how many Australians would find it relatively easy to migrate to China?

In relation to our closer neighbours, Indonesia, for example, has over 100 million people—how easy would it be to migrate to Indonesia? One should consider the situation in relation to Russia and the eastern bloc. I suggest that not only would one find it difficult to get into Russia as a migrant but one would find it very difficult to get out of the eastern bloc, for whatever reason.

Extremely tight and stringent regulations are applied. The Berlin wall is one very tangible example of how difficult migrants and immigrants find it to penetrate that barrier. It is more than just a piece of paper—it is a constructed barrier. The United Kingdom, after the Second World War, opened up its doors. I was born in the United Kingdom in 1930 and there were never any barriers to migration from Commonwealth countries—the huge Commonwealth of Nations. Britain had an open go policy. Anyone from the

Commonwealth could move into the United Kingdom. I recall migrants from Jamaica, the West Indies, Nigeria and a whole range of African colonies, the vast majority of which subsequently became independent and self-governing, but Britain did not close its doors until it reached the stage when 2 million to 3 million migrants were placing almost insoluble problems on Britain's doorstep.

Britain, which had long regarded itself as the land of the free, decided that no longer could it allow completely free migration and therefore imposed restrictions which currently obtain even upon Australians. A young fellow from Mount Gambier in the South-East only 18 months ago travelled to the United Kingdom with some \$8 000 to \$9 000 in his possession—plenty to live on for several months—and was hoping that for a short space of time he might be able to work in the United Kingdom with Honda as his family was associated with the Honda agency in the South-East.

Unwisely, in filling out the very small docket which all air travellers have to fill out upon arriving in a foreign country, he ticked the little spot where it said, 'I am hoping to find some work in the United Kingdom'. He was over the age of 28. He had made no provision to work in the United Kingdom before he left and, as soon as the United Kingdom officials saw the tick in the work box, they quite officiously decided that this young man was not for the United Kingdom, and that he was there to add to the already excessive unemployment problem there which at that stage was running at about 13 per cent (it is now down to 8 per cent, which is below Australia and South Australia). They decided simply that he could not stay, and they turned him straight around and sent him back to Australia. That is a very high degree of control over not only immigrants but visitors as well. This young man had plenty of money. He could have been sent to Europe to give him time to make another application to stay in Britain on holiday. However, they simply turned him around and sent him back.

I corresponded directly with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mrs Thatcher, and her Ministers and they responded by saying that they were sorry about the circumstances, but that they appreciated that this young man was going to the United Kingdom ostensibly to work because that is what he ticked on the immigration ticket. Had he simply ticked the holiday box the problem would not have arisen. The United Kingdom has every right and all the authority to turn people around and send them home. Mrs Thatcher reminded me in her response that Australia also has that right. If we see an undesirable migrant with questionable reasons for staying in Australia, Australian officials would take exactly the same approach. For that reason Mr Hawke, our Prime Minister, declined to offer me or the young man in Mount Gambier any assistance whatever. They said, 'Tough luck!' It was \$4 000 down the drain with no redress at all. I have personal experience of what happens in the United Kingdom and I will enlarge more on the situation.

Let us look at what happened in the United States of America. At the turn of the century America decided that it would encourage European migration. Its doors opened and people travelled from Europe by the boatload. The vast majority were impoverished and hoped for a new deal in this wonderful new world of America, which originally was colonised, as was Australia, by convicts from the United Kingdom. However, the United States decided that it wanted to develop the West, which was greatly in need of manpower, so it encouraged European migration.

In hindsight, the United States would claim that many of what in the 1920s were called the 'cesspits of Europe' (which is not a very nice term) were emptied into the United States. As a result, the United States received a criminal element which created massive problems and which gave rise to that desperate period in the 1930s when Al Capone held sway in Chicago and, despite alcohol and drug prohibition, the huge criminal consortia were all powerful.

I suppose that in hindsight the United States would look back to that period and say that it could have exercised greater control to the long-term benefit of that country. I do not need to enlarge upon that theme, but it simply highlights that, if anyone moves a motion asking an Australian Government to have virtually uncontrolled migration, they really ignore the historic world facts, and there are more to come. One only has to look at what I euphemistically call the recent Russian migration into Afghanistan. That was not a popular migration, because it was achieved by dint of very sophisticated and modern arms and the Afghanis, with relatively simple and primitive weapons, still did not completely capitulate.

**Mr Robertson:** They're making their own Stingers in the backyard.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Some of the Stingers would have come from sophisticated nations which are reputed to have supplied them through Pakistan. The leader of Pakistan recently died, so I will not enlarge upon his involvement but, in involving itself in a humanitarian way in the trials and tribulations of Afghanis, Pakistan also brought upon itself a great migration problem. Russians moved into Afghanistan and set up a Communist regime in Kabul, but the Afghanis, who did not want to be communised, fought in the hills and many moved into Pakistan where they established their own huge refugee camps, which were sustained in part by the Pakistan Government. However, Pakistan, which is finding it difficult to feed its own population, could ill afford to feed 2 or 3 million additional mouths. That is an illustration of another contemporary uncontrolled migration problem caused by one of the world's more sophisticated nations.

Post-war Europe experienced massive problems, simply because the German Government (the Third Reich) took people (who were not refugees) from all occupied Europe, which spread from the Russian boundaries to the Mediterranean, to the North Sea, and up to the Baltic and the North Atlantic. The Third Reich took able bodied men, women and children and placed them in factories which manufactured munitions and war supplies for the German Government. At the end of the war, these people were Stateless. They had no passports or homes of their own to go to.

The communist regime and the western allies divided Europe, in a manner that I now find quite lamentable, making it impossible for people with fairly fixed political affiliations to get back to their homelands. Many Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Balts, Yugoslavs, Serbians and Croatians fled to this wonderful country to escape the political persecution that they felt sure would fall upon them had they tried to return to their homelands. That is one of the things that makes Australia such a wonderful country.

Cambodia and Vietnam are contemporary countries with forms of migration problems still unresolved. They are aggressor nations, and there is massive deprivation and movement of people who wish to escape the trials, tribulations, terrors and horrors of their land—the physical disabilities associated with war. Yet a member of this House for, I suggest, an entirely political reason has moved this motion. He is not suggesting that any Australian would

want to create circumstances even 1 per cent approaching the problems that are prevalent in the rest of the world.

I have not mentioned the Scots migration into Northern Ireland and the religious problems which have been prevalent there and which still cause terrible crimes to be committed. Yet, you can draw all these situations into the same ambit claim and say that Australia is a very fortunate nation; it is far removed from that. Both Liberal and Labor Governments have, for the past few decades, been strongly supportive of all migrants arriving, and wishing to settle, in Australia. From a personal point I draw members' attention to Mount Gambier. Prior to 1955 and my arrival in Mount Gambier, where I was made very welcome, I lived in a huge industrial city which was bombed during the war. I saw a better life in a country such as this, isolated (as it would seem in the Southern Hemisphere) from the troubles experienced by the western nations.

**Mr Hamilton:** It's a good place.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The member for Albert Park derives from Mount Gambier and would have a close personal knowledge of the type of people to which I refer. Mount Gambier was one of those places to which people from Europe—English, Scots, Welsh (who had somewhat of a possessive interest in Australia, having sent the first convicts over here, although they had nothing to be proud of I might add), French, Germans, Dutch, Yugoslavs, and Italians (who formed the largest single migrant group in the South-East)—came in droves.

I am a member of the Austra-Italian and German Clubs in Mount Gambier. I have very close friends in the Greek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Serbian, Croatian, Slavs generally and Macedonian communities. The Mount Gambier community is a marvellous example that I would hold up for the rest of Australia to emulate. These people came to the South-East; they worked, played and established sporting and cultural organisations. They assimilated—and this is a very important point from the Liberal point of view—wonderfully well into the Australian community to the extent that, upon researching migrant figures only last week (figures that the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics supplied to all members of the House as part of its electorate information), I found that my own view of Mount Gambier, as a sort of polyglot of nations with a 50 per cent migrant and 50 per cent native Australian community, was greatly distorted.

The Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics indicates that no-one in the Mount Gambier district is unable to speak English or Australian and that only 11 per cent of the present population of Mount Gambier was born overseas. This simply highlights the fact that migration and integration and the acceptance of Australian customs and assimilation into the Australian way of life can do a great deal to establish a marvellous community. As I said, I will hold Mount Gambier up as a mirror for the rest of Australia to look into with the words 'multicultural Australia' in mind.

The South-East is a great district and the people there have assimilated extremely well. When asked to address naturalisation celebrations, which are presided over by the mayor several times a year in the Mount Gambier Town Hall, I always stress that Australia, by accepting migrants into its community as Australians, acknowledges a number of things. One is that in deciding to become naturalised Australians—and I would encourage everyone who has migrated to become a naturalised Australian—you do not have to relinquish your roots or your homeland. In fact, over the years a vast number of migrants have brought so

much to enrich our way of life. They have brought their cultural pastimes, sport, foods, national days and languages.

Our language is virtually an enrichment of languages because half of the English language has that hard, harsh, teutonic derivation from the north—that is, German, Dutch, Danish and Scandinavian—and the other half is a soft, romantic derivation—that is, Greek, Latin, Italian, French and Spanish. Many of our swear-words are of harder, harsher four letter Anglo-Saxon and teutonic origin and the euphemisms, the softer terms for sexual parts or any other swear-word, come from what was regarded as the more cultural part of Europe—the south.

**The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder:** You have done a lot of research on this.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I have not done any research—it is part of my historical background. As the honourable member can see, I am not reading from notes—I am speaking from the heart. I am essentially a person of mixed origin—I have a little bit of Welsh, a lot of English and I am not sure what else my antecedents were up to. However, I appreciate very much having been allowed to come into Australia to mix with all the other migrants who come here, particularly in the post-war period. I suggest that multiculturalism, assimilation into Australia and the acceptance of Australia as a wonderful way of life are as much part of Liberal Party philosophy as they are of Labor Party philosophy.

Finally, I advise members to read the Liberal Party policy—a copy of which I have available at no cost—to see that multiculturalism is an accepted thing and there is absolutely no racial bias with respect to the acceptance of migrants into Australia. The Liberal Party policy has far fewer barriers than the document entitled 'The Points System', which I was handed in the past two weeks by the Department of Immigration. This document, of its own accord, presents a far greater barrier to immigration into Australia by the under-privileged nations of the world than does any Liberal Party policy.

**Mr MEIER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

## QUESTION

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

## SMALL BUSINESS

In reply to the **Hon. R.G. PAYNE** (Mitchell) 9 August.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Small Business Corporation took the initiative of establishing a formal network with Corporate Affairs, in order that people starting in business are made aware of the corporation and the services provided. The objective is to capture the attention of people starting out to ensure they get started on the right foot.

Regrettably, very few people seek the assistance of the corporation after their mandatory visit to Corporate Affairs. Studies show that many people starting out in business are unaware of the planning, financial control and other management tasks required of them. They are equally unaware of the statutory requirements. This 'unrecognised management incompetence' is the root cause of most business

failures and closures, and it persists despite the effort of the Government and the corporation.

People starting out in business do not know that they do not know what is required of them; they drift into business and in many cases into financial distress without any warning whatsoever. The State Government has instituted several initiatives aimed at improving business awareness, and is currently examining a proposal aimed at further tackling the issue raised by the member.

#### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—  
Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1987-88.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on questions, I advise that the Premier will today answer questions that would normally be directed to the Minister of Emergency Services, who is absent; that the Minister of Education will answer questions for the Minister for Environment and Planning in that Minister's absence; that the Minister of Transport will answer questions that would be directed to the Minister of Health and Minister of Correctional Services; and that the Minister of Housing and Construction will answer questions that would be directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Recreation and Sport.

#### 5AA BOARD

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Premier confirm that a former Premier, Mr Des Corcoran, has been asked to resign from the board of 5AA but has refused to do so and will he say what action the Government intends to take over this impasse? Mr Corcoran was asked to resign in a letter dated 26 September. The request followed an admission by Mr Corcoran to the board on 13 September that he had made an improper disclosure of confidential board information relating to negotiations 5AA was conducting with Mr Ken Cunningham. The negotiations related to an offer which had been made to Mr Cunningham for a three year \$400 000 contract to transfer to 5AA. As a result of Mr Corcoran's disclosure, the negotiations were discontinued. At the 5AA board meeting on Tuesday of this week, Mr Corcoran refused to resign. The matter was referred to the board of the Totalizator Agency Board of which Mr Corcoran also is a member. I have been informed that this did not resolve the matter and that the TAB Board decided to refer it to the Government.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** If that was the situation, the reference would have been made to the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Mr Mayes) and, as he has not reported on the issue, I would assume that he has it under consideration. I will see that he gets a report.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable member for Briggs.

#### NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** Can the Premier report on progress in securing a National Crime Authority office in the State

following reports that the Federal Justice Minister (Senator Tate) did not see a need for an office here because of the NCA's heavy workload?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I thank the honourable member for his question because I was concerned to read that Senator Tate was saying that there was no need, in that sense impliedly suggesting that there was probably not much point in the approach that was being made. In fact, however, I understand from my colleague the Attorney-General, who spoke to Senator Tate, that the Senator did not in fact say that there was no need. Indeed, if one reads on in the press report that I saw, Senator Tate was talking about keeping at arm's length from negotiations and suggesting that contact should be made with Mr Justice Stewart, and so on. That is an accurate reflection of Senator Tate's position. In other words, the Attorney-General approached Senator Tate and the Senator suggested that the best thing would be for the South Australian Government to have in-depth discussions with the NCA.

Obviously, a number of practical and other matters are to be resolved, one of which concerns resources. It has already been stated that, in the event that the NCA established an office here, obviously the South Australian Government would be making a contribution to that, but the extent of that and the need for that would have to be part of those negotiations.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIAL LAWS

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Can the Minister of Labour say whether he had Cabinet approval to draft a Bill to make major changes to South Australia's industrial laws and does he expect Cabinet endorsement for his position that there will be no compromise on the Bill that has been drawn up and circulated to employers?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** No Bill has been drawn up and circulated to employers but there are draft Bills around. Members opposite who have been members of Cabinet and have been in Government would understand the difference. Perhaps it is their absence from Government that has led them to misunderstand the difference. Until such time as Cabinet approves a document and I introduce it into this House, it is not a Bill; it is a draft document. The member for Culance would understand that. I do not even know which copy he has because quite a few have been floating around.

#### RAILWAY PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** Can the Minister of Transport say whether drivers of metropolitan STA trains are instructed to announce upcoming stops over the public address system in trains that have such a system fitted such as the class 2 000 and 3 000 trains? I was recently contacted by a local resident who has moved to Adelaide from Sydney. She reported to me that a combination of reflective windows on the class 2 000 and 3 000 trains and graffiti on some suburban stations had made some signage especially difficult to read. She told me that she had great difficulty finding Hove, although she did notice one station labelled 'Hovel'. The fact that the final 'l' had been added to the word Hove became obvious several days later when an initial 's' had been added and 'Hovel' became 'Shovel'. It was suggested to me that more extensive use of the PA system might alleviate some of the anxiety caused by a combination of reflective windows and graffiti.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The STA is concerned about the extent of graffiti on our rail system. Rail systems seem to be the focus of graffiti artists and in some parts of the world graffiti artists place themselves at considerable risk when pursuing their aim which is to destroy the environment in which commuters are entitled to travel.

As I understand it, a public address system is fitted to the class 2 000 and the new class 3 000 rail cars and the drivers are required to announce the stations that the rail car is approaching. I have had some complaints about the quality of the PA system at times. I understand that on some rail cars the PA system has a bit of crackling in it and its sound is not as clear as it might otherwise be.

The point the honourable member makes is one of which the authority is well aware, that is, that it is sometimes difficult for commuters to identify stations, not only because of graffiti (and he has pointed out how 'Hove' became 'Hovel' and then 'Shovel'), but because of reflective material on the windows which is designed to reduce the glare and so make travelling in the rail cars more comfortable. The authority is trying to overcome the effects of graffiti station by station in its attempts to paint over or to obliterate the work of the graffiti artists. That has not been totally successful, but it is my view that there has been some success and the STA will continue to investigate ways of overcoming that problem.

The direct answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes'; the drivers of rail cars are required to announce the approaching station and I understand that they do that. However, we have investigated the costs involved in installing public address systems in the old red hens and it has been determined that the cost would argue against such action. The Government and the State Transport Authority intend to gradually move to more modern rail cars so that Adelaide commuters have an improved service from the capital stock. That is expensive and will take some time. The decision is we will not install public address systems in the red hens. However, I do not think the red hens have the same problems with reflective glass as do the series 2 000 and 3 000 stock, so the approaching station is more easily identified.

#### SAA BOARD

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I will redirect my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Will the Minister confirm that former Premier, Mr Des Corcoran, has been—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Unfortunately, the Chair must rule the question out of order because it is a repetition of a previous question.

**Mr INGERSON:** Can I not ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Unfortunately, Standing Orders limit the capacity of the Chair to agree to that proposal. The question has already been asked.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Mr Speaker, I am asking a supplementary question—

**The SPEAKER:** The phraseology used by the honourable member was pretty well identical to that used when he directed the same question to the Premier. The Standing Orders do not permit the same question being asked twice. There may be other ways in which—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is trying to be helpful. There might be ways in which the honourable member can

ask a question seeking the same sort of information in a different way later in Question Time. The honourable member for Adelaide. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question has been ruled out of order.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not going to ask the same question.

**The SPEAKER:** And I have called the member for Adelaide.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I thought you were calling me to ask a question because it was our turn.

**The SPEAKER:** No. When the honourable Deputy Leader rose to his feet, the Chair assumed he was taking a point of order. The honourable member for Adelaide.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, I will take a point of order. How can you rule, Mr Speaker, that the question is the same as the last one when the honourable member has uttered only three words of it?

**The SPEAKER:** The amount of phraseology used by the honourable member for Bragg was sufficient for the Chair to reach that conclusion. The honourable member for Adelaide.

#### FROZEN FOOD CONTRACTS

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** I direct a question to the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister seen the September issue of the *Link* disability journal and, in particular, the lead article entitled 'Frozen food fiasco' in which allegations of intellectually disabled people being 'taken for a ride' are made? Will the Minister ensure that these allegations are fully investigated and that a copy of the report of those investigations is sent to the editor of the journal? The September edition of the *Link* disability journal refers to a salesman from a freezer company offering for sale to intellectually disabled people a 12-month food package. The difficulty has arisen because of the problems that some disabled people have experienced in being able to either read or understand the full implications of the contract that they have been asked to sign.

The article concludes by noting that many of the customers making the complaints about the service they were being offered worked in sheltered workshops or were on pensions, and were simply unable to meet many of the repayments involved in the contract they had entered into.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for bringing to the attention of the House these most disconcerting facts. I understand that the ABC television program *The Investigators* has examined the activities of this organisation and referred to the authorities the facts it has discovered. It is particularly upsetting when a group of very vulnerable people in the community who require home deliveries of essential foodstuffs are subject to alleged unscrupulous trading, and the Department of Consumer Affairs, I am sure, will investigate thoroughly the activities of this organisation in this State and undertake whatever action is necessary to bring about fair trading in this area. I will certainly have the matter referred to my colleague for his investigation and subsequent report to the House.

#### YATALA PRISON ALLEGATIONS

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** My question is directed to the Premier. Is the Government aware of serious allegations

made today by a prison officer about the running of Yatala Labour Prison, is the Government having those allegations investigated and, if so, by whom? Will he give a commitment to make the result of those investigations public? On radio station 5DN this morning, a spokesman for the Prison Officers Association, Mr Bill Trevorror, alleged that convicted murderer, Bevan Spencer von Einem, and associates of von Einem, virtually run the prison and pass inmates from cell to cell for sex. I quote from an interview with Mr Trevorror referring to von Einem:

He's got a very comfortable cell, works a minimal period of time during the day, if you call it work, has everything in his cell you could possibly wish for, he has a very comfortably appointed cell and he swaps and changes cell mates as he wishes.

Regulations under the Correctional Services Act prohibit any prisoner from engaging in any act of sexual intercourse with another prisoner. Further, section 33 of the Correctional Services Act requires the prison management to monitor money and other personal items von Einem may be receiving from outside, and today's allegations raise the need for an investigation of this matter as well as to determine whether von Einem is receiving inducements to keep quiet.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have had those statements brought to my attention, and the Minister of Correctional Services responded to some of those matters in a radio interview today. Since then, of course, the matters have been published in the *News*. They are of very grave concern. I am surprised at the source of these statements because, as I understand it, Mr Trevorror is a representative of the prison officers. What he is really saying is that the prison officers are condoning or are actively involved in breaches of regulations, which is a pretty grave allegation to level at one's own members.

Apart from any questions one might ask of Mr Trevorror—and I think that it is very important that those questions are asked—I would think that the members of the union, the prison officers charged with carrying out the various regulations and the management of prisons, should feel very concerned that these things are being said. If they are happening, it is pretty outrageous. The timing of this is also strange, because, as I read Mr Trevorror's own statement, some of these things have been going on for some time.

The prisoner in question, von Einem, has been in prison for some time and, apparently, these breaches of prison regulations and criminal activities, I think they could be called, have been going on. If Mr Trevorror has been aware of this, why has he not spoken up, lodged complaints or drawn the matter to the attention of prison authorities, the police or the Minister?

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** He is doing it now.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** He is doing it now, and what I find—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** — surprising about the timing is that, the day before these allegations were made, a report was tabled in this Parliament—yesterday—from the Ombudsman, which made certain criticisms of the role prison officers were playing. One might perhaps draw the conclusion that Mr Trevorror's speaking out in this way today might in some way be a diversion from those criticisms that have been lodged by the Ombudsman. Whether or not that is the case, they are extremely grave allegations. If this behaviour is occurring, it is totally unacceptable. I understand that the Minister intends to request that the police interview Mr Trevorror so that they can get some

detailed and factual statements from him, the basis of the allegations, and we will try to clear up the matter.

## BUSINESS MIGRATION

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology tell the House whether he has been made aware of any adverse impact on South Australia's efforts to encourage business migration from Asia following the Federal Liberal Party/National Party coalition's change in its immigration stance? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House, I seek to briefly explain the question.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is the third occasion during this sitting that we have heard a question like this asked of the Government and, given your previous rulings on the matter, I ask you to rule it out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Hartley to bring up the wording of the question to the Chair so that I can verify whether or not it is repetition of a question asked some time ago—of which I do not have instant recall. A further opportunity to ask the question may be provided later in Question Time. I point out to members that in doing this I am not ruling the question out of order: what we are proceeding with at the moment is the possibility of a delayed ruling that it is out of order or a ruling that it is in order, which is a different thing from just ruling a question out of order at this stage.

## 5AA BOARD

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport received a report from the Chairman of the TAB, following a meeting of the board this week which discussed a request by the board of 5AA for the resignation of Mr Des Corcoran, and what action does the Minister intend to take? If he has received no such report, is he aware of the decision of the board of 5AA to seek Mr Corcoran's resignation, and has he discussed this matter with the Premier or Mr Corcoran?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The answer is 'No' to both questions. In relation to the allegation about Mr Corcoran, I have referred the matter to the Chairman of the TAB. I have not received a response at this point in time. The matter has been raised with Crown Law. I have discussed the matter and the basis of the allegation that has been made, and I am awaiting a response from the TAB.

## ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology say what his expectations are in relation to future production and investment in engineering construction projects in South Australia? Is the recent announcement of the dramatic rate of expansion in the manufacturing sector being reflected in plans for a productive investment in new buildings, plant and equipment in this State?

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is certainly true that in the past few days there have been more national reports of the resurgence of manufacturing in this State, and also in respect of the level of investment in non-residential and engineering construction. I might say that the two latest figures that need to be added to the impressive list to date, which



indicate that that turnaround is starting to occur, and that resurgence is starting to take place, come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Those figures show that spending on non-residential buildings in South Australia was 31 per cent higher in 1987-88 as compared with 1986-87. The subgroup figures that relate to this indicate that engineering and construction projects in South Australia rose by 14.6 per cent in the June quarter and that at the end of 1987-88 the value of work yet to be done in South Australia was a massive \$288 million—fully 47 per cent above the figure of a year earlier.

That is reflected by similar findings in the Westpac/CAI September quarterly survey on industrial trends which provided an excellent assessment of manufacturing output but showed also a 35 per cent increase in expenditure on engineering plant and machinery—clearly indicating that this turnaround is taking place.

The reason I was a few moments late in Question Time, for which I apologise to all members of this House, was that I was present at ROH presenting it with its second Austrade export award following on its receipt of the State Bank export award for this year. It is one of the contestants in the bicentennial export awards to be given in Brisbane later this month. That company, which is now ranked as one of the top five alloy wheel makers in the world, has a very impressive export record behind it. It anticipates that its exports, valued this year at \$17 million, will go up to \$30 million next year. Its exports are going not to one or two companies but to a wide range of companies and countries.

It presently exports to the United States, Japan, China and Thailand, and it is investigating European markets. The companies which purchase its products include the Harley Davidson motor cycle group in the United States, the Ford Motor Company, Nissan, Chinese automobile manufacturers, Mitsubishi, and a number of others—a very impressive record indeed, justly earning it its second Austrade award and the 1988 State Bank export award and, it is hoped, also earning it a bicentennial award in Brisbane later this month.

#### POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I address my question to the Premier. In view of the fact that the Government will ask the police to interview a prison officer (Mr Trevorrow) about serious allegations he has made concerning the administration at Yatala Labour Prison, will the Government also ask the police to interview the Federal Minister, Mr Duncan, concerning equally serious allegations he has made about corruption in the Police Force?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would have thought that, if there were cause to do that, that would be followed up as a matter of course. As I think I said in the House the other day—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Let me correct a misapprehension on the part of members of the Opposition. We are not instructing the police to do anything. I hope that I have not been misinterpreted in the case of Mr Trevorrow. We cannot instruct the police; we can ask them to do something. In relation to Mr Duncan, no, I do not intend to ask the police to take any action. As I understand it, and as I said in answer to a question in this place, what Mr Duncan is talking about was some historical situation, involving issues that he had raised in 1981-82. If in fact there is new and better information—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** In response to that interjection, I re-express our confidence in the Police Commissioner. We are certainly not going to take further action on what Mr Duncan has said because it does not warrant it.

**The SPEAKER:** The question previously asked by the honourable member for Hartley, on further examination, is out of order as being repetition in substance of a question already asked. The honourable member for Newland.

#### ROCK MUSIC INDUSTRY

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** Can the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the House of any progress in discussions with his Federal colleague to promote and develop the rock music industry and its export potential? In November last year I asked about means of building on the talents of young people musically and increasing the State's share of the rock music industry. I understood that negotiations and discussions were to take place with our Federal colleagues.

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this matter, which has the capacity to generate very large export revenues for the country, much to the mirth of the member for Mitcham, who seems not to care about the potential of this particular export industry. I do not believe that it is appropriate for members of this House to cast their own personal value judgments on the merits of various export industries. If such industries are bringing back legitimate revenue to this country we should be pleased about that and, if they are increasing the legitimate revenue of this country, we ought to be very pleased about that and want to support it, unlike the attitude evidenced by the mirth of the member for Mitcham.

As to the honourable member's question, a significant amount of work has taken place and new developments have been achieved. In Sydney recently the Federal Minister (John Dawkins) announced the formation of Export Music Australia Limited (EMA), which has been established by Australia's key music industry bodies. The initiative for the formation and incorporation of EMA has resulted from work carried out by the former rock music industry export panel of Austrade which sought to promote the export potential of this industry. That panel had among its achievements the production of an export guide for Australian music, industry workshops in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth, and assistance with the publication of an Australian music industry directory.

That panel has also produced a pilot video for the North American cable television network and, as I say, brought about the establishment of EMA. EMA is an incorporated company bringing together the following participants: the Australasian Mechanical Copyright Owners Society Limited; the Australian Record Industry Association; and the Australasian Performing Rights Association Limited. That body is looking to increasing the export of Australian rock music overseas and to ensuring that a greater proportion of Australian originated music is in other products exported overseas, where they contain musical elements.

It will participate in the MIDEM Fair to be held in Cannes next January and in the new music seminar to be held in New York next July and annually thereafter. It is also planning an official international marketing seminar to be held in Sydney in October this year. This is something that is supported by Austrade and by the music industry at

large, and I encourage South Australians involved in the rock music industry to take advantage of these opportunities and to see what export markets are available. The international market in rock music runs into many hundreds of millions of dollars and there is no reason why the talents of Australians should not be involved, bringing back those dollars for Australia, even though the member for Mitcham would not seem to care.

#### NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles):** Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government has yet made a formal request for the establishment of a National Crime Authority office in Adelaide? I understand that the NCA can consider this matter only after it is placed on the agenda of the inter-governmental committee on the NCA, but that this action has not yet been taken. In an answer in Federal Parliament last Friday, the day after the Attorney-General claimed that the South Australian Government had invited the NCA to open an Adelaide office, Senator Tate confirmed that the matter had not at that stage been raised with the authority and that there had been only preliminary discussions with him about it.

The establishment of an NCA office in Adelaide was first proposed by Senator Hill in May, more than four months ago. On a number of occasions, the South Australian Government dismissed the proposal, the Deputy Premier saying as recently as 19 September in the *News* that Senator Hill's statements were 'getting boring by repetition'. Last Thursday, the Attorney-General announced the Government's change of mind, 10 weeks after receiving the NCA report on alleged corruption. Apparently, however, nothing formal has yet been done about it.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member should have listened to answers given by the Deputy Premier to a question about the Government's change of mind on this matter the other day. However, I will go through the sequence of events and that will answer the question entirely. It is correct that, the NCA having recommended the establishment of an anti-corruption unit, the Government decided that that was the approach to follow. The first step in doing that was to establish the committee that was announced by the Attorney-General and the Minister of Emergency Services. They were assisted by an officers group, which then commenced work on a review of the literature, the preparation of papers, and so on, necessary to move into the stage of recommendations on an anti-corruption unit.

In the course of that, visits and discussions were also held with the Queensland Commissioner (Mr Fitzgerald), Mr Justice Stewart, the NCA and others involved in this area. After receiving a preliminary report from the officers' group the committee decided that, rather than pick up the NCA recommendation to establish an anti-corruption unit, it would be better to pursue the concept of an NCA office in Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That's fine; Senator Hill had been advocating it. It should be remembered that we were basing our approach on what the NCA had recommended, and it had not recommended an office in Adelaide—that was Senator Hill. The NCA said that it would be best handled by an anti-corruption unit. We thought that an NCA office would be the best approach, largely because of this question of coercive powers and the fact that the NCA has such powers. So that decision was made.

In the week before the Attorney-General announced the establishment of the NCA office in Adelaide, he approached

the responsible Federal Minister, Senator Tate, and indicated that we would like to see an NCA office established here. The Attorney wanted to gauge Senator Tate's reaction and get his advice on how best this matter might be approached. I have already covered Senator Tate's reaction in reply to a question from the member for Briggs, and Senator Tate is on record today explaining his reaction.

Discussions are now proceeding at NCA level with respect to such things as resources practicalities, and so on. The intergovernmental committee of the NCA meets again in late November and obviously the matter will be on the agenda if discussions are at a satisfactory point. I sincerely hope they will be because there is some degree of urgency in this matter.

#### HAPPY VALLEY WATER FILTRATION PLANT

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** Can the Minister of Water Resources describe what progress has been made on the construction of the Happy Valley water filtration plant, together with details of the contract to be let for this most important filtration plant in our network?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question. A \$1 million contract has been let to cover and line a filtered water storage tank at the Happy Valley water filtration plant. This contract for the supply and installation of Australia's largest floating membrane cover and liner has been awarded to Pacific Lining Company Australia. Stage I of the \$87 million Happy Valley water filtration plant will be commissioned at the end of 1989.

To give members some idea of the magnitude of this project I will briefly describe these filtration tanks. The south filtered water tank is the first of two tanks to be equipped. Each tank is about the size of the Adelaide Oval and when full each will hold 100 megalitres of filtered water. The tanks, which will have a cover and will be lined with synthetic rubber liner have already been used successfully by the E&WS for the Wattle Park service reservoir. The application of this modern technology greatly reduces the costs, compared with conventional steel and concrete tank structures. The work on this particular project is expected to commence on the site in December this year and should be completed by next April.

#### POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** My question is directed to the Premier. How will allegations relating to corruption made yesterday by the Leader of the Democrats in another place be investigated? If they are to be investigated by the police, which section of the force will be involved, given that an anti-corruption unit has yet to be established, and is it the Government's intention to ask the National Crime Authority to investigate the allegations?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The allegations made by Mr Gilfillan were in the context of his introduction of a Bill which will obviously be debated in the Legislative Council in due course. As I understand it, the Police Commissioner has said that he would like to take up matters raised by Mr Gilfillan and no doubt will set in train some approach to Mr Gilfillan to in fact elicit information so that proper follow-up action may take place. At this stage, of course, there is no anti-corruption unit, NCA office or other means whereby this could be handled except by the Police Commissioner taking it up directly. Obviously when the proper

mechanism is in place, this is the sort of material that could be referred to it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction to order. I call the Deputy Leader to order. The honourable member for Hartley.

#### MIGRATION CONSULTANTS CONFERENCE

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology inform the House of the benefits associated with holding the first national conference of the Australian Migration Consultants Association in Adelaide tomorrow?

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question and for his doggedness in pursuing this matter because it is very important that tomorrow the first national conference of Australian migration consultants is to be held in Adelaide. The official dinner is being held tonight. The fact that it is being held in Adelaide is a result of pressure from South Australian based business migration consultants. They encouraged the association to hold its conference in this State because they were concerned, as I hope we all are, to see that South Australia gets the maximum opportunities out of business migration to this country. Indeed, Senator Ray, the Federal Minister for Immigration, will be present at the official dinner tonight and I know that a number of viewpoints will be expressed to him as to how we can encourage more opportunities for the smaller population States of Australia to get their best return from business migration.

Indeed, I believe that delegates are hoping that Senator Ray can offer some positive directions that we can follow to make sure that we get our fair share. It is pleasing to note that both sides of this House seem to be agreed that it is important that we increase our business migration intake. I certainly hope that, if any members of the Opposition are present tonight, they will indicate that. If they are not to attend tonight, I will certainly be happy to convey the message on their behalf that they do not support and in fact dump John Howard and his policies. Since the last time this matter was raised in the House we have seen new matters of concern. I raise them for the information of all members in this place. The attempt by members opposite to not hear this should be of concern to all of us. There has been a drop in the level of interest in Australia as a destination—

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order. Sir. Given the Minister's remarks, I refer to Erskine May 20th edition, page 345 which states:

An answer should be confined to the points contained in the question with such explanation only as renders the answer intelligible.

The Minister is again using a question, as have a number of Ministers over a period, to do a bit of grandstanding. I ask that it be ruled out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I understand that the very reference in Erskine May to which the honourable member for Mitcham has drawn attention goes on to state that Ministers are allowed a certain degree of latitude in their interpretation of that. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** Dealing with the point of the national conference, if it is to be held here, there would be no need to hold a national conference merely for the purpose of people getting to know each other. The reason why a national conference would be held is to address the issues facing this country with respect to business migration.

One of those issues is the attitude or posture Australia is seen to have in other countries as a result of the comments of people like John Howard and John Stone. That concern is starting to filter through in the level of inquiries which business migration consultants overseas are receiving with respect to Australia.

The Department of State Development and Technology has reported a 30 per cent to 40 per cent drop in the level of interest in Australia—not South Australia, but Australia—as a country of destination. Those who would have come to Australia are now opting for New Zealand or Canada. That is legitimately the concern of business migration consultants and a matter they will wish to discuss at their business migration consultants' conference tomorrow. Similarly, I remind members that last weekend's *Australian* quoted the leading banks as saying that there had been a dramatic drop in the inflow of investment funds being transferred from Asia to Australia. A significant part of that would be the level of investment funds coming from business migration.

In November I plan to go to Hong Kong and Malaysia to put South Australia's viewpoint with respect to South Australia as a destination for business migration to help counteract the sort of attitude being portrayed by people on the other side of the House in the Federal arena. I repeat the offer I made: I am very happy to take the message from all members of this House to tonight's dinner guests that we support business migration in this State, that all sides of the House support it, and that all sides of the House utterly reject John Howard's and the Federal Opposition's attempts to stem business migration to this country.

#### POLICE CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Following an answer to a question yesterday which revealed that police have not questioned the former head of the Drug Squad (Mr Moyse) since his imprisonment to determine whether he can provide information about possible corrupt activities involving other police officers, will the Premier explain why Mr Moyse has not been questioned, particularly in view of the Premier's own prediction, reported in the *News* of 5 August, that:

More court cases and charges would follow from the conviction of Moyse.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not aware of this statement to which the honourable member refers, that Mr Moyse has not been questioned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know whether or not he has been questioned: surely that would be a matter for police procedure. If the police believe—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:**—there is something useful in questioning him, they will do so.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** What are you running away from?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member asks what I am running away from: I would like to know what I am running towards.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** My response to the interjection is as irrelevant as the interjection. What I would like to ask members of the Opposition is, 'Are they seriously trying to suggest that we should be instructing the police in how they

should conduct their operations, whom they should be questioning and how? I seem to remember that not so long ago—approximately 10 years, which is not very long in political memory—members of this very same Opposition, in which the honourable member who asked the question was involved, were absolutely outraged at any suggestion that the Government should interfere with, direct or run the operations of the police. What has happened to change this?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I would like to know what has happened to change this. All I can say is that, if it is appropriate that Mr Moyses be further questioned, that judgment will be made by the police and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction and the member for Mount Gambier to order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** If the NCA is interested in further questioning Mr Moyses, no doubt it will further question him. The Government will not direct the police in this issue, and I see no reason why we should.

#### COMMUNITY TENANCY SCHEME

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say how many properties are leased for community purposes under the community tenancy scheme, and are there any—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member for Price please resume his seat. I call the Minister of Transport and the Leader of the Opposition to order. It is highly disorderly for members to conduct a dialogue across the Chamber, even if they were not also disturbing the rights of another member to ask a question. The honourable member for Price.

**Mr De LAINE:** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House how many properties are leased for community purposes under the community tenancy scheme, and are there any plans to increase this type of community service facility in other locations around South Australia? On a recent trip with the Minister of Housing and Construction to the South-East of the State, I was tremendously impressed with the success of the community tenancy scheme in Mount Gambier, where a variety of family social problems are being addressed. I visited a general purpose shelter, a women's shelter, a community house and a house for single men. The occupants of these facilities to whom I spoke were full of praise for the programs.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As to the number of properties benefiting from the community tenancy scheme, when the Bannon Government came into office some 157 properties were benefiting from the scheme; as from 30 June 1988 we have a total of 520 properties. The number has tripled, and I think that that is real proof that this Government is committed to providing much needed facilities not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State. The 520 properties are provided for the following purposes: 69—

**Mr BECKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the information that the Minister is about to give was provided during the budget Estimates Committees—so why repeat it?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** He is just about to do so in relation to the 520 houses.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Hanson should not debate the matter with members who are interjecting. He has raised a point of order with the Chair. In giving a ruling on this, the Chair is in the position of having to cover new ground, because in the past it has been the practice in relation to members on both sides of the House to tolerate exactly the matter to which the member for Hanson is now objecting. However, since the honourable member for Hanson has called this practice to the attention of the House, it might be best if on this occasion and on all future occasions a Minister using material that has already been provided during Estimates Committees could refer to the page in *Hansard* where that information is already located and provide only supplementary material or material that in some way expands on material already given to the Estimates Committees. That will apply not only to Ministers responding to questions, as in this case in response to the honourable member for Hanson, but to all members in relation to material pertaining to the Estimates Committees. The Minister of Housing and Construction.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Perhaps you can enlighten me further on this matter, Sir. Are you saying, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Housing and Construction is just as entitled as anyone else to seek clarification of a point of order.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Are you saying, Sir, that, because the member for Hanson has said that the information I had just started to refer to was mentioned in the Estimates Committee, I am now required to give the number of the page in *Hansard* that relates to that information—when the member for Hanson does not even know?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! On previous occasions, members have requested that the Chair rise to his feet to recognise the importance of rulings that are being given. However, I now find that the very same members who have frequently called on the Chair to do that are flouting the authority of the Chair, while the Chair is reflecting their wishes.

The Minister has asked a reasonable question of the Chair. Since no-one is expected to have a photographic memory, on this occasion the Minister need not give the exact page number, although if a Minister was aware of it it would be appropriate to do so. However, the Minister on this occasion may simply refer to the fact that information of a certain nature has already been provided to the Estimates Committees.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I rise on a point of order. I wonder, Mr Speaker, whether you will consider the point of order you have just ruled on and come back to Parliament at its next sitting with a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FERGUSON:**—confirmation or otherwise. Practical problems are involved, and I think the situation requires further consideration.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I am not exactly sure of the cause of all the mirth from members on my left in relation to this matter, bearing in mind that the member for Hanson chose to make this a matter on which a ruling should be given. Regardless of what might be the practical consequences the Chair has given a ruling. If, through the Standing Orders Committee, members can draw attention to any difficulties that could be overcome by minor alterations to that ruling, the Chair will produce another ruling at a later date. Unless or until alterations are put to the Chair through the Standing Orders Committee, the ruling I have just given will stand.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** To satisfy the member for Hanson, I will not talk about the numbers and types of accommodation units that have been made available. However, I am sure that the House would be interested in how organisations such as those that I am not allowed to mention could gain access to this program. These facilities have been made available as a result of community organisations or Government departments approaching the South Australian Housing Trust for assistance in the first instance, rather than from Housing Trust initiatives.

As I said, 120 of those properties are located in the country, and the examples that the honourable member gave in relation to Mount Gambier are typical of the kind of quality accommodation that we provide in the country. Any applications for the community tenancy scheme will be considered by the Community Tenancy Scheme Management Committee. However, organisations must have recurrent funding resources, either internally or through the Department for Community Welfare, for example, through SAAP funds for shelters.

#### MYER REDEVELOPMENT

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** Has the Minister of Labour been advised of a site allowance to be paid to workers employed on the Myer-Remm development and is the Government concerned that these payments will force up building costs in Adelaide to the point where future capital investment will be jeopardised? The Opposition has been advised that unions involved in the Myer-Remm development have successfully insisted on a site allowance which will require the developers to pay \$100 for a normal five day week in addition to the award wage. This will increase to \$160 a week with weekend work.

I have been informed that developers involved in other construction projects in the city are seriously concerned about the likelihood that these allowances will be used as a pacesetter and force up the cost of other products. For example, an on-site allowance already negotiated for building workers employed on new operating theatres at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will force up the cost by \$750 000, but it is now feared this will go even higher with the Myer-Remm decision.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. No, I am not aware of it and I do not expect all employers in this State to come to my office and explain how they are conducting their industrial relations. I should have thought that the member for Victoria, who is a champion of free enterprise in the industrial relations system that has been advocated by the present Leader of the Federal Liberal Party, would applaud these on-site employer-employee negotiations being advocated. Indeed, I am amazed to get this sort of question from the honourable member.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The member for Victoria should appreciate that these negotiations are conducted between the appropriate trade unions and the employer and that, if the employer pays the employees, that is the employer's business. I will not interfere in that. Does the honourable member want the Government to interfere in every contract that employers have with everyone else? Of course he does not. It is a straight out attack on trade unions in which these people have always participated, as they cannot understand or appreciate the right of employees to negotiate with their employers.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his repeated interjections.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ABALONE POACHING

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Fisheries):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** On Tuesday 4 October, the member for Chaffey asked the Minister of Emergency Services whether police were investigating the failure of a recent helicopter blitz on abalone poaching on the West Coast, and whether the Government was aware of claims that a person within the Fisheries Department has sold information about radio codes to poachers. The Government is aware of the allegations referred to by the honourable member. It has taken advice from Crown Law and is investigating the allegations.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOUSING TRUST

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BECKER:** My personal explanation concerns a point of order that I took on the Minister of Housing and Construction. In Estimates Committees A, on 21 September, as recorded at page 331 of *Hansard*, the Minister, in giving a breakdown of the 520 Housing Trust properties involved in the community housing scheme, said that these included 229 shelters and 132 hostels for the disabled, etc. So, the reference is there.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Never in all the years I have been here have I been tempted to interfere with a member's right to make a personal explanation, but on this occasion it seems that we are getting not a personal explanation but a justification.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair was exercising a certain amount of tolerance towards the honourable member for Hanson to find out what his personal explanation was about. The normal procedure is for members to make clear to the House that they have been misrepresented in some way and then to explain, for the benefit of the House, how they have been misrepresented, I was waiting for the honourable member to get to that point.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology):** I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 12 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 5 October. Page 888).

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I do not intend at this stage to canvass all the matters raised in this debate, but one or two points made by the Leader of the Opposition are worth commenting on. In commenting on the Leader's response to the budget as it comes out of the Estimates Committees, I note that he has considerably modified his position from that which he adopted in early September. Members may recall that in his initial response to the budget he made a number of allegations, and one would have thought that in the light of the gravity of those allegations, if those matters were still to be argued, they would have been argued during the course of this debate, but they were not.

For instance, he said that taxation was 19.5 per cent of gross State product, but the Commonwealth budget paper referred to by the Leader shows that own-source revenue in South Australia was 7.3 per cent of gross State product, which was the lowest level of all the States. The Leader of the Opposition did not read the table properly and naturally remained silent about that. Secondly, he made a number of claims about the South Australian Financing Authority. First, he said that the equity to total funds ratio had fallen from 32 per cent to 20 per cent, but he arrived at those figures by failing to read the balance sheet properly. He compared two vastly different ratios.

In fact, based on a proper reading of comparable figures, there was a reduction from 24 per cent to 20 per cent, but that remains well above the average of major Australian banks. So, we did not hear any more about that. His second allegation about SAFA was that its profits were unsustainable, but that statement is proven to be incorrect: 90 per cent of SAFA's profits in the short to medium term are virtually locked in.

Finally, the Leader said that SAFA had failed to create adequate reserves. Again, however, he was 12 months or more out of date in the sense that the matter of SAFA reserves had been raised well over 12 months before and action was already in train. SAFA's general reserve of \$110 million and a retained surplus of \$99 million with provisions of \$9 million, give it a total of \$218 million, which is more than 60 per cent of this year's expected surplus. That is not a bad record.

On the economy, the Leader formerly claimed that this Government had presided over the worst period since the depression. A comparison of growth rates under our Government shows that they range from 13 per cent to .6 per cent, the lowest figure (in the 1986-87 period). However, overall there was significant growth year by year, and that has to be compared with the record of the previous Liberal Government, showing negative growth—.1 per cent to -1.4 per cent in two years.

The Leader also claimed that the South Australian economy could not grow at the same rate as the Australian economy, but that charge is well catered for by an examination of Commonwealth figures which show that between 1982-83 and 1986-87 South Australia had a higher average rate of growth in gross State product than the national average. Indeed, if one considers the investment in train at present worth hundreds of millions of dollars that has been announced just over the past six weeks alone, one must feel assured indeed that new investment in South Australian industry and development is not only substantial but will take us well into the next two or three years.

These claims have been forgotten, which only goes to show the hit-and-run tactics of the Opposition in making an allegation and, when that allegation is proved non-sustainable, remaining silent about it and searching around for the next one. It is a constant running battle to keep

ahead of the truth and Opposition members manage to do that to a certain extent by trading on the fact that people forget the allegations made and the mistakes that have occurred in calculating the figures.

It should be borne in mind, first, that the Leader's offering on this occasion was different from previously, because he had to drop most of his major allegations and claims; secondly, that he did not have the grace to admit that his earlier presentations had been incorrect and, finally, that he produced a new set of figures many of which had all the deficiencies of the old ones.

His inspiration for some of these new figures has been drawn from his examination of New South Wales budget papers, and he looks for tables, figures and statistics from that document source which ensures that he can pick and choose to try to put our economy in a bad light. In relation to his figures, the Leader of the Opposition posits:

Tax collections in South Australia are budgeted to rise by 10.7 per cent.

In fact, the budget papers indicate a rise of 10.6 per cent, but the real point is that included in that amount is payroll tax to be levied on Commonwealth instrumentalities for the first time, which is a matter of policy. If one excludes that particular measure, which is only of limited benefit to revenue at the State level, South Australia's budgeted tax revenue will rise by 8.8 per cent. That happens to be 1 per cent less than the figure for New South Wales, which has been quoted by the Leader as the epitome of budget probity and financial management.

The New South Wales Government publication also indicates that South Australia has the second lowest level of tax per capita of all the States, almost \$300 less than New South Wales and \$260 less than Victoria. He does not quote that figure from the New South Wales document. The Leader says that expenditure in the past five years has grown by 9.9 per cent in South Australia, the highest of all the States. I refer him to the Commonwealth budget papers, from which he was quoting only a few weeks ago, which show that growth in budget outlay between 1982-83 and 1986-87 averaged only 4.6 per cent in real terms—less than Queensland and Western Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition says that the net financing requirement has grown by 17.2 per cent over the past five years. Once again, the Leader is using figures, this time derived from the ABS, which have been consistently misunderstood and misinterpreted. He has been corrected a number of times but he still keeps repeating the same mistakes. Perhaps he is copying someone else's figures. I suggest that he go back to source and re-examine it before he continues to use the figures.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think the Leader has considerable difficulty in understanding the figures, much less the ability to go back and look at the source material. The fact is that South Australia's net financing requirement has risen in 1987-88 because of the repayment of \$126 million worth of debt. The net financing requirement is not a measure of borrowing, as the Leader claims: it also measures the state of liquid assets which is a necessary step in the retirement of State debt, but that is not acknowledged, not understood.

South Australia, we are told again, as we are told tediously day after day, is a big spending, big taxing, big borrowing State. The Leader ought to have another look at Mr Greiner's budget documents—he seems to see them as some kind of oracle. Tax as a percentage of gross State product last year was 3.7 per cent, the lowest of all States and 1.9 per cent below that of New South Wales. Expenditure as a percentage of gross State product last year was 17.2 per cent,



the third lowest of all the States and only slightly above New South Wales and Victoria. Growth in public sector debt (average annual growth rate over the past five years) was 14.4 per cent in South Australia, only New South Wales and Tasmania having less. The very source of the Leader's comprehensive comparisons (if he does not want to use our figures or look to the Commonwealth source)—the New South Wales source—contradicts his own selective use of figures.

Another target of the Leader of the Opposition was ETSA and the financing arrangements involving it. He was suggesting that we have the second highest electricity price in Australia. He did not go through a detailed analysis of tariffs, but he also forgot to mention—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is interesting that the Deputy Leader interjects on this: this is the man who brought us the natural gas agreement that meant rocketing gas tariffs that locked us in. If the previous Liberal Government had been able to maintain prices just at CPI (I am not suggesting that they do what we have been doing the last few years which is below CPI: let us say they just kept prices at that level), in fact the price of electricity for an average bill could be as much as \$100 cheaper today than it is. That is the result—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remind for the last time the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he has been warned.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Secondly, the Leader looked at ETSA's defeasance arrangements involving private sector parties and he claimed that they would benefit from tax concessions that are in some way inappropriate or illegal: there are only three parties to the defeasance arrangements—ETSA, SAFA and the Treasurer. There is no tax advantage in the defeasance: it is a simple accounting procedure. The restructuring of ETSA finances and the way it has been undertaken has been worth many millions of dollars in benefit to ETSA which in turn has been passed on to consumers of electricity in this State in the form of cheaper tariffs.

SAFA, of course, never escapes the criticisms and the attacks of the Opposition. In this case the Opposition was looking at Government enterprises where the Leader of the Opposition repeated what he said before, that SAFA has written off \$28 million worth of loans in certain Government operations, a sort of cosmetic exercise. SAFA has not written off loans: it has established equity positions within these operations, consistent with the capital structure of any commercial operation. Indeed, the Auditor-General stated in his report:

It is usual for companies involved in that type of operation [that is, new companies] to have an equity base.

So an equity base has been established in these operations. SAFA will contribute to the management in the normal process as an equity holder. The Leader of the Opposition referred, finally, to Moody's and an analysis of debt. He said that South Australia's total debt, 36.5 per cent of GSP, is the highest proportion of the four States, South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. In speaking about Moody's, the Leader of the Opposition did not look at the measures that were needed to get an accurate reflection of debt.

There are three measures that can be used. One is total State debt as a proportion of GSP, and that figure, which shows our level as being very high, is the one that he uses; and he stops at that point. That is quite ridiculous, because there is also the question of what liquid assets the State has. Liquid assets as a percentage of debt in South Aus-

tralia—at 16.8 per cent—is the second highest in the country, well above New South Wales and Victoria.

Then there is the debt service ratio, that is, the percentage of revenue needed to cover net interest cost, and that is a crucial point, because it is that amount of commitment that increases pressure on revenue raising and also means that there is less money to expend on recurrent and other services. Obviously, the lower one can keep the percentage of revenue needed to cover interest, the healthier the financial position, and in this relationship between gross debts and assets, which we have certainly talked about at length, setting it out fully in the various budget papers, shows that our ratio has fallen in both money and real terms—and on a per head of population real term basis—most dramatically as a percentage of GSP, from 23.2 to 17.2 per cent. It is a pretty remarkable record but there is no recognition of that by the Leader of the Opposition because it does not suit his case. He wants to look at gross inaccurate and incomplete measures in presenting his figures.

In concluding on this issue of financing figures, I would also like to refer to the extent of information that is available. It is always surprising to me that the Opposition, given this plethora of information and given bigger and more complete information than occurs in any other State, still fails to do its homework, fails to read it properly and fails in its analysis. Others have noted the completeness of this information. For example, the *Weekend Australian* on 24-25 September described the document on South Australian finances as 'trail blazing'.

The Institute of Public Affairs, which is not renowned for its espousal of social democratic policies or support of Labor Governments, has said of the recent State budget and the accompanying information that it is most complete, and that the budget itself represents one of the most sound approaches that could be expected from any Government. So, I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is very much on his own in his criticisms of the budget.

In conclusion, it is interesting that on the first occasion the Leader had a whole range of allegations and analyses, most of which proved to be wrong. They were simply chopped out of his speech and not referred to again. As far as he is concerned, that is yesterday's news, yesterday's incorrect statement. He then trots out a whole new set and we think that perhaps he has learnt his lesson from past mistakes as he has had a few weeks to think about it and do a bit of research. However, we get the same inaccuracies, even from the very source documents that he claims he is using. It is a pitiful performance and I would hope (although I have been hoping now for a few years) that we will see a better one in the course of future budget debates.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 12 to 21 (clause 3)—Leave out subclauses (7) and (8) and insert:

(7) Where—

(a) goods are seized from a person under subsection (6);

but

- (b) (i) proceedings for an offence against this section in relation to the goods are not instituted within three months after their seizure; or  
 (ii) proceedings for such an offence are instituted within that period but the defendant is not convicted of the offence,

the person from whom the goods were seized may, by action in a court of competent jurisdiction, recover from the Minister—

- (c) the goods, or if they have been destroyed or deteriorated, compensation equal to the market value of the goods at the time of their seizure; and  
 (d) compensation for any loss suffered by reason of the seizure of the goods.

(8) Where—

- (a) goods are seized from a person under subsection (6); and  
 (b) proceedings for an offence against this section in relation to the goods are instituted within three months after their seizure,

the court may, if it convicts the defendant of the offence, order that the goods be forfeited to the Crown and, in that event, the goods may be disposed of in such manner as the Minister directs.

No. 2. Page 2, line 30 (clause 3)—After 'regulation' insert 'being an emblem the copyright of which is vested in the Crown in right of the State.'

No. 3. Page 2, lines 34 to 39 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move:

That the amendments be agreed to.

By consultation with my colleagues in another place, we have before us a series of amendments which I will address jointly. The first amendment brings the provisions relating to forfeiture and compensation in relation to seized goods into line with those in the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act. It differs from the current provisions of the Bill in a couple of respects, but not in any substantial way. Therefore, we have no objection to that amendment. The second amendment ensures that an emblem may be declared a State commercial emblem only if the Crown in the right of the State has copyright in the emblem. This is the case with the emblem now proposed to be declared. Therefore, we have no objection.

The final amendment is consequential on the previous amendment. If the Crown must have copyright in an emblem before it can be declared a State commercial emblem, the Crown must have exclusive right to the use of the emblem. Any right in any other person to use the emblem must be derived from the Crown. No purpose would be served by the savings provision contained in paragraph (b) of sub-clause 12. It is therefore superfluous and, again, that amendment is acceptable.

**Mr INGERSON:** The Opposition supports the amendments before the Committee. We would like it noted that they are the same amendments moved by the member for Mitcham. It is a pity that the Minister did not recognise their value in this Chamber and that they had to be moved in the other place.

Motion carried.

#### LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 August. Page 501.)

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** The member for Eyre has asked me to speak in his stead, as he had to leave the Chamber. The Opposition supports the Bill. The Loans to Producers Act has been in existence since 1927. It has been a source of significant support over the years, particularly to cooperatives in South Australia. My electorate is very much involved with cooperatives, including wineries,

packing sheds and the whole process of fruit canning in South Australia. Consequently, this legislation has played a major part in the lives of my constituents. A significant provision in the Bill is the application of normal banking business principles. At the moment loan conditions are laid down in the regulations, but under this Bill banks will have the discretion to determine what security they require over the loans that they grant. The Opposition has no problem with this Bill and we bid it a speedy passage.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier):** The Government appreciates the Opposition's support for this measure. It contains nothing controversial, and that is confirmed by the previous speech. I am very happy that the Bill will have a speedy passage.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** For some time now residents in the West Lakes area, who have been both for and against a proposal for a vessel to ply the West Lakes waterway, have contacted my electorate office. I say from the outset that this matter has generated considerable heat within that community.

I have been very disturbed about some of the statements that have been made and allegations that certain people may have a vested interest, and that their views are being clouded by those alleged vested interests. As I have indicated previously during contributions I have made in this House, I have but one vested interest, and that is to ensure that this matter is brought to a satisfactory conclusion after consultation with all groups in the community. I noticed in yesterday's Messenger *Weekly Times* an article about Dr Walter Woods, who has corresponded with me and whose views have been recorded in *Hansard*.

In part, the article in the *Weekly Times* of 5 October under the heading, 'Lakespace will lobby for appeal rights', reads:

Lakespace, the new West Lakes residents' group, will lobby State and local governments for third party planning appeal rights. Under South Australian law, West Lakes residents have no right to appeal to the South Australian Planning Commission against any proposed developments in the local area. 'West Lakes residents are virtually unique in South Australia in that have no right to appeal against planning decisions,' Lakespace secretary Walter Woods said.

Dr Woods said the lack of appeal rights dated back to a concession made by the State Government to Delfin Property Group, the developers of West Lakes.

'That same indenture foreshadowed any changes that occurred once the major works were completed,' Dr Woods said.

'It may be fair enough while a major development is underway as was the case with West Lakes.

'Now it's finished, let us have our normal rights back, the same rights as ordinary citizens of South Australia.'

He said an Act of State Parliament was needed to change planning appeal rights for Lakes residents.

Lakespace members will lobby Woodville Council, local MPs and State Cabinet ministers in their campaign.

I believe that the Minister of Marine and the Deputy Premier, particularly in his capacity as Minister for Environment and Planning, should review the legislation which, I understand, encompasses the West Lakes Indenture Act and the various Planning Acts and legislation under the purview of the Minister of Marine. As I understand it, under the

Indenture the Minister can declare that, because the West Lakes development has been completed, amendments should be made to various Acts to enable third party appeals through the Planning Act.

This will ensure that residents of West Lakes will have no more and no less but the same third party rights of appeal as the majority of South Australians. There are exceptions—the Golden Grove Indenture Act and the City of Adelaide—but they are in the minority. It has been suggested to me that even though we live in a democracy people such as those who reside in the West Lakes area are being denied natural justice. They are being denied the right to appeal against decisions that are made by local councils and other bodies. If those people did not live in the West Lakes area, they would have third party right of appeal provisions. I view this with concern, because I believe that the Government should review this issue and enable my constituents to make representations to both Ministers. I believe that the development is almost complete.

The residents in that area have for many years, going back to 1969, been denied third party rights of appeal. Previously, they had those rights and I think that it is about time that the Government addressed this issue. If the Government refuses, I believe it must detail its reasons. Why are these people being denied the right to appeal against this project which is the subject of considerable animosity between neighbours, with allegations and rumours rife around the waterway? This matter is of considerable concern to me. I have spoken to the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Local Government about this—

**Mr Ingerson:** You're not being very successful.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The member for Bragg should be aware, as a person who contested a seat against me, that I have been very successful during the nine years that I have been the member for Albert Park. With the help of my colleague, the Minister of Housing and Construction, Albert Park has been well served by this Government since we came to office in 1983. I believe that this is a sympathetic Government which is full of compassion, irrespective of a person's political background or allegiance. This is a matter which should be addressed, and I believe that this Government will address it.

I appeal to the Ministers responsible for this area to look very closely at the matter. From past experience, I know that the door is always open, but I have to raise this matter in this forum so that my colleagues and my electorate understand how strongly I feel about the third party rights of appeal provisions. I am not suggesting that the question of retrospectivity is something that my constituents may wish to address, but that is another matter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Flinders.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** Today I had hoped to be able to ask a question about the Government's attitude towards Lifeline, and whether the Government and the Minister will reassess their attitude towards financial assistance to that organisation. I refer in particular to the Lower Eyre Peninsula branch of Lifeline based at Port Lincoln.

My comments in relation to this matter have been prompted partly by my general knowledge of the difficulties that the Lifeline organisation is having, and more particularly from an article which appeared in yesterday's *Port Lincoln Times* and a subsequent editorial in that paper about Lifeline. Because of the distress of many of the people who are suffering from the drought, I believe that it is timely to relate to the House the contents of the article and

the editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times*. The article, headed 'No help here for the helpers' and then in big block letters, 'Government cuts another Lifeline', states:

Lifeline, the Lower Eyre Peninsula's unique telephone counselling service, is in crisis, mainly because of the withdrawal of all State Government support.

The service itself has been able to maintain local funding because of an all-out effort by its Peninsula based volunteers. However, the lack of Government support means that dreams of establishing a full-time secretariat to handle the day-to-day running of the scheme have been shelved.

The article then quotes comments that Mr Norm Marks, Chairman of the Lower Eyre Peninsula Lifeline, made when giving his annual address, as follows:

It seems to me a sad reflection on our State Government that they withdrew two years ago the small amount of money they gave us to pay for 20 hours a week of coordinator's salary, when I continually see evidence of huge amounts of taxpayer money being spent on projects whose value 20 years from now will be far less certain than Lifeline's. In our last year of operation we had 1 300 calls on the crisis phone. To take these calls, we filled 28 shifts per week, or 1 456 shifts for the year. At times we had less than 20 active telephone counsellors to cope with this load.

The breakdown of last year's calls reveals over 300 contacts with the caller in relationship crisis (marital or *de facto*). Another 30 related to marital physical and/or emotional abuse. Another 18 calls related to threatened or attempted suicide. Over 200 related to clients having emotional difficulty in just coping with day-to-day life.

During its years of operation, Lifeline has trained over 200 people in our community [Lower Eyre Peninsula]. Not all have gone on to work for Lifeline. Many have used the skills and confidence gained from their Lifeline training to go on to other fields, and I continually meet ex-Lifeline members in every helping service in the local area, and, as time goes on, across the South Australian community.

Those are just extracts from the article that was published in the *Port Lincoln Times*. I believe that the sentiments expressed in the article, and more particularly those expressed by the many people in the Lower Eyre Peninsula community, were very adequately portrayed in an editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times* of Tuesday 4 October 1988. The editorial states:

Lifeline for the desperate.

Lifeline's an eerie organisation, quite thoroughly misunderstood and grossly under-rated by those who benefit from it most—which includes the State and Federal Treasuries. But to be fair, even the volunteer workers who make up the service's counsellor force have little real concept of just how important they and their precious Lifeline are. There's nothing all that unusual for an Australian organisation to wind up being best at something that was never conceived, let alone intended, by its founders. And Lifeline's a classic of its kind, typifying just what can emerge from a motley group of people who simply want to help others.

Initially, there was a lot of muted chuckling in professional circles over Lifeline, which was set up by the Methodist Church. It's anyone's guess precisely what the Rev. Allan Walker and his people really had in mind when they established the service. But Methodists, being more than a mite evangelical in their thinking, you can bet your sweet bippy that someone, somewhere was off on a campaign to land the occasional lost soul. No-one's quite so receptive to religion as a person distraught, penniless, mayhap, and thoroughly beaten down by life. So, there's little question that the idea behind it was some steady evangelising among the needy and unwanted.

Initially, Lifeline aimed at providing a counselling service—primarily by telephone—for people under stress. And, as an offshoot, it acted as a referral agency for other organisations handling specific areas of care. It still works extensively in that way, but for a number of reasons Lifeline has steadily expanded into other areas that scarcely rate a mention in the documentation. For many troubled people, it provides a 24-hour group therapy session. For others, it's very basic... a friendly, helpful human being prepared to listen to the lonely.

Over the years, Lifeline has entrenched itself deeply in the Australian psyche, for it, unlike so many of its better publicised contemporaries, is the true Aussie legend of the Quiet Achiever. And like most other of the genre, Lifeline is thoroughly misunderstood by just about everyone involved, not the least being our governments and politicians.

Probably because bad news and lurid sensation make better headlines than gentle success, Lifeline seems to have gained an undeserved reputation as a specialist in taking would-be suicides out of their last act of defiance in a world gone mad. It's certainly very spectacular and emotion rending . . . the mental picture conjured up is a dedicated, super-calm counsellor talking the suicide out of his or her intended bloody end just before the titles flash up on the screen.

However, it's not like that at all. Of the 1 300 emergency calls taken by the local Lifeline workers in the last year, just 18 were from suicidally inclined people. 300 men and women sought help over a crisis in a relationship . . . a breakdown in marriage. Another 30 telephoned over physical or emotional abuse from a partner. Then there were the 200 people who called simply because they were having problems coping with the everyday stresses of living. This, of course, is the hidden wonder of Lifeline, the area of expertise that has been totally ignored by governments and public alike. How can one put a monetary value on human misery? How possibly can we place people on a balance sheet? For that, precisely, is what seems to be happening.

The attitude of Government in all this is beyond comprehension, for even if we do attempt to equate misery with money we find a startling result. Psychological disturbances soak up cash like a sponge, for psychiatry is one of the more expensive of all medical disciplines, and the basic cost of providing adequate care for the disturbed is astronomic—and ongoing, as few other conditions are.

Should we then conduct a cost-effectiveness of Lifeline? Should we examine just how many people there are still out in the community, coping with life, maintaining themselves and their families at no charge to the community simply because of the help—and the simple human dignity—they received from Lifeline? Remember, most psychiatric patients are not clinically 'mad'. They are ordinary, normal people who, for various reasons can no longer cope with a life that has got beyond their ken. The cost in treatment and lost productivity is incalculable. Yet, Lifeline, in its eerie, gentle way, seems to have kept so many of those potential patients as viable members of society.

Could the politicians, the governments and the humanless bean counters, who now seem to rule us all, stop for an instant, and they'd see just why Lifeline is worthy, possibly above many other services, of full public support and recognition.

I think it was appropriate to express in this Chamber the sentiments that have been expressed in that editorial. I think the last sentence is the linchpin of the whole matter—that is, that this type of service needs full public support and recognition.

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** One of the great joys in being part of this place is that occasionally one gets to serve on committees. One of the committees that has given me the greatest pleasure to date has been the committee which concerns the Maralinga lands and the Pitjantjatjara lands. During a visit to the Pitjantjatjara lands earlier this year I had the opportunity, for the first time in my life, of visiting what has been known on maps and by the people in far-off Adelaide as the Unnamed Conservation Park which is in the far north-west corner of South Australia. I suspect that the park is unnamed because the people who gazetted it, as early as Tindale in 1929, could not pronounce or write the name. The name given to the park by the local Pitjantjatjara people was spelt Namungarintja, but it was pronounced somewhat differently. Of course, one of the proposals when the park is finally given a name is that it be called the Nummalgnaree Conservation Park.

The area is quite extraordinary because it is on the edge of three major desert areas. Because it is an area of relatively high dune country, because the soils are relatively good and because it has a considerably higher rainfall than areas around it, it has a unique array of vegetation and animal communities. Indeed, in the time I was there I was able to spot a number of species that I had never seen before, except in places such as the Botanic Gardens or in the gardens of members of SGAP and similar devotees who grow eucalypts.

I was able to see the Victorian desert mallee which occurs only in the park and across the Western Australian border:

a tree known as Ewarts mallee, a magnificent, straight, white-barked tree known as the desert gum, which grows only in the park; the fairly familiar red mallee which, in fact, occurs right across the Nullabor; a marvellous little tree called the sharp capped mallee, *Eucalyptus Oxymitra* (which literally means 'sharp-capped'); the pimpin mallee which again grows only in that area; the ouldea mallee; and others. The area is quite extraordinary and it is probably testimony to the fact that there is no permanent water there. Therefore, the area was of no use to pastoralists and, indeed, it has remained untouched for many years.

In searching through the information available on the species of animals and plants in the area, I find that there are 23 listed plant species, many of which are quite unique to the area. There were 23 gazetted species of bird found the latest biological survey conducted in 1979 by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. There were four species of mammal including, unfortunately, *vulpes vulpes*, which, of course, is the fox, and *felis catus*, otherwise known as the domestic cat. They become less than domestic up there because their diet is rather better and apparently they spend more time in the sun. They grow to enormous sizes. Indeed, after a few generations, they begin to regress to the lynx size animal from which, of course, the original domestic cats were bred. Fourteen reptile species were also gazetted on that biological survey in 1979.

The area is quite unique, but it has suffered, along with many of the other desert and semi-desert areas of Australia, in that many of those fauna have been lost, partly because they had previously existed only because they were husbanded by the Aboriginal people who managed the area and who used a combination of judicious firing of vegetation, the provision of watering points for the animals, selective hunting of predators and the like. Indeed, many of the animals that were there initially and were gazetted at the first European contact have been lost.

For all that, I am advised that we may be able to reintroduce a number of the animals; National Parks people who work in the north advise that several of the bettongs could be reintroduced to the area, those being the burrowing bettong and the brush-tailed bettong. The numbat, which is now restricted to the jarrah forests of Western Australia, could be reintroduced to South Australia where, fossil evidence suggests, it used to live. Add to that the bilby and the stick-nest rat which, of course, is a marsupial and which currently lives only on offshore islands in South Australia because it has been allowed to survive there as grazing pressure and the fox have not managed to exterminate it. I am also advised that amongst the bird species, although Alexandra's parrot still exists and the night parrot may exist, there is a possibility of re-introducing several other bird species to the park.

It seems to me that there may be some wisdom in these reintroductions, and that ultimately the National Parks and Wildlife Service might be persuaded, with appropriate resources, to do that, but something more could be gained if the area was managed by the Aborigines who originally managed it, that is to say, by the Pitjantjatjara-speaking people of the various communities living around the park. On Tindale's tribal boundaries map of 1929, the park itself was managed by the Kokatha people in the east, by the Pindii in the west (going over into the Victoria desert), and by the Mirning people in the south. All those people are generally known in the present as the Pitjantjatjara people because they speak Pitjantjatjara. The true Pitjantjatjara, incidentally, inhabited the territory to the north at that time.

It seems to me that a great deal could be gained by a joint management approach—by the Aborigines and also

by the National Parks and Wildlife people. Not only could we achieve viable reintroductions of some of the species that I have named—the bettong and perhaps even the rabbit-eared bandicoot—but also we could provide for the Pitjantjatjara people of the area an unspoilt tract of countryside in which they could conduct their traditional bushcraft and teach hunting and survival skills to their young people and perhaps even to Aboriginal people from the city.

It seems to me that the advantage that would accrue to national parks would be that we could give a greater thrust to the existing facilities of the service for the interpretation of parks and education within the parks, in as much as the Pitjantjatjara people could conduct tours if they wished to do so and could give visitors some indication of the pre-European history of the area. It would also provide a better level of natural resource management, so that the reintroductions could be assured of survival, and might even be built on the database that the National Parks and Wildlife Service presently has on a very remote and unexplored area—and, indeed, an unnamed area at the moment.

It would seem to me that the advantages for the Aboriginal people would lie in the provision of employment, particularly for young Aborigines, the provision of a form of

career training and a structure which does not presently exist, the provision of contract employment with a Government agency, and introduction to an efficient and caring Government employer in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It would also enable the Aborigines themselves to develop skills that might have been lost over the past 150 years. It seems to me that that action would also enhance the development of communities in the adjacent Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands. If an additional work-base could be created there, the social and service roles presently provided by Government agencies may in fact be taken over more and more by the Aborigines. The idea of joint management or, indeed, management by the Aborigines, has many appealing features, not the least of which is that they could provide a much more authentic form of tourism for any Europeans who were lucky enough, as I was, to have the opportunity to go there. For what it is worth, I would suggest that consideration be given to a joint management procedure and that the National Parks and Wildlife Service be given the resources to explore that option.

Motion carried.

At 4 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 October at 2 p.m.