

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 9 August 1989

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1990.

PETITION: HARTLEY LANDFILL

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to stop the proposed landfill at Hartley was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: GOLDEN GROVE TRANSMISSION LINE

A petition signed by 468 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to underground the 66kv transmission line passing through the Golden Grove development was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD CARE WORKERS

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to seek the immediate implementation of a child-care workers award was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: In the past two sitting days the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have raised questions regarding patient activity at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Specifically, they have produced two staff memorandums from the hospital administrator, Dr Brendon Kearney, which they claim demonstrate that services are being rationed at the hospital. In response, I expressed my concern at the nature of the questions and made the point that Dr Kearney's comments were being used selectively and out of context.

I subsequently noted that \$7.6 million in this financial year has been committed by the State Government specifically to reduce booking lists for non-urgent surgery in South Australian public hospitals. In fact, in the past three years, \$13.4 million has been made available specifically to reduce booking lists. I further noted that 50 per cent of people who

have elective surgery at Adelaide's major metropolitan public hospitals undergo their surgery within a month of being added to the booking list. Nevertheless, the sensational and highly exaggerated claims by the Opposition Leader and his Deputy were widely reported.

This morning I received a letter from the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Dr Kearney, regarding the material raised in this House by the Leader and his Deputy.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I ask members to behave in a somewhat more orderly manner. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: I note that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has just delivered a gross personal insult to the integrity of the Administrator of our largest hospital. But let me read this letter, which states:

Dear Mr Hopgood, I write to express my concern over press reports on Royal Adelaide Hospital information bulletins. These reports are internal communications for the information of staff, and the press reports have taken selected statements out of context and have engaged in speculation that cannot be substantiated. In particular, the level of patient activity in the memorandum refers to inpatients occupying beds and to the very much higher level of activity that was experienced before March 1989. Substantial gains are expected in patient treatment through day surgery and other forms of day treatments which represents a change in the way services are provided and an increased level of services.

The hospital is actively recruiting nursing staff, and hopes to substantially increase nursing staff numbers progressively over the next four weeks. Nursing staff numbers currently represent the major constraint on patient activity, not the budget. The speculation I refer to above is not in the interest of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and is selective and uninformed. This year's budget will provide for an overall increase in patient care, and it would be best if the hospital was allowed to get on with its job without further statements that are misleading.

That is signed 'B.J. Kearney, Administrator'.

An honourable member: You wrote it for him.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: Here is another member of the Opposition who wants to suggest insulting things like that about the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: That is the sort of thing—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier was given leave of the House to make a ministerial statement. I expect members to be able to conduct themselves with slightly better manners than has been the case over the past three or four minutes.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The Opposition has been engaged for some time now in a campaign aimed purely at scaring people in need of non-urgent hospital care. It is disgraceful and dishonest. In the interests of the community I suggest that the Opposition Leader take Dr Kearney's advice and let the hospital 'get on with the job'.

QUESTION TIME

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr **OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition)**: I direct my question to the Minister of Health.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member for Briggs is out of order.

Mr **OLSEN**: The ABC poll and a few other polls have got on their nerves! My question is to the Minister of Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition not to respond to the out of order interjections of the member for Briggs, and I remind the member for Briggs that brandishing a document is also out of order.

Mr OLSEN: What faith can hospitals, doctors, patients, and the public have in decisions of the Health Commission when a senior officer of the commission, in an internal memorandum, has very strongly criticised the research upon which key decisions of the commission are based?

I have in my possession an internal Health Commission memorandum dated 11 April this year. It was addressed to the Chairman of the commission by the Manager for Health Services Research in the commission's Information Branch, Mr Van Konkelenberg. The memorandum contains a proposal for yet another health bureaucracy—a South Australian Centre for Applied Health Studies, with its own board of directors. In justifying this proposal, he advised the Chairman as follows:

Research efforts tend to be uncoordinated and projects frequently omit key cross system perspectives. There is a duplication of research activities and resources, and conflicts arise in assigning research responsibilities, particularly when research questions cross a number of areas of interest or analytical skills.

Dispersed research functions involve additional administrative burdens to the organisation as a whole. It adds to costs and can detract resources from the routine administration or policy process. The commission also has no clear focal point for managing, conducting or coordinating research; for ensuring research results are made available to system managers; or for establishing an integrated research network with external groups such as WHO, AIH, NHMRC, universities and the private sector.

While the report by the consultants, Speakman Stillwell, into the efficiency of the Health Commission has recommended against implementation of his proposal on the grounds that the type of research organisation suggested 'would, in practice, coordinate even less with the Health Commission's research needs', his comments are cold comfort for hospital administrators, doctors and patients who are all affected by decisions of the commission based on research which is considered to be totally ineffective.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If the Premier and the Minister have some difficulty, I have a copy which I would be more than happy to make available.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader should be aware, from my having just a moment ago reprimanded the member for Briggs, that he cannot brandish documents in that manner. I also remind all members to try to avoid this practice of making speeches under the guise of asking questions.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Leader of the Opposition never ceases to amaze me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Does he take as his bible the report that he was talking about last week which I notice sets aside specifically those recommendations or, on the other hand, does he accept the recommendations? He had that report wrong last week: there was some suggestion that there was \$8 million to be found in the system. It is just a whole lot of nonsense. There was a suggestion that over time it may be possible to save about 40 positions in the Health Commission. The Government really must be the best payer in the country if 40 positions in the commission equate to \$8 million a year. However, I happen to know that the Government is not the best payer: we are pretty parsimonious in the way we pay our public servants.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Leader by way of a disorderly interjection asked for refutation, and I have just

given that to him. From time to time in a vibrant organisation like the commission one would expect that various points of view will be put forward, and put forward forcibly. That does not necessarily mean that they are accepted. I have no doubt that, if the honourable member searched through waste paper baskets and the like in the commission, he would find all sorts of expressions of opinion that have been put forward by commission officers. That does not necessarily mean that they are approved of by either the Government or the commission.

The Opposition will have to do a lot better than this before it can start to identify any particular weaknesses in the commission. The Health Commission would be the first to say that, like any other Government instrumentality, it is always looking for ways in which it can improve its performance. In particular, under my predecessor there was a considerable increase in the efficiency of the commission to the extent—and I have the figures here with me somewhere—that it has reduced its establishment by about 150 positions since 1986 and, in the light of the report, with which the honourable member apparently no longer agrees (because it does not suit him this week, but it did last week), doubtless there would be further efficiencies that we could identify along the road. This is one of the ideas that has been thrown up and kicked around in the whole system. It is no more than that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the third day of sitting in a row, although conceding that we are entering into an election countdown period when the House becomes a little more fractious, I remind members that the Chair cannot tolerate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the honourable Deputy Leader continues to interject when the Chair is trying to bring the House to order, he will be named without any hesitation whatsoever. The Chair cannot continue to tolerate some of the boorish and ill-mannered behaviour that has been evident from members over these three sitting days; and the way in which some members have tried to shout down the Deputy Premier is disgraceful. The honourable member for Mitchell.

BUDGET ESTIMATES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Premier indicate the use to which additional revenue collections from the budget estimates for both the 1987-88 year and the 1988-89 year have been put? Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that in the 1987-88 and the 1988-89 budgets an additional \$128 million had been collected in taxation revenue but that only about \$55 million had been returned to South Australians?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I saw that extraordinary statement by the Leader and I can understand the honourable member's being somewhat confused by it. The initial starting point was fairly predictable: he knew that whatever we did would be too little too late! There was always going to be something wrong, some nitpicking and some analysis. I point out again concerning timing, because some people have tried to draw important conclusions from that, that until such time as we were clear as to the State's financial outcome for 1988-89 there was no way in which we could start embarking on tax concessions or even expenditure programs. That is part of our overall budget process. However, having determined that favourable result which I outlined to the House yesterday, I thought it incumbent then

and there to provide benefits in relation to revenue relief—and substantial relief it is, too—of \$55 million or so.

One of the Leader's responses, apart from the predictable one, was to say: 'Yes, you collected more money in the past year as well and you are returning only a small proportion.' Let me analyse that statement. If we use the figure used by the Leader, of about \$120 million to \$130 million, in 1987-88 as a result of that year's result \$34 million was applied to finally wipe out the balance of the Consolidated Account deficit of \$63 million that we inherited from the previous Liberal Government in 1982-83. It took us some years to get there, but eventually we wiped the slate clean. So that is where some of the \$34 million went.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can understand the embarrassment of the member for Heysen. He was a member of the Government that chalked up that debt and he is now trying to defend himself. However, he need not worry. He is on the Opposition backbench now and is likely to remain there for the rest of his parliamentary career. That is the first instalment. Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition ignores the fact that in the 1988-89 budget (last year's budget) \$23.5 million was returned in tax concessions. In fact, land tax rebates and payroll tax benefits were provided totalling over \$23 million. So, there is another slab of the money that the Leader of the Opposition says was not returned. Of course it was returned: it was returned last year, but the Leader had forgotten about that.

Yesterday, I announced the package of \$55 million which, after a quick calculation, means that in two years we have returned \$113 million. That is more than twice what the Leader contends we have returned.

Further to that, in each of these years we have faced a real reduction in the amount of money that the Commonwealth Government has provided to us. We had to make that up somewhere; we do not just conjure it up out of thin air. We do not maintain our services without having some finance to pay for that. In fact, new and maintained expenditure has had to occur in those years, and that is where that very small residue that is left over—and it is a small residual amount—has gone. It is outrageous that we be criticised for that residual amount being retained for our services when every day this week the Opposition has asked us to spend more on hospitals; we are told that more and more money and resources are needed; and reckless promises are being made in the education system, and so on.

The Opposition had better get its act straight. We raise money only because we need it to provide those services. The Opposition cannot go around, on the one hand, bleating that not enough money is being returned to the taxpayers and, on the other hand, demanding that we spend more. That does not compute, and it is one reason why this Opposition will remain where it is.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to make speeches by way of interjection. The honourable member for Coles has the call.

STATE REVENUE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I direct my question to the Premier. As his announcement yesterday demonstrates that he can provide the answer to the House now, rather than wait until the presentation of the budget, will the Premier say how much the Government expects to collect in revenue from State taxation this financial year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have obviously been reading the polls. The honourable member will have to wait until the budget, when those things will be revealed. Let me put clearly on the record what I have done. I have announced the 1988-89 outcome—and a very favourable outcome it was indeed. I have also said at the earliest possible opportunity that some of that benefit will be returned in the form of tax concessions—\$55 million-worth. That has been announced.

In relation to the rest of our program, when the budget is brought down the honourable member will hear about it and she will be delighted with the impact, the spending programs and the way in which the South Australian economy will develop as a consequence.

NATIONAL WAGE CASE

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide has the call.

Mr DUIGAN: What position did the State Government take before the recent national wage case, and will it move to ensure that the increases awarded by the Full Bench flow on to State awards? This week's decision of the Full Bench of the Australian Industrial Relations Commission affects workers under Federal awards. South Australian workers would want to know the State Government's attitude to the increase and the 50 per cent of workers on State awards need to know whether the increases will be available to them.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Adelaide for his question. It is an important question—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Murray-Mallee could have asked the question himself. It is amazing to hear the deafening silence from the ranks opposite. When workers in Australia were seeking wage increases from the Australian Industrial Relations Commission and proposing a very radical way of overcoming some of the structural deficiencies in the awards and in the Australian industrial scene, members of the Opposition were silent. They were a bit like one of the Opposition's adverts: they were waving their hands around a lot but we could not hear their words. The only time we did hear words from the Opposition was when it complained about the increase. Talk about relieving the pressure! Tens of thousands of workers in South Australia have had a fair amount of wage restraint so that the economy can recover from the vandalism that the Federal counterparts of members opposite performed in 1981-82 and from their refusal then to adopt structural changes. I notice the member for Victoria shaking his head. He just does not understand how the Australian industrial relations scene works and he is part of that push to try to change it.

If the Liberal Party's plans are ever implemented, Australia will see the destruction of our manufacturing and tertiary industries. Many Australian workers, and South Australian workers in particular, will be unemployed and unable to obtain a job. What members opposite cannot face up to is that the responsible wages policies as supported by our Government, the Federal Government and the ACTU

have seen 1.4 million people return to work since the Hawke Government was elected. What members opposite do not accept and what they refuse to talk about is the paltry number of people—fewer than 200 000 people—who were able to obtain work under the Fraser Government in the five years prior to the election of the Hawke Government.

Sensible wages policies saw 30 000 people return to the work force in South Australia, a greater number than was the case about 12 months ago. Those people are in work and can have the dignity of taking home wage increases. As a Government, we will ensure that South Australian workers will obtain that increase, but the employees also have to give certain commitments about award restructuring. That means that South Australian industry will be working more efficiently.

Mr S.J. Baker: What happened to the 4 per cent productivity wage determination?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: We have the member for Mitcham shooting his mouth off again, as he always does in this place. He cannot speak loudly enough and I cannot hear him; he does not even make any sense today. We will be doing our best to ensure that award hearings in the State Industrial Commission are facilitated. If anybody in this House, or even in the broader community of South Australia, thinks that we will get immediate changes overnight, they are wrong. We will see changes spread over a few years and some people have said that those changes will continue, because we have started a process that will shake off some of the cobwebs of the past.

I applaud the initiative of the trade union movement and the Labor Government in presenting this argument to the commission. It is worth noting that the Federal Liberal Party has opposed, from memory, every application for an increase for workers before the Arbitration Commission. The Leader of the Opposition was silent until it was announced—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Sir. May I draw your attention to the comments of the Minister. Only a matter of minutes ago you reminded the House that asking questions during Question Time was not an opportunity for giving speeches. I recognise the latitude that has been given by you and other Speakers to Ministers when answering questions, but I put to you, Sir, that the Minister is exploiting this House by giving such a lengthy answer to the question. I draw to your attention also the political nature of his answer in which he referred to unrelated matters.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. However, the Minister will wind up his remarks as soon as possible so that we do not consume too great a portion of Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: As I was saying, the Liberal Party has opposed every wage increase, and recently the Federal spokesman opposed and deplored this increase. The only comment of the Leader of the Opposition was to deplore it and say that South Australia would lose jobs. He displayed no thought or concern for those tens of thousands of people who will enjoy those increases of up to \$30 a week, together with the vast changes that will take place in productivity and working relationships in South Australian industry. Members opposite have chosen to ignore those facts; all they choose to do is trot out nostrums of the past, which will lead them to their path of ruin.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct a question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Are people who are working at Marineland under threat of the sack if they speak up because the Government is desperate to cover up scandalous maltreatment of the animals and mismanagement of the complex in the period between 1984 and 1987?

I have in my possession a number of documents which suggest that the animals at Marineland were seriously and perhaps even criminally mistreated and that the complex was allowed to deteriorate to the point where there could have been a major disaster. As the West Beach Trust, which managed Marineland during the relevant period, is subject to ministerial control, these matters are the direct responsibility of the Government.

Evidence pointing to this scandal is available in a document which was prepared in 1987 by the Minister's own department and which made the following references to the condition of the Marineland animals:

The animal health aspect . . . would have left the trust and consequently the Government open to severe criticism and embarrassment. Closure of the facility would have been inevitable and prosecution of individuals a possibility.

I have further evidence which refers to some animals having broken skulls, to nutritional deficiencies, to a sea lion pup dying 18 hours after birth because 'nobody knew that the mother was pregnant' and to one of the dolphins being unable to eat for months because it had swallowed a large plastic ball and no veterinary treatment had been given.

A further report I have, dated 1984, states that at this time the Director of the Adelaide Museum had affirmed the quality of treatment given to the animals, suggesting that this maltreatment occurred in the period between 1984 and 1987 when I understand the person who was in charge of the animals refused to allow regular access to Marineland by a veterinarian.

Further, another document in my possession is a lawyer's letter referring to the discovery in 1987 of 'cancerous concrete' in various parts of the building and raising the possibility that the weight of water bearing down on the aquarium might cause the concrete to 'unexpectedly give way'. The evidence becoming available points to a scandalous situation of mismanagement at Marineland and maltreatment of the animals while they and the complex were under the direct control of this Government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Hanson has asked whether or not there have been threats to employees of Marineland and in his explanation went on to make a series of other statements that imply other questions with respect to the wellbeing of marine life at Marineland. Substantially, his comments seem to relate to the period 1984 to 1987.

With respect to the wellbeing of marine life at Marineland between the years 1984 and 1987 and such other periods as the member for Hanson mentions while they were not his question, I will have those matters reported upon. My colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning is monitoring the situation with respect to marine life at Marineland.

Now to come to the actual question of the member for Hanson, which I presume members opposite would like me to do. No threats have been issued by the Government with respect to statements made by employees at Marineland. Look closely, listen closely; that is the case. We understand that the receiver of Tribond Developments has told employees that their employment would be continued on a temporary basis and, given the press coverage of the affairs of Tribond, he has reiterated that he expected them to observe the normal business practice of employees not disclosing

company business to outside parties and that they would continue to be employed only if they accepted that normal business practice.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is a matter for the receiver to determine the appropriate commercial conduct of the business under his receivership. The Opposition needs to determine whether normal business practice is what it supports or whether it is not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The answer to the question whether the Government has issued any threats, constraints or restraints on the capacity of employees to comment on Marineland is 'No'.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Will the Minister of Transport inform the House how the latest increases in STA fares compare with rises in previous years and how our fares compare with those in other States? STA fares increased on 16 July this year. Around the time of the increase, the Opposition claimed that bus fares have risen by up to 90 per cent since 1985.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member is asking the Minister for an opinion, which I understand is contrary to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! A *Hansard* check will reveal the exact words, but my understanding is that the honourable member for Newland asked the Minister to deliver a comparison.

Ms GAYLER: Would you like me to repeat the question, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Newland believes that it will assist the House, by clarifying the matter in the mind of the honourable member for Eyre, I would appreciate her doing so.

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House how the latest increases in STA fares compare with rises in previous years and how our fares compare with those in other States?

The SPEAKER: The question is obviously completely in order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for her question. On the day of the very modest increase in STA fares, the press were informed by staff of members of the Government to be prepared for the Opposition's annual nonsense at the bus stops. The Opposition has not had a new idea in seven years. Every year, regular as clockwork, it turns out the same tired old pamphlets and the same tired old story. It is totally predictable.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell the House what reception we got. The basic message it gave was that this was in some way a quite horrendous increase in public transport fares. As members will have noticed over the years during which I have been here, I like making comparisons. I always go back and check the facts. I looked at the position when members opposite were in government, when they had the chance to do something about public transport fares, and what did I find?

Mr Groom: Same as Greiner.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not quite as bad, actually. I will get to Greiner in a minute when I make the comparison but, in all fairness to members opposite, they were not quite as bad as Greiner. In the three years during which

members opposite were in government, they increased the two zone fare—the standard fare that most people travel—by 100 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have not finished—100 per cent over the rate of inflation. The figures are here. Whilst they were increasing the standard public transport fare 100 per cent over the rate of inflation, they were accumulating a massive deficit, which it has taken this Government seven long, hard years to remove. I heard the member for Coles, interjecting on the Premier in response to a previous question, asking 'How much did we inherit?'—'we' being the previous Liberal Government. I can tell you how much you inherited. You inherited a surplus; you know that you inherited a surplus.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister cannot refer to members opposite as 'you'.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am still making the comparison, Sir. The facts are these: in real terms, that last fare increase was actually a decrease of 16 per cent over the previous three years of this Government. That is what has happened to public transport fares. The figures, which are there for all to see, cannot be argued with.

What particularly interests me, and what I know will interest constituents of the member for Newland, is the concessions that apply in this State for people who require a concession, whether our elderly or whoever. The comparison between this State and other States is quite remarkable. I will go through this table very briefly. The standard two zone peak period multi-trip ticket in this State costs \$4. That is the concession price for 10 trips. The closest State to us is Western Australia, another Labor State and quite a good one—but not as good as this one—where the cost is \$5.40.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Are the zones the same size?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, two zone, 12 kilometres. In Victoria, again another Labor State—not bad, but it is still not as good as ours—the cost is \$5.80 compared with our \$4.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Are the distances the same?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on my left not to continue calling, by way of interjection, on the Minister to deliver more material than he is already delivering to the House.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In Sydney the cost of a concession multi-trip ticket is \$5.50 compared with our \$4; and in Brisbane, the heart—as they like to claim—of the free enterprise system, it is \$6.80. That is how Queensland treats people in need of concessions—it charges them \$6.80. By any comparison, public transport fares in South Australia are extraordinarily cheap and, when the continuation of the O-Bahn opens later this month, constituents of the member for Newland, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Energy will be able to travel on that busway using multi-trip tickets for \$1.20. That is not bad: in fact, it is very good.

I thank the member for Newland for her question, because it is important to make the comparison. It is important that people in South Australia know just what the alternative and companion Parties do in other States. That is what they do: it is expensive for commuters and workers, and it is particularly expensive for the elderly and people who need concessions.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Environment and Planning endorse the statement reported in the *Advertiser* of 4 May this year by the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Ms Wiese) that the Mount Lofty cable car development would enhance the Hills experiences and be a significant attraction for interstate and overseas visitors, and a major source of enjoyment for Adelaideans and South Australian families. If so, will she be asking Cabinet to approve the development, and when will that decision be made?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is an excellent attempt to preempt the way in which Government has operated in this State for many years. Governments operate by Cabinet decisions and we have on both sides of the Parliament, when either Party is in Government, Cabinet confidentiality and, I am proud to say, Cabinet solidarity.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Minister of Tourism is entitled to her own view of Mount Lofty—after all, she is the Minister of Tourism. I can assure members that Cabinet will make a decision; it will make an informed decision; it will make an intelligent decision, and we will not be rushed by the Opposition or by anyone else into making a decision that will not be in the best interests of South Australia. I can give the honourable member and the House an assurance that the decision, when it is made by Cabinet, will be announced to the community, who will be the first to know. We will provide information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I find it interesting that the Opposition has adopted a number of positions on the Mount Lofty project—that seems to be fine for it. However, it has adopted positions which have changed consistently. If the Opposition wants to preempt a proper Government decision by trying to force some kind of rushed response, it has been totally unsuccessful. Perhaps the Opposition will tell the people of South Australia where it stands on this issue.

An honourable member: Is Jenny going to lie in front of a cable car?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I hate to think that Opposition members would hang themselves on cable cars. The member for Heysen has adopted a number of positions publicly on these questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are discussing an environmental matter, not the *Kama Sutra*.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I assure you, Mr Speaker, that I was talking about the Mount Lofty cable car and the development on Mount Lofty, not the *Kama Sutra*. I must say that in this case it was certainly a good try and I believe that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who has a smile on his face, fully understands that I know the way in which Government operates and that I will not be goaded into an inappropriate response.

STAMP DUTY CONCESSION

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Premier provide an estimate of the number of first home buyers who will benefit from the stamp duty concession that he announced yesterday? The Premier said that the stamp duty concession for first home buyers would apply to houses valued at up to

\$80 000, which is an increase of \$30 000 on the previous level.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In announcing that concession, I made clear that I believed that there would be many potential home buyers at present in rental accommodation who felt a little nervous about making a commitment to purchase a home in the present interest rate climate, and that we should be doing everything that we could to encourage them to do so. Therefore, the lifting of this level will be welcome indeed.

We estimate that about 70 per cent of first home buyers would be buying houses at or below the valuation of \$80 000, so the concession is a substantial advantage. However, in saying that, let me correct an impression which I have heard and which is expressed in an editorial in today's *News*, where it is stated that the new concessions would be confined to properties valued at \$80 000. That is not true. The Government's decision means that properties up to a value of \$80 000 are totally exempt and that no tax will be paid on them. So, if one buys a property at that value, there is a saving of \$1 050.

If one buys a property valued at between \$50 000 and \$80 000 there is a commensurate saving ranging from \$200 or \$300 to \$1 050. However, importantly, those properties being bought by first home buyers at valuations above that \$80 000 ceiling will still attract the exemption rate up to \$80 000. In other words, the proportional adjustment means that they, too, will inevitably benefit by the \$1 050. Of course, the assistance is structured to have its greatest impact on those around that housing level.

As to the number requested by the honourable member, it is not easy to estimate. However, in 1988-89, we had about 9 000 applications from first home buyers for stamp duty concessions, and I hope that we would be able to maintain at least that number. So, we would expect to see about 9 000 families receive that benefit.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Gilles to order and remind all members that they cannot converse across the barrier between the Chamber proper and the Speaker's gallery. If they must converse with someone in the Speaker's gallery, they must do so discreetly in the Speaker's gallery. The honourable member for Heysen.

MARINELAND

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say when the Marineland dolphins will be transferred to Queensland, and what guarantee will she give that Buttons, the pregnant dolphin, will survive the journey? Alternatively, will the move be delayed until after the birth, due in December? Will the four fur seals, including two seven-month-old pups, and the nine Australian sea lions, which are the most endangered species of sea lions in the world and which have not yet been found alternative homes, be killed if they cannot be relocated before the demolition of Marineland?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question to the best of my ability. First, I cannot give the House a date on which the dolphins will be moved to Sea World for the simple reason, as I said publicly when announcing the decision, that the dolphins cannot be moved from Marineland to any other alternative home either in the wild or in any other dolphin area in Australia or anywhere else until they have been thoroughly checked to ensure that none of the animals—not only the dolphins but any of the animals in the whole Marineland facility—has a contagious disease.

While it might seem—and it seemed to me—that that would be a fairly simple procedure, I can inform the House that to test all those animals for tuberculosis is not a simple process, as it is in the human species. In fact, only five veterinarians in the whole of Australia are capable of carrying out the test for tuberculosis. Once the tests have been taken—and I would be delighted if our resident veterinarian has any further information to give me, because if he has I would be pleased to know of a simple solution—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, are you interested in the answer or not?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Sir, I have been asked a question; I am answering it on the basis of the absolute ability and knowledge that I have. If the Opposition does not want to hear the answer, that is fine. But I have been asked a question and I am prepared to answer it. I understand that, once the tests are undertaken—and in fact the tests have been undertaken—a number must be sent to Western Australia, because that is the only place where these particular types of tests (and I am not a veterinarian; I do not profess to have in-depth knowledge of it; I am going on the briefing I have received from John Heard) can be analysed. We then have to wait for a response.

I have not received, and John Heard (and let me remind the House that he is the owner of the dolphins, because he is the receiver) has not received, the final health reports on all the animals at Marineland. The reason I cannot give a date for any proposed move is that we do not yet have the clearance in terms of the health of these animals. I think there was a question about Buttons and whether or not that dolphin will be transported. It is my understanding that that dolphin will be transported along with the other dolphins. However, until we know the date on which that will occur, I would not want to give a definitive answer to that question.

With respect to the fur seals and the sea lions, when I had my last briefing from John Heard he was in the process of negotiating with a number of Marineland-type facilities around Australia and was looking at other options to ensure that every animal at Marineland was found a safe and appropriate home. There is certainly no proposal, and the receiver has never raised with me a proposal, to put down any of those animals, particularly the sea lions or the fur seals. However, I will obtain an updated report from the receiver to ascertain the latest situation with regard to the four fur seals and the nine sea lions.

WEST LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Education advise my constituents and the residents of the western suburbs whether the Education Department has made a decision to close the West Lakes High School in the near future? A letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* of 7 August states:

According to the Education Department, West Lakes High School will close in the near future . . . Parents and students in the West Lakes area feel strongly about the pending closure. . .

Has a decision been made by the Education Department?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this issue and I acknowledge his interest in the schools in his electorate, particularly at this time when a review is being conducted of the future programs that will be provided by those existing schools. I can tell the House

that no such decision has been made and, indeed, no interim recommendations of that committee have been transmitted to the Education Department. Further, no recommendations have been presented to me.

However, on 30 June this year the Western Suburbs Secondary Education Review Committee released a set of provisional recommendations. The purpose of the review was to examine possible ways of restructuring the provision of secondary education in the western suburbs of Adelaide to ensure that the future educational needs of young people in that area will be well met.

Similar reviews have been conducted in the Elizabeth Munno Para area and in the south-western corner of the metropolitan area. Further, a similar procedure is being adopted with respect to the examination of future educational needs in the western suburbs. This is necessary because of the declining enrolment in the area. For demographic reasons, enrolments have dropped steadily. There are 23 000 fewer students enrolled in South Australian schools than was the case just six years ago. This enrolment decline is reflected in the western suburbs where, in the 14 secondary schools, there is a projected decline of 1 900 students for the period 1987 to 1992, representing a decrease of 22 per cent of the student population in those schools. We know that that trend will continue into the mid-1990s.

The review committee included representatives from the community, the Institute of Teachers and the High School Councils Association and was chaired by a member of the community, the Reverend George Martin from the Port Mission. The provisional recommendations about the future of secondary education in Adelaide's western suburbs were drawn up after extensive consultation with schools and their communities. That is why it is disappointing to note that some press comments suggest that these recommendations came as a surprise. The extensive consultation will continue for some time.

As part of the continuing consultation process, the provisional recommendations were released for further public comment and that was the subject of a press release dated 30 June from the Education Department which gave schools notice of those recommendations and which also invited responses to them. In due course those responses will be presented to the Education Department and then to me.

I can assure the House that, when making its recommendations about the future of secondary education in the western suburbs, the department will be primarily concerned to ensure high quality education and to enhance educational opportunities for students in that area.

POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Does the Government still plan to cut the police budget? I refer to the Minister's statement reported in the *Advertiser* of 13 May that he had received a shopping list of cuts that could be made to police services if the department's budget was cut in real terms. Such a list would not have been produced without a request from the Minister suggesting that at that time the Government was contemplating further cuts to police services, such as the closure of some police stations at night.

As a result, the Opposition continues to receive reports that police morale is at an all-time low, with services being stretched to the limit. Anybody who doubts that has not had their ears open. This is occurring because effective manning rates have fallen following the introduction of the

38-hour week, while police resignations have been higher than expected across all ranks.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. As he well knows—although perhaps he might not know, because he was never a Minister—in any budget situation all options are looked at.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Indeed, the honourable member became Speaker of the House with the support of only the Labor Party, not his own Party. All options are looked at during a budget situation. I have no intention of telling the honourable member what the budget outcome will be. Like everybody else, he will have to wait, but I will point out to him—

Mr Lewis: That's not true, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will tell him that from the Liberal Party's last budget to the budget situation last year there was a rise of almost 100 per cent.

KENO

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Will the Premier explain why the recent deliberations on which clubs were to be awarded pilot club keno licences took place in secret without any public consultation on the desirability of the proposal, on which clubs should participate or upon the criteria to be used to select the clubs? Will the Premier ask the Lotteries Commission to reconsider its decision to exclude many viable clubs now excluded from the club keno trial and open up the process to a fair and equitable selection system based on more sophisticated criteria than liquor turnover? Will he also advise the House whether any steps have been taken to safeguard the position of those clubs which depend for their survival on bingo and other traditional fund-raising activities and which now face severe financial constraints as a result of the extension of the gambling system into selected clubs?

The decision to offer club keno in a few clubs was first announced in the media, even though none of the clubs, including those chosen, were aware of the proposal. Many large, well-run clubs whose primary focus is service to their members and their local community were ignored in the selection process which, according to a statement released by the Licensed Clubs Association, was based almost exclusively on bar turnover. Even though this is only a pilot program, clubs in my electorate which have been excluded from the scheme have advised me that it will have a dramatic, adverse impact on their financial status.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. He has also written to me on the matter and a reply is on its way, but I am happy to respond to the question here. I think that the point I should pick up is in part of the honourable member's explanation where he referred to a pilot scheme: they really are the key words in this case. If one goes into any new enterprise of this kind, clearly the waters have to be tested and it has to be carefully handled. It is a matter in the jurisdiction of the Lotteries Commission, and the Lotteries Commission is taking responsibility for the orderly introduction on a pilot basis of this particular form of wagering. It is certainly welcomed by the clubs, but not all clubs will either want it, or, indeed, seek to have it. Certainly no club will be forced to take part in the scheme.

In terms of a pilot—in other words, a testing ground—I understand that the Lotteries Commission has not yet made any formal approaches to clubs that it believes would qual-

ify for participation in this scheme. It has had discussions with the Licensed Clubs Association, which I am told was asked to provide a list of clubs in metropolitan and country areas that may be suitable for such a pilot scheme. That is a start in terms of identifying which clubs appropriately could be used.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Perhaps they should join.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is chivvying around the edges while I am attempting seriously to answer the question, and I am doing so based on information provided by the Lotteries Commission on how it is approaching it. I understand that the Opposition supports this scheme, so I am surprised at the honourable member's opposition.

Mr Lewis: Since when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 'Since when' asks the member for Murray-Mallee: since the so-called shadow spokesman said that a future Liberal Government would be committed to it. Perhaps there should be a bit of checking. The member for Davenport may not be aware that the member for Bragg recently issued a statement saying that a future Labor Government—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There is no difference of opinion. The Lotteries Commission is moving systematically to test the water, institute a pilot scheme and see how it goes. This is no difference in terms of agencies. Lots of outlets would like to have TAB agencies or Lotteries Commission agencies and so on. Not everyone can or should be involved in that. We have to find out where it can be done most effectively.

Presumably the criteria are in the process of being established for an assessment and a selection to be made. I would have thought that we could have a fair degree of confidence in the way in which the Lotteries Commission will approach this matter. In general terms, it is welcomed by the clubs. I understand that it is not a matter of political dispute. The commission should be allowed to assemble its pilot list, set the scheme in operation and see how it works. Then can be judged the extent to which it can be more widely spread to clubs in this State.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Following his meeting this morning with representatives of Mitcham council and residents, does the Premier accept that for very good reasons there is overwhelming opposition by the ratepayers directly affected to the creation of the new city of Flinders and, if so, will he give a guarantee in the only way currently possible to prevent this amalgamation by committing his Government to support a joint address to the Governor to overturn the proclamation creating the city of Flinders?

The SPEAKER: Unfortunately, the Chair was occupied with the Government and Opposition Whips at that moment, but it sounds as though the question was most clearly out of order in the sense of anticipating debate.

LAND PRICES

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Can the Minister of Lands tell the House what the Government—

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I would appreciate some courtesy from the Leader of the Opposition when I am trying to ask a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members to extend to other members the courtesy that they would expect for themselves. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can the Minister tell the House what the Government in this State is doing to protect first home buyers in Adelaide from the escalating land prices which are crippling first home buyers interstate?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question, because he has an electorate in which this is a very relevant issue. It is an electorate which has fringe land for development. In South Australia I am pleased to say that the figures for land prices in the fringe areas, when compared with all other capital cities, show that once again first home buyers in Adelaide have a much better chance of getting a reasonably priced home than first home buyers interstate. Only Hobart and Darwin have lower average land prices. Between March last year and this year the average price of a block of land in the fringe areas of Adelaide rose only 1 per cent to just over \$28 500.

I would like to compare that with a similar block of land in Sydney, which would cost some \$60 000; in Melbourne, \$38 000; and in Perth, \$38 000. In answering the honourable member's question I must point out that credit for this situation in South Australia must go not only to the State Government but also to private land developers. In South Australia we are ensuring that our provision of allotments which keep pace with or are just ahead of demand through careful forecasts and monitoring ensure that we have the most affordable land of the main capital cities in Australia.

The Government will continue to keep a close watch on the situation to ensure that our potential first home buyers have the very best possible chance to achieve their goal. The announcement recently of the Seaford project is part of keeping land prices at a reasonable level. This 700 hectare project south of Adelaide will provide housing for some 30 000 residents, with the first residential allotments becoming available at the end of 1990. We have a proud record in South Australia. I reiterate: we have had an increase of 1 per cent compared with an average increase which is much higher for other States, and I am delighted to tell the honourable member that the South Australian Government is responsible for ensuring that land remains affordable for first home buyers.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

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

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 the members of this House appointed to the committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House tomorrow.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended so that on Thursday the adjourned debate on the question—That the Address in Reply,

as read, be adopted—take precedence over all other business, including questions, between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills to be introduced before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1990. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides \$1 070 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$750 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the year.

This Bill is for \$1 070 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. The amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$75 million on the second Supply Bill for last year to cover wage and salary and other cost increases since that time.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$1 070 million.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is two-fold—it makes a number of machinery amendments and also paves the way for further developments in quality assurance programs. Members may recall that the legislation was introduced towards the end of the last session but was not debated.

Turning to the machinery amendments, members may recall that as part of the updating of the South Australian Health Commission Act in 1987, Part IXC of the Health Act was replaced by section 64d of the South Australian Health Commission Act.

Under Part IXC the Governor could authorise persons to conduct research for the purposes of reducing the incidence of morbidity or mortality in the State. Information supplied to authorised persons could not be used as evidence in any legal proceedings except with the approval of the Governor by Order in Council. Many persons who were authorised under Part IXC undertook valuable research in a variety of areas for the purpose of reducing morbidity and mortality. For instance, many important improvements in patient care resulted from the work of, and reports produced by, the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee, a committee established to investigate the causes of deaths associated with anaesthesia.

Section 64d was subsequently introduced, and replaced Part IXC. The wording of the new section is different, although its purpose is the same as the previous provisions. It allows the Governor to authorise a person or class of persons to undertake research into the causes of mortality and morbidity in the State. Confidential information can be disclosed to any person so authorised without breach of any law or any principle of professional ethics. Disclosure to persons other than those authorised could lead to a penalty of \$5 000.

Members of the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee and a number of other researchers and classes of researchers were and continue to be authorised under section 64d. However, the difference in wording has given rise to concerns by the Anaesthetic and Intensive Care Committee, its subcommittee, the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee and anaesthetists in South Australia.

Although legal advice to the Government is that section 64d is better drafted than the previous provision and prevents a court from requiring an authorised person to disclose confidential information, anaesthetists remain concerned that section 64d will not prevent a court from requiring an authorised researcher to give evidence about information collected in the course of research. In addition there is concern that any anaesthetist or other person giving information to the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee can be required to give evidence in court of anything which he or she reported to the committee.

These concerns have meant that there is a loss of confidence on the part of anaesthetists and committee members in South Australia in the confidentiality of material supplied to the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee. As a consequence, the important work of the committee which previously enjoyed a very high level of support from specialist anaesthetists and others involved in anaesthesia in this State is jeopardised. In order to restore confidence and to enable the committee to continue its valuable work, amendments are therefore proposed to section 64d.

Turning to the important matter of quality assurance, for several years, the South Australian Health Commission has encouraged hospitals to run quality assurance programs aimed at increasing the quality of patient care. Such programs require openness by all participating health care practitioners, confidence that the process will not be biased, a preparedness to admit problems in patient care and a willingness to correct problems highlighted. Adequate documentation is essential in this process for analysis and assessment.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital has a quality assurance program but is now interested in undertaking a pilot study into a form of quality assurance developed in California and known as Medical Management Analysis. Medical Management Analysis is designed to provide early identification of hospital incurred adverse patient occurrences and patterns of substandard care. The system uses a set of

specific objective outcome screening criteria which cover all aspects of hospitalisation. Medical Management Analysis highlights problems in the care of specific patients. These problems must be documented and followed up with critical evaluation by other practitioners.

However, practitioners are hesitant to participate in the pilot program because of the potential legal repercussions for the material and information generated. The practitioners' concerns are two-fold. First, the concern is that the information presented to committees or practitioners as part of quality assurance programs may be defamatory of other practitioners or health care workers. This concern is not necessarily well founded as the peer review process is probably the subject of qualified privilege so that an action in defamation would be unlikely to succeed.

The second concern is that material gathered in quality assurance programs may be relevant in an action in negligence. Material created through the use of this system may contain some evidence of negligence. In some states of the US and in some Canadian provinces legislation protects quality assurance material. The US courts have adopted the view that the public benefits of quality assurance outweigh the patient's right of access to documents.

In order to clarify the situation and place these important programs on a sound footing, certain amendments are proposed in new section 64d. The amendments will permit specified persons and groups to be authorised by the Governor to have access to information for the purpose of assessing and improving the quality of specified health services. This will allow for quality assurance committees to be so authorised.

Confidential information may still be disclosed to a person to whom the provision applies without breach of any law or any principle of professional ethics. However, a person must not divulge the confidential information, whether obtained directly or indirectly, in any circumstances, including proceedings before any court, tribunal or board. This will provide a statutory protection to persons giving information to authorised persons and committees. It will encourage them to be more frank about the information they supply than they might have been had the protection not been there.

In order to prevent any abuse of such privilege it is proposed that any person or committee seeking protection must first be authorised by the Governor. It is intended that such authorisations would be gazetted and would extend to Government funded hospitals, private hospitals and any other properly constituted body carrying out quality assurance of clinical practice or competence. In granting an authorisation the Governor would need to be assured that a committee was properly established for the purpose of quality assurance and reported to the Board of Directors of the hospital or other appropriate body. In addition, the Governor would need to be satisfied that privilege was necessary in order for the quality assurance work to be properly carried out and that such privilege was in the public interest.

The provisions in new section 64d have been the subject of lengthy consultation with hospital and medical administration and the South Australian Regional Committee of the Faculty of Anaesthetists of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons. I am pleased to say that the amendments are introduced with their cooperation and support.

There are a number of other machinery amendments. The Bill provides that regulations may be made for hospitals and health centres which provide that no fee is payable in respect of a service of a specified class or a service to a person of a specified class.

Existing regulations simply state 'no fee' is payable for specified services such as for the supply of pharmaceuticals to Health Benefit Card holders or for services to specified classes such as public inpatients. The Supreme Court has declared such regulations to be invalid. The notion of regulation implies the continued existence of the thing to be regulated. Accordingly it is necessary to introduce new provisions making it expressly clear that there can be services for which no fee will be charged. This will validate existing regulations.

In line with 1988 amendments to the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 new divisional penalties have been introduced into the Act. A new provision is also inserted into section 64c. This was done on Parliamentary Counsel's advice and extends the evidentiary provisions. In addition an amendment to section 57aa of the Act provides that by-laws can be made which include the power to remove persons guilty of disorderly or offensive behaviour from health centre grounds. This is in line with by-law making powers for hospitals. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 39 of the Act which relates to hospital fees. A new subsection is inserted to make it clear that the Governor may, by regulation made on the recommendation of the South Australian Health Commission, provide that recognised hospitals may not charge any fee for a service of a specified class or a service provided to a person of a specified class.

Clause 4 amends section 57aa of the Act to give an incorporated health centre the power to make by-laws for the removal of persons guilty of disorderly or offensive behaviour from within the health centre or the grounds of the health centre. Incorporated hospitals currently have this power.

Clause 5 amends section 57a of the Act which relates to health centre fees in a manner similar to the manner in which clause 4 amends section 39 of the Act.

Clause 6 amends section 64c of the Act to add an evidentiary provision that in a prosecution an allegation that a specified person was, or was not, an inspector under Part IVA at a specified time is to be accepted in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Clause 7 substitutes section 64d of the Act. The current section 64d provides for the protection of confidential information disclosed to a person authorised to conduct research into the causes of mortality or morbidity. The new section 64d in addition provides for the protection of confidential information disclosed to a person authorised to have access to the information for the purpose of assessing and improving the quality of specified health services. 'Confidential information' is defined as information relating to a health service in which the identity of the patient or person providing the service is revealed.

Under the new section confidential information may be disclosed to an authorised person or to any person providing technical, administrative or secretarial assistance in the performance of such functions.

The new section provides that it is an offence to divulge information obtained directly or indirectly as a result of a disclosure made pursuant to the section, except where the information is disclosed by an authorised person, or assistant, to another such person. The penalty provided is a division 5 fine (maximum \$8 000). The information cannot be divulged in proceedings before any court, tribunal or board.

The schedule amends the penalties throughout the Act, converting them for the purposes of the divisional penalty system. The penalties altered are as follows:

Section	Current Penalty	New Penalty
ss. 38 (1) (n) and 57aa (1) (n)—max. fine that may be imposed for contravention of by-law of incorporated hospital or health centre	\$50	Division 10 fine (\$200)
s. 45 (2)—failure by insurer to forward accident report to Commission	\$100	Division 9 fine (\$500)
s. 57b (2)—provision of health services by private hospital at unlicensed premises	\$5 000	Division 5 fine (\$8 000)
ss. 57f and 57i (5)—breach of condition of licence by private hospital	\$5 000	Division 5 fine (\$8 000)
s. 57k (3) and (4)—hindering inspector	\$500	Division 8 fine (\$1 000)
s. 64 (1)—breach of confidentiality by health service employee.	\$5 000	Division 5 fine (\$8 000)
s. 66 (2) (h)—max. fine that may be imposed for contravention of a regulation	\$200	Division 8 fine (\$1 000)

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dentists Act 1984. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this short Bill is to strengthen the principal Act with respect to illegal dentistry. Members may recall that the legislation was introduced towards the end of the last session, but was not debated. Members will recall that in 1984 a new Dentists Act was passed. It provided a more modern framework for registration and greater accountability for the profession through revised disciplinary procedures. The legislation also provided for the first time for registration of clinical dental technicians, taking account of recommendations by a select committee of the Legislative Council.

The Act has now been in operation for several years, and experience has shown that there is a need for some fine tuning in relation to illegal practice. As the Act stands, unregistered persons cannot hold themselves out as being registered, nor can they seek to recover a fee in court. However, they are not actually prevented from practising. While it can be argued that the public is safeguarded (by the 'holding out' provisions) against being misled into believing that a person providing treatment is registered, the Dental Board has found this to be inadequate. The board has, for instance, received a complaint about an unregistered person who was believed to be registered, and who provided dental treatment at substantial cost. The patient subsequently required attention from a registered dentist. While such complaints are very much in the minority, the board nevertheless feels inadequately equipped as the Act stands to deal with them satisfactorily as they do occur.

A similar problem arises in relation to clinical dental technicians. As members would be aware, there are now a number of registered clinical dental technicians in South Australia. As envisaged by the select committee, they have undertaken a specific course and are now registered to deal directly with the public in the supply of full dentures. Unfortunately, however, some persons who are not registered continue to operate in apparent contravention of the Act. If they do not hold themselves out or attempt to recover a fee in court, the legislation does not provide a means of stopping that practice. This is obviously unsatisfactory, particularly from the point of view of the clinical dental technicians who have met the requirements for registration and are operating within the terms of the legislation. The Dental Board, the Australian Dental Association (South Australian Branch) and the clinical dental technicians have all sought a strengthening of the Act. The Bill therefore makes the necessary amendments.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 38 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is that a person who provides dental treatment for fee or reward is guilty of an offence unless he or she is authorised by the Act or another Act to provide the treatment.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND CARE BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the conservation and rehabilitation of the land of this State; to repeal the Soil Conservation Act 1939; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Soil conservation and land care is of paramount importance to the future productivity of the agricultural and horticultural industry of this State. 'The State of the Environment Report for South Australia' prepared by the Environmental Protection Council of South Australia recognised that although the 'dust bowl' conditions of the 1930s have been largely eliminated through improved farm management practices, land degradation remains a major concern. Sustainable methods of agriculture need to be advanced and adopted more widely. The Bill before you seeks to strengthen community involvement in soil conservation and land care and to introduce a forward planning concept based on the need for land to be used within its capability.

The intention of this Bill is to replace the Soil Conservation Act 1939. Over 50 years ago the need to protect the soil resources of the State was recognised and culminated in the preparation of that Act. Today, evidence indicates that land degradation is still occurring in the form of water and wind erosion, dryland salinity, soil acidification, water repellance, overclearance and decline in soil structure. Recent estimates indicate that land degradation is costing South Australia in the order of \$80 million in foregone production annually. For some forms of land this loss is incremental as often affected land cannot be rehabilitated without a great deal of time and expense.

Forms of degradation such as wind and water erosion can cause, even in minor form, a great loss of soil nutrients, organic matter and pasture seed which the soil takes many years to regain. Increases in soil salinity, acidity and mass movement are difficult to reverse and have long term effect on our agricultural resource base which contributes over \$2 billion to the State's economy annually. Consequently our approach has been to develop a forward looking planning process to prevent these losses in the future.

The Soil Conservation Act emphasised the need to manage the severe wind and water erosion which occurred in the 1930s, and has, given its scope, been to a large extent relatively successful. However, there is a widespread recognition today that soil conservation should not be restricted to managing only those effects. Rather, the whole community has recognised the principle that land resources, including soil, water and vegetation are interdependent and must be managed in an integrated manner. To this end, it is recognised that soil conservation is dependent on sound land management based on ensuring that land is not used beyond its capability.

Proposals for the new legislation have been the subject of considerable public debate since 1983 when the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation was requested by the Minister of Agriculture to develop guidelines for the revision of the Act. A number of discussion papers were distributed by the Advisory Committee for comment before the Government released a green paper earlier this year. It is on the basis of six years of consultation that the Bill was developed. Further consultation was had with the United Farmers and Stockowners, Advisory Board of Agriculture, Conservation Council, Australian Conservation Foundation, Nature Conservation Society, the Wilderness Society and the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation in the final stages of drafting the Bill.

A major finding of the consultation process is that the landholder has the prime responsibility for soil conservation and land care and is in the prime position to implement measures necessary to conserve and rehabilitate this vital resource. Education rather than regulation has been identified as the most effective approach in having landholders recognise their responsibility for the care of the land. Despite this finding, it is recognised that ultimately, the Government, on behalf of the wider community, has a role to ensure the land is managed within its capability.

Beneficiaries of sound land management include not only the immediate owner but also adjacent and often distant neighbours and future generations.

The objects of the Bill have been developed knowing that the land is the major important resource we have and that each generation only occupies the land for a relatively short period. Briefly, the objectives of the Bill are to determine how well we are managing the resource, to involve the community in the issues of soil conservation and land care, and motivate them to take action, provide mechanisms for better planning of land use activities so we do not exceed the capacity of the land to sustain continued use and to provide, as a last resort, measures to enforce better management of land.

Community recognition of the need for sound land management is shown by the renewed interest in the formation of more soil conservation boards and community land care groups. For many years there were only seven District Soil Conservation Boards covering the wind and water erosion risk areas of the State. There are now 14 District Soil Conservation Boards with a further two in the process of being formed. Negotiations are also underway for the formation of a further seven such boards. In addition, in excess

of 60 applications for funding under the National Soil Conservation Program have been received from community land care groups.

The National Soil Conservation Strategy establishes nationally agreed policies and priority actions for the prevention and control of land degradation and for the rehabilitation of affected areas, so that Australia's economic prosperity can be sustained. Its overall aim is to conserve Australia's soil resources so that further soil loss and land degradation are prevented and that economic and environmental utility is sustained. This strategy recognises the need to:

- integrate conservation and development and emphasise their interdependence and common grounds;
- retain options for future use;
- focus on causes as well as symptoms;
- accumulate knowledge for future applications; and
- educate the community about the interdependence of sustainable development and conservation.

It also recognised that:

- the nation's lands must be used within their capability;
- the individual land user and the Australian community have a responsibility for preventing and mitigating land degradation;
- land resources, including soil, water, flora and fauna are interdependent and must be managed in an integrated way; and
- land management practices should maintain or improve soil qualities.

These principles were informally endorsed in late July by all Ministers in Australia at the Soil Conservation Council meeting in Darwin and each State and Territory agreed to pursue a land capability planning approach as a matter of high priority. South Australia has escalated its program and will attract further Commonwealth support.

To ensure that the principles of the National Soil Conservation Strategy are adopted there is a need to provide an organisational framework which supports community and individual aspirations to conserve our land resource. This Bill provides that framework.

This Bill clearly identifies that the land and its soil, vegetation and water constitute the State's most important natural resource and that their conservation is crucial to the welfare of all people of the State. In order to effectively prevent or minimise further degradation and rehabilitate degraded land, community involvement is essential. To achieve this requirement this Bill introduces a four tiered system comprising the Minister, a soil conservation council, community based soil conservation boards and local committees.

The Minister of Agriculture will be responsible for the administration of the new Act. The major land users who need to be influenced are people involved in the production of agricultural products. To achieve any effective changes will require integration of farming practices with sustainable land uses. To this end, the Minister, under the terms of the Bill, will cause all land identified by the council to be assessed to determine land use, land capability and areas of degraded land. This information will be utilised by boards in the preparation of district plans and individual property plans.

The Bill requires the Minister to establish a soil conservation and land care fund comprised of grants, gifts or loans, fines imposed by boards and any other money made available. The purpose of this fund is to provide a mechanism whereby corporate sponsorship can be sought and used to promote, research or undertake community based soil

conservation or land care activities. The fund will only be used for soil conservation and land care activities.

The Soil Conservation Council will replace the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation and provide a wider community and Government input into the monitoring and management of land resources. The council will advise the Minister on all policies that should govern the administration of the Act. It will also develop integrated strategies for the conservation and rehabilitation of land, including the dissemination of information on the state of land resources and the promotion of community awareness and involvement. The proposed membership of the council caused much comment on the release of the green paper. Most of the views expressed have been incorporated and it now contains a balance between active land managers, skills in science and conservation, a representative from the soil conservation boards, a representative of the Pastoral Board and public servants from the Departments of Agriculture, Environment and Planning, and Engineering and Water Supply.

Soil conservation boards will be established. The formation of the boards recognises the need for landholders to take responsibility for land management practices designed to conserve land resources. Boards will have three year terms and will be appointed by the Minister. The functions of a board are to instil in the community an awareness of soil conservation and land management issues and cooperatively develop programs which introduce management practices ensuring the use of land within its capability. To enable this to occur, boards will oversee the preparation of district plans and three year management programs.

The concept of district plans has been introduced to allow the whole community to examine and have an input into the establishment of district management standards. These plans are broad scale, aimed at helping landholders and the wider community understand their district. They will define land classes in the district and determine the land degradation problems associated with each land class and its cause, extent and severity. The preparation of these plans will include the development of criteria for managing each land class within its capability and set minimum standards for land management within the district, particularly in reference to severe climatic events such as drought or flood. These plans will be produced and provided for public comment prior to approval by the Soil Conservation Council. Obviously, as new innovations or techniques are developed the plans will be modified and the Bill allows for a three year review and an update of the plans if required.

Boards will have the responsibility of encouraging landholders to prepare property plans which cover individual properties and are based on land capability. Where significant land degradation problems exist or could occur, the board can make a soil conservation order. The order can either require certain actions or works to be undertaken or the preparation of a property plan.

The appointment of a Soil Conservator is included in the Bill as in the current Act. This person, a public servant, has the powers of a soil conservation board where one does not exist. The person also has a monitoring role on the activities of the boards and if, in the Conservator's opinion, a board has not taken appropriate action, the board can be directed to do so. If the board does not act then the Conservator can override the board and take action (but not against a pastoral lessee). The Conservator can also take independent action in urgent cases. This mechanism ensures that land can be managed appropriately.

The Bill allows the boards to form committees to bring groups of landholders together with a common interest or

problem. Currently community land care groups are forming across the State due to the encouragement given by the provision of Commonwealth grants. In order to provide a framework for them to operate in and to address significant land degradation issues they have been encouraged to become affiliated with district soil conservation boards. Under the Bill these groups are likely to become special issue committees under the auspices of a board.

The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill has already introduced the concept of property planning for the pastoral regions of the State, as well as recognising the need for Government to accept responsibility for planning and the administration of pastoral leases. In order to ensure that the two Acts complement each other, a number of provisions have been included in this Bill for that purpose. Decisions of the Pastoral Board will prevail where conflict arises between decisions made by a soil conservation board and the Pastoral Board. The Bill recognises the intention of Government to secure community input into and acceptance of responsibility for land management throughout the State, including pastoral land. Boards established in pastoral regions will be required to seek and consider the advice of the Pastoral Board prior to taking action under this Bill.

This will allow the Pastoral Board to ensure land in the pastoral regions is managed within its capability. If the Pastoral Board is concerned, it can advise the relevant board of its concerns and, if no action is taken, take action under its own legislation. A board is required to keep the Pastoral Board informed of all soil conservation orders that it proposes to make. It should be noted that nothing in this Bill will prevent the Pastoral Board from taking independent action in relation to pastoral land if it chooses to do so.

The central object of both Bills is to ensure land is used within its capability and that degraded land is rehabilitated. The provisions contained in this Bill and the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill are complementary. Land degradation problems within the pastoral regions and the need to secure community support is no different to that applying elsewhere in the State. Both Bills recognise the dual requirements of providing a framework for community involvement and the need for Government to ensure management practices conserve or rehabilitate the land resource.

The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill recognises the existence of plans or guidelines established by a soil conservation authority. The Bill now before you allows for the Pastoral Board to provide advice and for that advice to be considered in the preparation and approval of either a district plan or a property plan. Similarly the Pastoral Board or a pastoral lessee is required to consult with the relevant soil conservation authority in the preparation of a property plan.

This Bill once again, as its predecessor the Soil Conservation Act did in 1939, places South Australia in a nationally pre-eminent position in soil conservation and land care by adopting the major aims and principles of the National Soil Conservation Strategy endorsed by the Australian Soil Conservation Council. The community has shown its widespread concern about land degradation and is now prepared to accept its responsibility to redress current problems. This Bill provides a new direction and leadership for this community upsurge in land care.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides necessary definitions. The definition of 'degradation' makes it clear that degradation of land means degradation of soil, water, vegetation or other natural resources of the land. The definition of 'rehabilitation' of

degraded land is the same as in the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill.

Clause 4 binds the Crown.

Clause 5 sets out the objects of the Act, the first of which are to recognise the vital importance to the State of its land resource and to recognise that all sections of the community must work together to prevent or minimise degradation of that resource and to rehabilitate land that is already degraded. It is also one of the Acts primary objects to ensure that land is used within its capability and to provide the necessary systems for implementing and ultimately enforcing that principle of land use. Involvement of the community in the administration of the Act and in conservation programs generally is another important object of the Act.

Clause 6 obliges all persons and bodies involved in the administration of the Act to adhere to and seek to further the objects of the Act.

Clause 7 sets out a general duty for all owners of land (including of course the Crown) to take all reasonable steps to prevent degradation of the land. This is similar to the duty imposed on all landowners by the repealed Act.

Clause 8 requires the Minister to set up a Soil Conservation and Land Care Fund into which will be paid fines imposed under the Act and grants made for the purposes of the fund. The fund must be applied for the purposes of land conservation or rehabilitation programs.

Clause 9 gives the Minister the normal power of delegation.

Clause 10 provides for the appointment of authorised officers.

Clause 11 gives the Minister the power to acquire land compulsorily for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 12 empowers the Minister to carry out land conservation or rehabilitation works on land with the agreement of the landowner, or to give the landowner financial assistance to carry out such works.

Clause 13 establishes the Soil Conservation Council, comprised of 11 members to be appointed by the Governor. The chairperson of the council cannot be a Public Service employee. Three members will come from landholder area, one from the education field, one from the conservation groups, one from the Pastoral Board, one from the soil conservation boards and three from various interested Government departments. At least two members must be women and two men. Deputies may be appointed if needed.

Clause 14 sets out the usual conditions of office. Appointment will be for a term of three years.

Clause 15 provides for the payment of allowances and expenses.

Clause 16 deals with procedure at meetings. The person presiding at any meeting has a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote.

Clause 17 provides for declaration of interests by members of the council. A member will only be able to take part in the discussion of a matter in which he or she has an interest if the council so requests. A member who has an interest in a matter cannot vote on the matter.

Clause 18 sets out the functions of the council. Its primary function is to advise the Minister on the administration of the Act and the policies that should govern that administration. The council is to monitor and evaluate the condition of the land of the State and advise the Minister on all trends and implications of land degradation. The council must play an educative role in the community. The council must monitor the operation of the Act and report any problems to the Minister.

Clause 19 gives the council the power to delegate its powers, except for its function of advising on policy.

Clause 20 requires the council to give an annual report to the Minister and also a special report at the end of the year 1995 when this Act will have been in operation for 5 years. This special report must contain a full review and evaluation of the effectiveness of this Act in achieving its objectives. Recommendations for change should also be included. The annual reports and special report will be laid before Parliament by the Minister.

Clause 21 provides for the establishment by the Minister of soil conservation districts and soil conservation boards for each district. The Minister may dissolve a board and make provision for the disposal of its property. The Minister cannot establish or dissolve a board except upon the recommendation of the council. Before the council makes any such recommendation, it must consult with landowners within the district and all local councils concerned.

Clause 22 constitutes soil conservation boards as bodies corporate.

Clause 23 provides that a board will have up to seven members to be appointed by the Minister. One member will come from local councils concerned in the area and the others will be residents of the district that have, in the council's opinion, suitable knowledge and experience. The membership should represent the major land uses within the district and at least one member must be a woman and one a man.

Clauses 24, 25, 26 and 27 provide for conditions of appointment, allowances and expenses, procedure at board meetings and conflict of interest in the same manner as applies to the council.

Clause 28 sets out a board's functions. A board is expected to promote the use of land within its capability throughout its district. It must develop or support programs for the conservation and rehabilitation of land within its district. It also takes responsibility for implementing and enforcing the Act within its district. A board may, with the Minister's approval, employ staff and acquire and dispose of property. Staff of the board will not be Public Service employees.

Clause 29 empowers a board to delegate its powers (except the making and enforcing of soil conservation orders, which must be on the decision of the board itself).

Clause 30 provides for annual reports by boards.

Clause 31 continues the present Public Service position of Soil Conservator in existence.

Clause 32 provides that the Soil Conservator is responsible for the implementation of the Act in those parts of the Staté that are not covered by a soil conservation district. For this purpose the Conservator has all the powers and duties of a soil conservation board.

Clause 33 makes it clear that this Part of the Act does not derogate from the operation of the Pastoral Act 1936, or prevent the Pastoral Board from taking action under that Act in relation to land. If conflict should ever arise between the terms of a notice issued by the Pastoral Board and a soil conservation order made by a board, the Pastoral Board notice will prevail. A board must always consult with the Pastoral Board before taking any action in relation to pastoral land.

Clause 34 requires the Minister to cause such land as the council from time to time recommends to be assessed. An assessment will determine land classes, land capability, the preferred uses for each class of land and the condition of land. Assessments will be furnished to the council and the boards.

Clause 35 requires each board to prepare a plan of its district and a program for its proposed activities over the ensuing three year period. The plan and first three year program must be completed within five years of the com-

mencement of the Act. The plan must identify all the land classes within the district, the capability and preferred uses of the land, the actual use of the land, degraded land and the causes of and remedies for that degradation and the optimum land management practices for each class of land. District plans and three year programs are to be submitted to the council for approval. These plans and programs are to be available for inspection by members of the public at the Conservator's office.

Clause 36 provides that an owner of land may submit a property plan to the soil conservation board for the district in which the land lies. Boards are required to encourage this voluntary submission of property plans by all landowners except for land within urban areas. The board may promote the submission of a plan in relation to urban land that is seriously degraded or is likely to become seriously degraded. A board may revoke an approved property plan if it is no longer appropriate.

Clause 37 empowers a board to make soil conservation orders where land in its district is, or is likely to be, degraded, or where activities on land in its district have caused or are likely to cause degradation of other land (whether that other land is inside the district or not). An order can also be made where particular action taken in relation to land in its district would prevent or minimise degradation of other land, wherever situated, or where failure to implement an approved property plan on land in the district has led to or could lead to degradation of other land, wherever situated. Soil conservation orders can require a landowner to take specific action or to desist or refrain from taking specific action. An order can also require a landowner to make good damage caused to other land by his or her activities. A property plan may be required if none exists. Subclause (5) requires a board to try to get the landowner's co-operation before it proceeds to make a soil conservation order.

Clause 38 provides for the approval, variation and revocation of property plans that are submitted pursuant to a soil conservation order.

Clause 39 empowers the Soil Conservator to make soil conservation orders if a board fails to do so. This power cannot be exercised against a pastoral lessee. In the event of conflict between an order made by a board and one made by the Conservator, the latter will prevail.

Clause 40 requires the Conservator to have a register of soil conservation orders established and maintained.

Clause 41 empowers a board to impose a fine of not more than \$10 000 on the owner of land who fails, without reasonable excuse, to comply with a soil conservation order. The board may also cause such work to be carried out on the relevant land as is necessary for compliance with the order. Costs of carrying out such work are recoverable from the landowner and are, until paid, on a charge on the land of the landowner. Fines paid to a board must be paid into the Soil Conservation and Land Care Fund.

Clause 42 provides that the Conservator must cause soil conservation orders to be noted on all relevant certificates of title, Crown leases, etc. An order is binding on all successors in title to the land.

Clause 43 provides that a person whose land suffers damage a result of the non-compliance with a soil conservation order by some other person may recover damages from that other person. If a soil conservation order requiring damage to land to be made good is not complied with, the owner of the damaged land can recover the cost of making good the damage from the person the subject of the order.

Clause 44 enables a landowner to have an approved property plan noted on all relevant certificates of title,

Crown leases, etc. If this is done, the plan is binding on all successors in title to the land.

Clause 45 repeats a provision contained in the repealed Act empowering the Minister to prohibit certain stock movements for specified periods of time for the purpose of preventing soil erosion. The Pastoral Board will recommend such action if it relates to pastoral land. An offence against this section carries a division 7 fine.

Clause 46 gives a right of appeal to a landowner against revocation of approved property plans, the making of soil conservation orders and the imposition of fines by a board or the Conservator. The appeal lies to the council which must review the decision that is the subject of the appeal.

Clause 47 provides that decisions will stand notwithstanding an appeal, unless the council, on application by the landowner, suspends the decision.

Clause 48 sets out the usual provisions relating to the powers and procedures for appeals to the council. These provisions are substantially the same as, for example, those pertaining to appeal proceedings before the Pastoral Land Tribunal.

Clause 49 sets out the principles that must govern the determination of appeals. The council is not bound by the rules of evidence, but must act according to equity and good conscience. The objects of the Act must be adhered to.

Clause 50 gives authorised officers, members of the council, board members and the Minister the power to enter and inspect land for the purposes of this Act. Persons authorised pursuant to the Act to carry out work on land on behalf of a board may enter and stay on the land for that purpose. Seven days' notice of entry must be given to the owner of the land except where it is not practicable to do so, or where an offence has been committed, or a soil conservation order or approved property plan has not been complied with. Persons exercising a power of entry must give evidence of their authority if required to do so.

Clause 51 sets out the usual offences of hindering, assaulting, etc., a person acting in the exercise of powers under the Act. All these offences carry a division 7 fine.

Clause 52 provides personal immunity for persons engaged in the administration of the Act.

Clause 53 provides for the manner in which notices under the Act may be served.

Clause 54 provides that offences against the Act are summary offences, and provides a defence of "no negligence".

Clause 55 provides power to make regulations.

Division I of the schedule repeals the Soil Conservation Act 1939.

Division II of the schedule provides some necessary transitional provisions. Existing districts, boards and local committees will be preserved. The present Soil Conservator will continue in office. Soil conservation orders under the repealed Act will continue to be enforced under that Act (but the new council will handle the enforcement).

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Summary Offences Act Amendment Bill 1989 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

PRISONERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act Amendment Bill 1989 be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The need for this Bill to amend section 12 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 follows from the decision of the High Court delivered on 30 June 1989 in the matters of *Hoare and The Queen* and *Easton and The Queen*. It is necessary to look at the history of section 12 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 to put the amendments in context. Section 12 re-enacts, with minor, immaterial, amendments the repealed section 302 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

Section 302 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which came into operation on 8 December 1986, provided that a court, in fixing the term of a sentence of imprisonment, or in fixing or extending a non-parole period in respect of a sentence, shall have regard to any remission of sentence to which the prisoner may become entitled under the Correctional Services Act 1982. Under the Correctional Services Act a prisoner may earn a maximum of 15 days a month remission of sentence for good behaviour.

Section 302 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act was enacted following concerns expressed by the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court Judges that, since courts were precluded by law from taking into account the likelihood of an offender earning remission of sentence for good behaviour, the sentencing process was seriously distorted and the public faith in the integrity of the system of justice tended to be undermined when it was seen that the appropriate sentence and non-parole period devised by the court did not correspond with the punishment which the offender actually suffered.

The Supreme Court Judges proposed that remissions for good behaviour should be abolished. This course was not adopted, and I shall return to the question of the abolition of remissions shortly. Instead, it was decided that the law should be amended to require the courts when fixing the appropriate sentence and non-parole period to take into account the likelihood that the sentence and non-parole period will be reduced administratively by the granting of good behaviour remissions, and section 302 was enacted to this end.

Section 302 was first considered by the Court of Criminal Appeal in *R v Dube and Knowles* (1987) 46 SASR 118. The court construed the section as requiring a 'significant' or 'quite dramatic' increase in the level of sentences for crimes committed on or after 8 December 1986. In the course of

this judgment (in which Bollen and Von Doussa JJ concurred) King C.J. said (at pages 121-122):

The extent of the adjustment must be a matter of judgment in each case. What the judge must have regard to is that a prisoner may be credited with one-third remissions. Clearly the judge is not required or entitled to consider whether the individual prisoner is likely to behave well in prison and thereby earn the remissions. The mandate is to have regard to the objective existence of the remission provisions and their potential bearing upon the time which the prisoner will spend in prison. It is not certain, of course, that any particular prisoner will receive any particular period of remission. Commonsense and common experience in these courts, however, combine to indicate that in most cases the maximum or very nearly the maximum period of remissions will be credited.

What I have said above is, I think, sufficient to indicate that the effect of the operation of the new section will be to increase the level of sentences significantly. As there is no certainty about the period of remission which any particular prisoner will earn, the judge is not obliged, in my opinion, to adjust a sentence which he would otherwise have imposed in any strictly mathematical fashion. Nevertheless the reality is that if it is desired that a prisoner spends six years in prison before parole, regard for the remission provisions is likely to lead to a non-parole period approaching nine years. The same considerations apply to a head sentence. It can be seen, therefore, that the effect of the new section on the level of sentencing will be quite dramatic and could in some cases result in as much as a 50 per cent increase in the sentence which would otherwise be awarded.

At the end of his judgment the Chief Justice (at page 124) spelt out the effect of what had been said about section 302:

I think that it is desirable that the warning which is implicit in what I have said above should be made explicit. Crimes committed on or after 8 December 1986 will attract substantially heavier sentences than hitherto by reason of the removal of the legal fetters which previously existed. Sentences, especially for serious crimes, could in some instances increase by as much as 50 per cent.

The approach subsequently adopted by both sentencing judges and the Court of Criminal Appeal was generally to increase the level of head sentences for serious crimes committed on or after 8 December 1986 by up to 50 per cent over the levels applicable to crimes committed before that date.

The High Court in *Hoare and Easton* concluded that S. 302 had been wrongly construed by the Court of Criminal Appeal. The High Court said that the section, in requiring a sentencing judge to 'have regard', in determining sentence or in fixing a 'non-parole period', to the fact (where applicable) that a prisoner may earn remissions up to the prescribed maximum by good behaviour while in custody, does not provide any basis for increasing what would otherwise be seen as the appropriate or proportionate head sentence or increasing the appropriate non-parole period. The court said that it may, in exceptional circumstances, tend to reduce the weight to be given to particular mitigating circumstances and will necessarily be relevant when considering the question of the practical effect of a given non-parole period against a given head sentence.

This interpretation of the section by the High Court has left little for the section to do and does not accord with Parliament's intention that courts should be allowed to increase sentences and non-parole periods to take account of the remissions a prisoner is likely to earn. If nothing is done the public perception will once again be that prisoners are receiving light sentences for serious crimes and the courts will be required to turn a blind eye to the fact that a prisoner is likely to receive remissions.

The proposed new section 12 subsections (2) and (3) will make it quite clear that the law as expounded by the Court of Criminal Appeal in *R v Dube and Knowles* is the law which is to be applied by sentencing authorities in the future, in relation to offences whether committed either

before or after the amendment comes into operation. Subsection (3) also makes it clear that the law as expounded in *Dube and Knowles* applies to all sentences imposed since the judgment was delivered. There are good reasons for making the amendment retrospective.

The Government believes that those offenders who have been sentenced on the basis of the Court of Criminal Appeal's interpretation of section 302 (or section 12 of the Sentencing Act 1988) in *Dube and Knowles* were, despite the views of the High Court, sentenced as Parliament intended them to be sentenced. Section 302 was enacted on the basis that the law was that the sentencing authority could not increase a sentence or non-parole period to take account of the remissions a prisoner is likely to earn. The South Australian Supreme Court Judges in their 1985 Annual Report said that a Judge 'is precluded by law from taking into account the likelihood of good conduct remissions'.

It was clearly intended that this should be changed. This was made clear in the second reading speech when the amending Bill was introduced. It was then said:

The intention of the original legislation was that the court would take into consideration the remissions a prisoner can earn on his or her non-parole period when determining sentences. However the courts have taken the view that the Judge is precluded by law from taking into account the likelihood of good behaviour remissions during the sentencing process. The new Bill specifically addresses this problem and provides for an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to empower Judges to consider the effect of good behaviour remissions during the sentencing process.

This is a clear indication that Parliament intended to amend the law in the way the Court of Criminal Appeal subsequently interpreted it in *Dube and Knowles*. *Dube and Knowles* established the criteria by which future offenders would be sentenced. These criteria were well publicised and all offenders should have been aware of the basis on which they would be sentenced. The community at large was also entitled to expect that offenders would be, and continue to be, sentenced in accordance with the principles laid down in *Dube and Knowles*. They were the criteria on which the courts, police and corrections proceeded.

By making the amendment retrospective no injustice is being done as offenders were being sentenced in accordance with the principles by which they were intended to be sentenced. It is not an amendment which changes the rules of the game retrospectively as by, for example, increasing a penalty for an offence that has been committed before the increase in the penalty is enacted.

Subsections (4) and (5) provide the mechanism and dealing with offenders who have been sentenced since *Dube and Knowles* and the coming into operation of this amendment. The proposed new section 12 (4) will ensure that where those offenders have had their sentences or non-parole periods reduced on appeal the court will be able, on the application of the Attorney-General, to resentence them on the basis that the interpretation of the law as expounded in *Dube and Knowles* was the law applying at the time their sentences were imposed. Proposed new subsection (5) ensures that appeals against sentences imposed since the High Court decision are not out of time. These provisions will not apply to the sentences of Hoare and Easton, the successful applicants in the High Court case. They will retain the benefit of their successful appeal to the High Court (subsection 6).

The amendment in this Bill to section 9 of the Act further clarifies the sentencing process. The amendment requires the sentencing authority to inform the offender of the minimum time that he or she will have to serve in prison. In other words the sentencing authority will have to set the head sentence and non-parole period and then calculate the maximum days which the prisoner can earn for remissions

for good behaviour. The minimum term in prison can then be obtained by deducting the remission period from the head sentence and/or non-parole period.

It will, from now on, be clear to offenders and the community the precise effect of a sentence. The minimum term the offender must serve in prison if he is of good behaviour and obtains maximum remissions will be spelt out as will the maximum term the prisoner must serve if no remissions are earned.

As I mentioned earlier, the Supreme Court Judges suggested that the distortion in the sentencing process could be eliminated by abolishing remissions. The judges in recommending the abolition of remissions referred to the recommendations of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee (the Mitchell Committee).

The Mitchell Committee advanced several reasons for the abolition of remissions. Most importantly, the committee saw the operation of the system as an automatic award of remissions at the beginning of sentence. The practice has now changed and a maximum of 15 days remission is earned monthly—remissions are credited at the end of each month depending on the prisoner's behaviour and work performance. Further, the current remissions system:

- has been responsibly used by prison managers;
- is a formal, legal and accountable system; and
- is well accepted by staff and prisoners.

In the context of definite release dates the remissions system provides a key mechanism for the encouragement of good behaviour and application to work. In the absence of remissions there is a real probability that there would be a return to informal, illegal and *ad hoc* mechanisms of prisoner control of the kind discredited by the 1980-81 Clarkson Royal Commission.

The case for abolishing remissions has not been made out. The 1986 amendments removed the distortion from the sentencing process and courts had been sentencing in accordance with Parliament's intentions. This further amendment will ensure that this will continue and offenders and the public will be aware of the minimum sentence a prisoner must serve if he or she is of good behaviour.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 9 of the principal Act. This section deals with the information to be given by a court when it passes sentence on a defendant who is present in court. The proposed new paragraph (c) will require a court when it fixes a term of imprisonment or fixes or extends a non-parole period to inform the defendant of the minimum term that must be served in prison (assuming that maximum remissions are earned).

Clause 3 amends section 12 of the principal Act. New subsection (2) in effect reinstates the principles expressed by the Full Court in its judgment in *Dube and Knowles*. Subsection (3) provides that these principles are to be applied by courts of criminal jurisdiction in relation to offences committed before, on or after the date on which this amendment comes into operation. Subsections (4) and (5) make possible a judicial review of sentences imposed in the period between the handing down of the High Court's decision in *Hoare and Easton* and the reinstatement of the earlier principles. Subsection (6) qualifies the provisions which allow for the retrospective operation of the principles reinstated by the Bill. It provides that the reinstated principles are not to affect sentences given in the cases of *Hoare and Easton* or in relation to offences committed before 8 December 1986 (i.e., the date on which section 302 came into operation).

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 August. Page 94.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing, I commend His Excellency the Governor for the manner in which he opened Parliament and for the status which he brings to that high office. I am sure that all members will agree with me that his occupancy of that position has done nothing but good for the State of South Australia. I join with His Excellency in expressing my sympathies to the families of the late members of this House. Although three of those members were unknown to me, I was a member of this House when the late Mr John Ryan (or Paddy Ryan, as he was affectionately known by members) was Speaker of this House.

I wish to make one small comment. At that particular time, we had two hours of Question Time, members asked short questions and Ministers gave short answers, and it was not unusual for me to be able to ask three questions in one day, whereas now, if I ask three questions in one month I am lucky. That is an indication of how the system has changed. I also mention the late Sir Lyell McEwin. I, like most other members of this Chamber, considered Sir Lyell McEwin a friend. He had a very distinguished career in this Parliament, and I mention him especially because he was a regular visitor to my electorate, particularly on 19 March, which was the first landing celebration for Lower Eyre Peninsula. This ceremony is conducted annually by the Caledonian Society. Regrettably, because of ill health, Sir Lyell was unable to participate in that all important sesquicentennial event which took place earlier this year to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the landing and settlement of the Port Lincoln area.

I am sure that the Caledonian Society would like me to acknowledge the contribution made by Sir Lyell McEwin to that organisation as its chief. In opening Parliament His Excellency made particular reference to climatic conditions and, more particularly, to the rural scene that has emerged. I am pleased to note that there is greater emphasis placed in the speech on the importance of rural areas.

Members know that the speech is an outline of the Government's legislative program. I would like to use my opportunity to speak in the debate to draw to the attention of the House the impact of many instant experts who were around last year when we experienced such a devastating period, that is, the driest year since records have been kept for over 80 years or more. That period followed four below average years. As a result of that disastrous drought, all sorts of advice was given as to whether the area should be farmed at all and that Goyder's line should be shifted. At the time I questioned the wisdom of that advice.

I now extend an open invitation to anyone, whether it be a member of Parliament or a departmental adviser, to visit Eyre Peninsula and see what that country can do given a normal rainfall season. I confidently predict that, short of plagues of grasshoppers or infestations of wogs, bugs or some other abnormal climatic environmental condition which can beset an area, rural production from the area will be well above average.

The area needs it, especially the people who have been hammered and who have received little or no Government

support. Although many have been able to survive this drought, regrettably some farmers have not been able to survive. Generally, that area is in good heart now and I encourage all members and other people to visit the area. We want all those instant experts who were only too willing to offer their advice last year to come back and see whether they still believe so firmly in the short-sighted advice that they gave last year.

Environmental issues are now an important part of the community. His Excellency commented about strict control over native vegetation clearance, and I wish to address that issue. First, although everyone would recognise that there has been overclearing in some areas of the State, the whole legislative program of controlled restriction has had the wrong effect. Some areas have been cleared because of hostility to this approach and, if the Government had applied a different approach and provided incentives, I am sure that it would have obtained much better cooperation from landholders so that the net impact would be much better than applies at present. That point needs to be made.

Secondly, I am talking about Eyre Peninsula, which has been carrying the can for the conservation lobby in terms of native vegetation clearance merely because it was the last area in the State to be developed. All the other areas have already been overcleared—I am sure that we all acknowledge that. People in those areas have effectively got away with having cleared all their land—land which is now under production. Therefore, it is the people in the newly developed areas—newly developed because they were further away from their markets—who now have to carry the can in respect of the conservation lobby.

We know that, with about a 97 per cent refusal rate of native vegetation clearance applications, we will see little extra native vegetation clearance. Sooner or later the Government will have to look at equalisation along that track and hopefully encourage revegetation in those areas where there has been overclearing. I am sure that all members would agree that that would be a desirable approach, so that people who still have 60 or 80 per cent of their land under native vegetation can clear some of it. This would allow some equality to apply.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You sound as if you would like to join the Liberal Party in respect of its environmental sensitivity.

Mr BLACKER: The member for Alexandra seems to be carried away with his own sense of importance. I will take him up on that issue in another way. Today the Minister gave notice of the introduction of a soil conservation and land care Bill. I will closely watch the passage of that legislation. I am sure that all members would agree that it is desirable to implement an education program to encourage as many people—not just landholders but people throughout the community—to recognise areas of danger in respect of soil degradation and land care.

The last thing in the world that we want is groups outside agricultural areas dictating to farmers who have to pay the bill how and what they should do. That is the last thing that farmers want. They are the issues that I will be watching for. As I have not seen the Bill, it is difficult to comment further. The idea of having community groups telling a farmer how to farm or what he should do with a piece of land that might happen to be gravelly or with a pH level that is too high or too low, especially if an outsider makes the determination when a farmer has been living with that soil perhaps over many generations, would be the height of hypocrisy and is certainly the wrong way to go.

The point I wished to make earlier is that there needs to be some incentive and perhaps an encouragement scheme

rather than a demanding and highly legislative program. I am pleased to see the expansion of the tree planting scheme, which is desirable. Again, the emphasis in this scheme should be on encouragement. There will need to be taxation incentives to cover the cost of fencing and the other tree guards that are necessary to get trees growing. Rabbits caused the main problem, but more importantly the cost has been prohibitive. We do not have to sell to farmers the idea to plant trees. We might have had to do that 15 years ago, but now the concept of the need for trees is well established and it is not a problem. The problem is the physical cost and the ability of farmers to plant trees.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Our farmers recognised the need to plant trees strategically on the farm before the greenies jumped on the bandwagon.

Mr BLACKER: I would certainly agree with that. Farmers have been the leaders to that end. I now wish to refer to the Prime Minister's great environmental statement. Although I have not read the document from cover to cover, I read the Prime Minister's statement that he wants to see one billion trees planted by the turn of the century. While that objective is commendable, I have read the fine print and ascertained that the Government will allocate \$4 million to plant the first 400 million. That means, from my calculations, the Government is allocating one cent per tree. That would not cover the cost of freighting trees to properties or even the gathering and propagating of seed.

The Prime Minister's statement becomes even more ridiculous when one finds that the remaining 600 million trees are to be propagated by natural regeneration. The whole statement loses its credibility when one understands that only 40 per cent of the proposed one billion trees is to be financed at one cent a tree. If it was \$1 a tree, the statement could have some credibility. The statement that 600 million trees are to be provided by natural regeneration is ridiculous and gives the objective no credibility.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You might have to make it 10 cents a tree.

Mr BLACKER: That would increase the cost to \$40 million. I remind the House that this year marks the 100th anniversary of this part of the building. The centenary of this building was celebrated only a few weeks ago and I for one was proud to be a member at that time. My great grandfather was around at the 25th anniversary of this building and I am happy to have played a small part, even if only by my presence, on the recent occasion.

Much debate has taken place concerning finance and yesterday the Premier made a statement on the results of the 1988-89 fiscal year. The Premier's statement contained some points that are to be commended. In previous Address in Reply and budget debates, I have referred to the commendable intention of any Government, whatever its political complexion, to balance its budget, and I strongly disapprove of deficit budgeting that would require future generations to pay for the mistakes or lavish expenditure of previous Governments. So, I believe that the Government should strive for a balanced budget. On the other hand, Opposition members have pointed out not only that Government expenditure must be considered but that Parliament should also consider the financial position of statutory authorities as well as the general Treasury function—the net State debt.

I believe that there needs to be a mechanism by which the true financial position of the State can be identified and made public, and to that end I recommend that a full independent State audit be held. Although some people might pooh-pooh that idea, I believe that it is necessary for two reasons. The first is that it would ascertain whether the

Premier, as he has claimed, is managing the affairs of State well. If he is, a full State audit would give full credibility to the Premier's statements in that regard and the Premier should have nothing to fear from such an audit.

On the other hand, the Opposition believes that many financial areas have not been properly accounted for and that the total State indebtedness is greater than has been indicated. If that is so, such a state of affairs would be exposed by a full State audit. When the Greiner-Murray Government came to power in New South Wales, it immediately initiated an independent State audit. Although I do not know what that audit cost, I understand that it brought to light the fact that the indebtedness of that State was considerably more than the sum indicated by the previous Government. So, a full independent State audit would serve a two-fold purpose. First, it would provide the Government with credibility as to its financial dealings if it was doing the right thing and, secondly, it would show whether the Government was covering up in some areas and the Government would thereby be exposed. Irrespective of whatever political Party is in power, I see considerable benefit in a full independent State audit.

The difficulties being experienced in the electorate basically revolve around interest rates. I freely acknowledge that many of those difficulties have been due to the Federal Treasurer's fiscal policy and his belief that our overheated economy needs steadying by means of higher interest rates to reduce consumer demand. However, such higher interest rates affect only the small business person and the home buyer, the rank and file persons who make up the wider community of which we are all proud. On the other hand, the person who has been through his business career and has a nest egg stacked away will be earning interest on that amount and is doing very nicely, thank you. Moreover, the big corporations are not affected so much by the high interest rates: it is the small businessman, such as the farmer and the person who in the city or country has set out to establish a lifetime business for himself, who, like the home buyer, is affected adversely.

In this regard, the State Government of the day has an obligation to help the small businessman, the farmer and the home owner who is suffering because of the Federal Government's fiscal management. To do this, the State Government could put pressure on the Federal Government to alter its economic direction. The small businessman, the farmer, and the home buyer should not have to carry the economic burden alone merely because they are borrowers: everyone should be made to carry it equally. To this end, the Government of the day should have greater pressure put on it to change its economic direction. This will require a much more concentrated effort and belt-tightening by all sections of the community.

Indeed, the Government must tighten its belt, which means that we must lose some services or downgrade other services so that fewer public services are provided. We may have to pay more for services that we now take for granted. At the same time an incentive must be provided so that those people with the ability to produce can do so, because the producers must have a far greater input than they have at present in order to put this country back onto its feet. This can be done on the dual basis of reducing Government expenditure and of providing incentives to encourage production. In this way, interest rates, hopefully, will fall and the home buyer will thus be able to buy a home, which is the Australian dream.

Small business is basically the backbone of the community. Indeed, small business people are the largest employers of labour and therefore have the greatest potential to create

employment. The Government may talk about the establishment of a new factory employing 150 employees. That is fine, but within the small business infrastructure there is the ability to employ more people than are employed in one big factory, and such action requires only little incentive. The red tape involved in employment these days is a restricting factor in the employment of labour. In this regard, I can quote a personal example. Earlier this year, on our farm we wished to shear 80 sheep for Kuwait. The work lasted less than a day, yet it was necessary to write out four cheques in relation to the shearer—for wages, taxation, WorkCover and superannuation.

If that is not a disincentive to employment, I do not know what it is. I realise that a person should be covered in all aspects of employment, but there must be a simpler way for the small businessperson to deal with such matters. To this end I recommend a one stop shop for small business whereby on one form could be set down all the Government requirements such as the business name, registration under the Companies Act, the licence to sell dangerous chemicals if that is required, fuel, gas, and so on. All those Government requirements should be listed in one booklet and the small businessperson should once a year be able to go through that, mark the appropriate items, enter the fee, and by means of one cheque pay the total to the State Government in one operation without hassle.

That may sound like an over-simplified form, but it is being worked towards by the Government in New South Wales, where Mr Gerry Peacock (Minister for Small Business) hopes to have the one stop shop operating soon. If we could do that, it would eliminate at least some of the hassles for the small businessperson. One of the greatest anti-Government moves in the community concerns the bureaucracy and the need to fill out various forms and documents. Indeed, the filling out of forms by an employer of only one or two people almost requires the services of another employee because of the red tape. If the red tape could be reduced, the Government would be doing great things for the business community, and I am sure that that would greatly assist in the employment of more people.

Another major area I wish to address is the matter of main roads. Over the past few years there has been a 30 per cent reduction in moneys spent in real dollar terms on roads, and that is showing. We find that in just about every area—except major metropolitan areas, where 96 per cent to 98 per cent of the roads are sealed—roads have deteriorated. In most of the local government areas that I represent 94 per cent to 96 per cent of the roads are dirt roads, and only about 6 per cent are sealed. That is an added cost to those communities; it is a cost in wear and tear, and certainly a cost in fuel. Fuel then becomes a major issue.

I again recommend to the Government that a State fuel equalisation scheme be pursued in order to achieve some equality and to repopulate country areas. People who leave the cities and repopulate the more sparsely populated areas have a better lifestyle and live more cheaply and, in many cases, value adding of the raw product is the way that many countries are going.

Yesterday the Chief Secretary announced the gazetted regulations for daylight saving. This insidious ritual has gone on for a long period of time and each year the Minister adds a week or 10 days to the daylight saving period. On this occasion the Minister is adding to the beginning of the daylight saving period. What is this Government thinking about? It does not care a damn what happens to the people in the West who, because of their geographical location, already had daylight saving long before it came in. Our time in South Australia should be based on a meridian in South

Australia, but that meridian is in Victoria. This means that the further west one goes, the greater the period of daylight saving.

When Government initiated daylight saving is added to that, this ridiculous situation gets further out of hand. When daylight saving was applied only during school holiday periods, it was fine. People could work around that and it was of no great concern and, in the main, it met with the requirements of most people. This Government does not care about those who are most inconvenienced by daylight saving. If the Government were genuine and if it used the time meridian in the centre of the State, considerable advantages would flow to everyone, but it has been said that that should not occur because the time in this State would then be one hour behind that in the eastern States. I disagree with that.

That argument was put in 1889 when a similar Bill was before Parliament. Surely given the sophistication of communications and technology since that time it is convenient for people to communicate by using facsimile machines and other updated electronic gadgets. If the time meridian in the centre of the State was used, our ability to be able to communicate with the West would be improved, so what we would lose on one side we would pick up on the other.

I now turn my attention to the issue of raw sewage being pumped into the sea at Porter Bay. This issue was first brought to light in 1973 when a State Government report of the Engineering and Water Supply Department highlighted the fact that the area adjacent to the outfall at Porter Bay was the most polluted area in Spencer Gulf. That report was initiated when the Government was trying to find an excuse for the establishment of a petrochemical plant at Red Cliffs, and it became a convenient blind to transfer the heat from Red Cliffs to some other issue. However, that has not solved the problem at Port Lincoln, which is a city of some 13 000 people. It seems to me to be utterly ludicrous that raw sewage should be pumped into the sea so close to a residential area where there is no ocean current to rapidly dissipate the sewage outfall.

The Government must—and I repeat 'must'—reconsider its priorities to ensure that no major city in this State discharges raw effluent into the sea. Recently the Government indicated that it intended to bring down legislation and to introduce restrictions to stop pollution of the sea. There is no better way for the Government to demonstrate its sincerity than to become involved and build a sewage treatment plant at Porter Bay.

I recall taking a deputation to the former Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Dr Hopgood). When the maps were laid out on the table and the departmental officers were asked where the sewage treatment works were situated, they had to advise the Minister that no such works existed.

I know that this problem will become political, because I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee when the Finger Point sewage proposal was before it in 1982. I know what can happen with various priorities put up by Governments. This project must be given some priority and must be put on the program so that it can be built in the not too distant future. If a full treatment plant cannot be built now, at least a primary separation plant or other stages of the construction of a sewage works should be placed on the priority list.

I again commend His Excellency for the manner in which he opened Parliament. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply and look forward with some interest to the Government's presenting its budget in 10 days, or whenever, so that we can get an indication of what it proposes for this

State and so that alternatives can be looked at. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I, too, join with other members in support of the motion. I share the regret that was expressed by the Governor at the deaths of the five former members of this Parliament whose names were recorded in his speech. I also express my condolences to the members of their families. I did not know Mr James Heaslip or Mr Leslie Nicholson. I certainly knew Paddy Ryan—John Richard Ryan, as is recorded in the Governor's speech—as did many other members. I well remember from my first term in this place his stentorian voice which allowed him to keep very firm control of all activities in the House. It is a pity that there is no tape recording of his utterances of 'Order!' which could have been heard across the road and, I think, sometimes cleared the bar opposite when he required members to return to some degree of the decorum that they should normally exercise in the Chamber.

I got to know Sir Lyell McEwin when I first came into this Chamber and it is worth noting his parliamentary career spanned some 40 years, and that record would not often be emulated in any parliamentary system. I also note that the late Sir Arthur Campbell Rymill, whom I knew to a degree also, had quite a distinguished record.

I have been in this place for quite a number of years and it is not often that I feel sympathy for the Opposition, particularly the present Opposition members in this Chamber. However, yesterday when the Premier announced the \$55 million tax relief package, the scene opposite almost moved me to feel sorry for members of the Opposition. If one looked at the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader and the lady member who seems to have some kind of fascination for bulldozers, one could only say that, viewed from my now less prominent position on the back bench, the picture from left to right was as follows: despair, dismay and dejection. As I looked at the opposite side of the Chamber, the scene was one of depression and absolute despondency. If anybody has any doubts as to how the Opposition actually felt at that time, I can say that the scene moved me to visit the library to consult the Oxford Dictionary about the words I have just used to describe the scene yesterday. In the Oxford Dictionary 'despair' is defined as 'a state of mind in which there is entire want of hope.'

That aptly describes the condition of the Opposition yesterday, and obviously today, as we observed the state of the Opposition during Question Time—an entire want of hope.

What was it that the Premier announced which put members opposite into that utter state of dejection? It was an announcement that proved what the Premier has been saying for quite some time, that is, that the State is in good hands, it is being managed properly, and, in difficult times, the best possible remedies are being applied. Those remedies led to a state of buoyancy in the operations of the whole South Australian community to such a level that the estimates of revenue have been far exceeded in the financial year just completed.

In addition, the Premier gave direct evidence that prudence—one is almost tempted to say parsimony—had been the guiding principle adopted by Cabinet and the Executive as a whole during that 12 months so that, at a time of increasing demand for more services and at a time of some economic stringency, the Premier, together with the Cabinet and Public Service officers, could exercise the necessary controls and save a further considerable sum. The Premier announced that there was a Recurrent Account surplus of \$83 million. The savings thus effected allowed for some

relief to be applied to the South Australian community. That relief was to come into effect not in the future but, rather, on the day that the announcement was made. One section of the community that certainly requires assistance comprises purchasers of homes. As of midnight last night, in South Australia first home buyers are now able to benefit from the new criteria applying to stamp duty.

Of course, the millions of dollars involved do not necessarily indicate the extent of assistance at the level where it is to be applied. For that reason, it is valid to mention a few examples of home purchases and the savings that will apply to those purchasers. A person buying a home valued at \$65 000 was previously required to pay \$525 stamp duty. However, as from midnight last night that person will not have to pay anything. That purchaser will not have to find that additional sum of money at a time when a mortgage is being organised for such an important purchase.

A home costing \$75 000 previously would have attracted a stamp duty of \$875. However, under the new conditions, no duty will be required. Under the old conditions \$1 050 stamp duty would be applied to a home costing \$80 000, but as of midnight that home would also attract no stamp duty. A sliding scale also enables homes exceeding \$80 000 to attract some remission.

My other purpose in speaking today is to give credit where it is due in a government and semi-government area. Of course, I intend to refer to a specific instance. Although it is not necessarily the only area which should be commended, it is one in which I have an involvement, and I refer to the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust in the electorate of Mitchell.

At this stage, I put on record my congratulations to the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings), the General Manager of the trust (Mr Edwards), the board, and the officers at other levels who have been concerned with the redevelopment of Mitchell Park. I know that my just mentioning the words 'Mitchell Park' will strike a responsive cord in the heart of my colleague, the member for Playford.

Mr McRae: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Going back quite a few years, he certainly has an attachment to Mitchell Park. Mitchell Park was, and I quote:

... a typical example of a large trust double-unit development developed during the 1950s. The material used in the construction of the houses was either brick, Mount Gambier stone, or Hollostone block, depending on the material available at the time.

There were shortages in those days. Further:

The units were set on relatively large blocks of land with little or no variation to the style or setback from the street alignment. Hence the suburb had a monotonous appearance from an architectural and planning point of view.

This was possibly, sometimes incorrectly, referred to as a dormitory suburb for the then Chrysler motor vehicle plant, now Mitsubishi. The catchment area in relation to this redevelopment takes in 394 double units, which were constructed between 1956 and 1958. They are mostly dwellings of five rooms, although there are a few four and six-room dwellings scattered throughout the suburb. It must be said that Mitchell Park has not enjoyed a particularly high reputation as a place in which to live. That is not a comment on the people who live there. They are wonderful people. They are quite wise and they have shown a considerable amount of perspicacity in continuing to elect the member for Mitchell with a resounding majority—much of it coming from that area—over seven elections.

The suburb had other attributes, as it were, because it was handy both to major shopping (Westfield major shopping centre is easily reached from Mitchell Park) and to

transport, and the hospital and university are within walking distance. It was basically family-type housing to cater for families with children, but it now comprises about one-third single parents, one-third couples and single persons without children and one-third couples with children.

Members will understand that there has been a dramatic change in the type of accommodation currently sought by many tenants in the area we generally refer to as the public sector. This changing demand and the fact that a number of the original tenants no longer have children at home (there is a diminished family scene in each house), were among the factors taken into account in considering Mitchell Park for redevelopment.

When I was approached on the matter, before the redevelopment began, I was asked whether, as the member, I had a view. My view was that, if the residents of Mitchell Park were in support of it, it ought to go ahead, but that, if they were not, it should not. That view was accepted by the trust and in consequence householders in the area were canvassed for their views. Some 200 tenants in the catchment area were canvassed. They completed a questionnaire which sought their views. After the interviews with those people who completed the questionnaire, they were invited—I put this to the trust and it was accepted—to form a tenant representative committee to work with the trust on the proposed development in an ongoing capacity.

The next step taken by the trust—a worthy step which should be commended—was to put an office on-site with the plans for the redevelopment and to make it accessible to all tenants. They could go there and see what was proposed for their street, house or location, consider what they might be offered in future and make any comments they wished. It is a classic example of involving the community in a redevelopment of this nature.

The first redevelopment was modest. Four pairs of attached houses were demolished and fencelines moved from adjacent properties to create maximum land usage. By building 17 new units, there was a yield of about two to one.

The Mitchell Park neighbourhood centre was built by the Housing Trust on adjoining land. There had not been one before. It is successfully operated by the Marion council for the local community. The creation of a large reserve, because of the demolition and rebuilding and relocating of homes, now provides local residents with a centre for community involvement and activity. Additional redevelopment is going on, and larger groups are now being dealt with. Currently, there are about 25 new two-bedroom and three-bedroom single and two-storey dwellings under redevelopment.

Another important feature of the redevelopment was the recognition that medium density housing does not necessarily need arterial highways traversing it in all directions. There has been a reappraisal of the road layout in the area. Some roads have been realigned to become culs-de-sac and so on to provide a peaceful and calm environment for the family-type accommodation which was provided in those areas. I think that, all in all, it is an excellent example of how to go about these matters. As I have said, I commend the trust and the Minister concerned for the approach that was taken.

I particularly want to record my appreciation to the Area Manager, who is located at Warradale where the trust has an office, and, for that matter, the Area Manager's deputy who is currently acting Manager while he is on long service leave. I do not think that those two persons would mind if I put their names in the record, because they are entitled to commendation for the way in which they have always been so approachable on matters connected with the rede-

velopment and any other Housing Trust matters in my electorate that I have had to raise. The Manager is Mr Ross Clare and Ms Jan Connolly is the acting Manager, but normally Mr Clare's deputy.

While I am offering some commendation to the Housing Trust, I should also like to take the opportunity to look at what the General Manager says in the current publication of the trust's document 'Corporate Strategy 1989-1993', which most members would have received. In what one might call the foreword the General Manager (Mr Edwards) says, under 'Operating in the Real World':

Most of all this plan represents a commitment to listen.

This is what I want to get over to members. This is the only way that operations of this nature with respect to public housing should be conducted. Mr Edwards goes on:

Listen to tenants and applicants; listen to the staff who serve them; and listen to the community and industry groups with whom we interact on a daily basis.

That is an intelligent statement to appear in such a document. It is the way that these things should work. I am also taking up the offer implicit in that statement by the General Manager. I propose to put before him some thoughts that I have on the Housing Trust and the way in which it operates.

There are three areas that the trust could review in relation to its rental housing operation. First, I refer to the behaviour of some tenants. There is a need for a code of practice to be devised in conjunction with tenants—taking note of what the General Manager has said about listening to tenants—so that when, as occasionally happens, severe disruption and interfering behaviour takes place in medium density housing in the trust's control, some kind of principles of behaviour can be required with backup support for those who might be considered to be the offending tenants. I am not telling the trust how to do it: that is not my function. I am taking the opportunity given to me by Mr Edwards and asking him to listen to someone who has had a fair amount—20 years—of experience involving instances of the type of behaviour about which I am talking which causes serious disruption.

The second thing I bring to the attention of the trust is this: I understand that the trust, in its youth housing program, now has what it calls contract tenants. It is a very unwise position for the trust to have more than one class, if you like, of tenant. It seems to me that, if you designate some people by a label which clearly indicates that they are not in the running for permanent tenancy, you are making it difficult for them to be on the same footing as the remaining tenants. I support the trust's endeavour to assist people, through its youth housing programs, to go into homes and to try to learn living styles so that they can actually function in the community in rental housing far more efficiently and happily than they are able as a result of their upbringing or development up until when they become tenants.

I have seen on one or two occasions an excellent young person—a single mother, for example—placed in youth housing and behaving almost as a model tenant but required to vacate that accommodation at the end of the contract period. It is this part on which I have expressed my thoughts and concern—the nature of the tenancy being under a contract. It has seemed that where tenants in the same situation have behaved poorly, because of the difficulties that put them into that situation in the first place, they are often given much longer tenancy. I think members will understand the point that, if you have more than one class of tenant, you build in these kinds of difficulties. It ought to be that, if a person is given the chance to be a tenant, he

or she ought to be given the chance to continue in the tenancy as long as he or she wishes, without being restricted by some kind of contractual arrangement.

The final category of the operations of the trust to which I wish to refer and ask the trust to examine is that of transfers. For those who do not have Housing Trust accommodation in their area, I can tell them that the way in which transfers operate within the trust is that a service time is necessary before one is considered for a transfer. There may be very good reasons for that, but they are not apparent to me and that is why I raise the matter. It seems to me that if tenants in the public sector are to be on equal footing with tenants in the private sector, where one takes the decision to move to more suitable accommodation by way of organising one's own arrangements, that ought to be possible in the trust and not necessarily require long service and waiting periods. It is not as if the trust loses a vacancy.

When a person moves from one place to another, the trust is no worse off, so it seems to me an unnecessary restriction. I am not suggesting that every month a person ought to be able to say 'I am sick of this joint; I want to go to another one,' but there ought to be some reasonable transfer arrangement. If that is the case now, it is not apparent to me, because I have been given information which sets out the kinds of criteria that I have talked about—the necessity to stay in a place for a given amount of time before one can even consider a transfer. It is undesirable, but I will not go further than that. I am not putting it down as extremely reprehensible or anything like that, but I want the trust to give that matter some consideration.

Whilst on housing, I turn to retirement villages. I have a very large retirement village in my electorate—the Edwardstown retirement village. I want to put on record today that there is an emerging area of residents' rights in village home complexes for the aged. This relates, in particular, to the very vexed question of maintenance payments which are made by persons who purchase both independent living units and semi-independent accommodation in retirement villages. The people who live in these villages are not really residents; they are licence holders, in some cases, and there are various titles which can apply to them.

I will cite the figures in respect of one retirement village (I will not name it, because I have not had any contact with it). The breakdown of that semi-independent unit maintenance fee is as follows: council and water rates, \$8 per week; insurances, \$1 per week; electricity, \$6 per week; equipment replacement, \$1.25 per week; unit maintenance, \$2.75 per week; the trustee company involved, \$1.25 per week; salaries, \$38.50 per week; meals (and this is where semi-independent living is concerned), \$38.50 per week.

This is a point on which I have had a number of approaches. When people are absent from their unit for an extended period—because they are in hospital, and so on—there is no remission of the maintenance amount which relates to the provision of meals. It seems to me a little unjust, and I think that it is an area which will require further investigation and might well need to be addressed under the regulations of the Retirement Villages Act. Clearly, it will not be an easy task to draw up some guidelines. Should there be a seven day minimum or a longer period before there shall be some remission of the amount paid, should it include absence on holidays, or should it be an involuntary absence, such as going into hospital? It is an area of great difficulty about which I have had a number of approaches. There are many other areas I wish to canvass, but I have no time left; besides, other members have the right to contribute to this debate. I have very much pleasure

in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): This is the ninth occasion on which his Excellency has opened a session of the South Australian Parliament and, in October, Sir Donald will become the longest serving holder of the Viceregal office in our State's history. He will surpass the 7½ year period served by Sir Willoughby Norrie from December 1944 to June 1952. Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have worked with quiet dignity to ensure that the Viceregal office is seen as relevant to the times in which we live, and of benefit to the community they serve.

This is the last Address in Reply debate in which a number of members will have the chance to make a contribution. I refer first to the members for Stuart, Playford, Gilles, Mitchell, Peake and Spence. They are to retire, and all members on this side of the House wish them well in their retirement and for the future. Their combined service to this House totals some 100 years. The members for Spence, Stuart, Mitchell and Gilles have had ministerial experience, the member for Playford has been Speaker, while the member for Peake remains the Chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Each of these retiring members has, therefore, served in public positions during his membership of the House. We may have different political views, but we have appreciated the courtesy they have shown to us when we have had official dealings with them in the different positions they have filled. They will take with them into retirement experience and an approach to public and parliamentary duties which their Party is going to miss.

I am confident, of course, that this will be the last Address in Reply debate in which a number of other less experienced Government members will participate, although I shall not name them all, because there are too many of them. So, I also take this opportunity to wish them well for the future. Following the next election there will be a new approach to Government in South Australia, for there will be a Liberal Government.

Under a Liberal Government in the 1990s, South Australians will have a fairer Government; a Government of reform; a Government of vision; a Government committed to easing the pressure on South Australians and a Government firmly believing that its role is to make it easier for people to do things for themselves and not to control more and more of their daily lives. There is no doubt that South Australia needs such a Government. For 20 of the past 25 years, with Labor in Government, South Australia has lost influence, impact and importance on the national scene. We have fallen behind economically and socially.

This Government has never disputed the case that we have constantly put. It cannot dispute that South Australia has fallen back in its share of national population, of employment, of investment and of exports. In this debate, I will examine in particular the record of the past seven years. It has accelerated the decline which began when Labor first came to office in 1965. And what does the House have before it for this session? Last Friday's *Advertiser* called it a 'tame legislative program'. There is no answer to the critical problems facing South Australia. It is proof of Labors' failures that all the Premier can do now is attempt to frighten people about what he suggests will happen when there is a change of Government at the next election.

After almost seven years in office, the Premier is left with trying to misrepresent and mislead as his only tactic. At the recent PCA Conference, he dwelt on what he said was the disruption and dislocation to public services being caused

by a Liberal Government in New South Wales. He ignored that this is a Liberal Government trying to clean up the corruption and mismanagement by 12 years of Labor Government. Nor did the Premier look at what is happening in Victoria and Western Australia—under Labor Governments—where the full cost of Labor's economic interventionism is only now being revealed with their elections out of the way and where there is much more disruption and dislocation than New South Wales has seen. The Premier ignored that. He ignored the Dowding and Cain Governments' disruption of the past week or two because it did not suit his argument.

The Premier need look no further than his own State if he wants to see real public sector disruption and dislocation—here and now—in the provision of our vital services. Unlike the Premier, in recent times, we have been visiting our public hospitals, our schools and our police stations. We have seen for ourselves how the Government's misguided and mismanaged priorities have put the pressure on these services and those responsible for providing them.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, I did have a look at the number of holding cells in your police stations. A Liberal Government will ease this pressure with administrative reform and with financial reform. We do not believe in reform merely for the sake of it. We are committed to practical reform and radical reform in some areas. But reform with one goal—to turn around our State for the better. The Premier has led his Party for almost a decade, and he has led the Government for almost seven years. This is time enough to have stamped a vision on the State, to have demonstrated a sound set of principles—to have shown vision and vigour and to realise that vision for this State. But the Premier passes none of these tests. Within his Party the Left is still fighting the rest, while the State is divided over the directions in which we should be heading—because he has not shown that vision, that leadership, or that direction.

He has not summoned the creative and collective energies of South Australians to the cause of stopping the drift, the decline of our State. There are few, if any, speeches he has made which define the principles he follows—his purpose—and his plans for South Australia. Have a look at his speeches. He simply believes in politics by press release—that a promise made today need not be consistent with a position taken tomorrow. Let me demonstrate this.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: This is incredible!

Mr OLSEN: The Minister says that this is incredible. We had the promise of stamp duty relief in 1985. It took the Government four years to get up to the barrier to provide that election promise. We get it finally on the eve of the 1989 election campaign. If ever there was demonstration of the proof of what I am saying it is that. It is the Government's own words and actions. I know the Government does not like it, but it took the Government four years to honour that election promise.

Let me demonstrate the Government's record over the past decade. In Opposition, the Premier opposed the Roxby Downs development. He opposed the O-Bahn. He said the Liberals were moving too quickly with the Stony Point project. Yet he has been happy to open each and every one of these projects in this State. Now, no doubt, he will seek the credit for these Liberal achievements as we go into the next election campaign. No doubt on 20 August when he cuts the ribbon for that final section of the O-Bahn he will say, 'Look at what I've done' when in fact it was not his deal at all. Similarly, I have no doubt that he will pretend that Technology Park and the International Air Terminal were his initiatives. Of course, they are further products of

a Liberal Government in action, a Liberal Government doing something, a Liberal Government putting something on the deck for the benefit of this State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What about the Torrens linear park?

Mr OLSEN: The Torrens linear park is another example. The former Liberal Government also began the studies that led to the ASER development. It signed the contract for the financing and redevelopment of the ASER site. Similarly, the last Liberal Government initiated the establishment of SAFA; and we initiated all the research and detailed discussions and negotiation which led to the formation of the State Bank. I will say more about these two arms of Government later. For in some respects, and without a mandate, the Premier has moved them away and beyond their original charter.

In summary, the original momentum for all of these initiatives was not developed by the Premier—although he tries to run with all of them now as if they were his own. We set that agenda, and we are still setting the agenda in important areas like administrative reform—financial reform—with our policies for more efficient and open government; in environmental protection, with our new ideas for stopping marine pollution in South Australia; in law reform, with a stronger and safer parole policy; in education, with more say for parents, more discipline and more support for teachers in the challenge they face today to educate our children for the opportunities of tomorrow; in labour market reform, with our proposals for enterprise-based industrial relations and voluntary agreements; and in our proposals for much more individual choice and freedom for people in voluntary unionism, voluntary voting and freedom of information—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well might Government members interject in respect of freedom of information. In Opposition it was promise, promise, promise, but they have not delivered. We have introduced freedom of information legislation twice, and we are about to do it for a third time in another place. I bet that once again the Government does not get to the barrier to support it, yet that was a key ALP promise in 1982. At least our policies have been consistent, firm and based on consistent overriding principles.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Let me respond to the hapless Minister on the front bench. We do not believe that it is the role of the Government to pretend that life is easy out there or that it is possible to achieve prosperity without hard work and effort, or that the Government has all the answers. Fundamentally, we believe that the role of Government is to serve people—not to control them. There are things that the Government must do as well as it can in areas like health, education, community safety and transport. They are the essential services that the Government is supposed to provide for people.

That is why Governments are elected—to serve people and provide those basic essential services. That is where the community's taxes ought to be spent and directed and, for that reason, we do not believe that it is necessary for Government to be active in certain areas. It is well that the Minister at the bench is here now. The Government ought not to be running businesses or involving itself in a range of other activities that taxpayers provide already for themselves in direct and healthy competition with one another out in the market place.

We believe that the Government has too much control of individuals and businesses. There must be a breakdown of that power in the community so that more people have

more opportunity to influence the decisions and activities that impact on their daily lives. Today too many people out in the community feel helpless and cut off from the centre of power and influence. They believe that their views do not count. If Government members want to laugh at that, they should do some doorknocking and talk to a few people. They will see how people shrug their shoulders and say that the system—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: There is not a better example than the case of Mitcham in respect of taking away the rights of people. The Government has been caught out and, because it is close to an election, it will take a half step backwards.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We believe that there are areas of essential services to which I have referred—such as education, health, community safety, transport and community welfare—where Governments have a responsibility to adopt a caring and supporting role.

Mr Robertson: It's patronising of you to say so.

Mr OLSEN: The 'oncer' for Bright may as well make his interjection now because it will not be too much longer before he cannot make it.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Given the pretty clear reception that I got at Marino Rocks the other day, the member for Bright must be concerned about his position. Indeed, his biggest worry is that he and some of his colleagues will not be here after the next election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr OLSEN: We need to get this State going ahead again by providing some incentive and reward for effort. We need to give people motivation and encouragement to work harder. We must unite people in a common purpose for the development of the State. The State must not be broken down as it has been under Labor with its misguided direction for South Australians. Clearly, the present Government has done just that. I can understand some sensitivity on the part of members opposite. They would not have appreciated the polls released last week by the Australian Broadcasting Commission and other polls released this week. Those polls did not report Labor as winning, so Government members have come in here today gingered up to fire back.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If we look at the market research of the past week or 10 days, we will see clear pointers to electoral prospects. We were just talking about the direction that the Government should be taking. It is not a matter of competing unfairly with the private sector. The Government has a role and responsibility to provide a framework within which the private sector can be encouraged, without the hindrance of red tape, taxes and charges. After all, it is the private sector, especially small business, that will create job opportunities for young South Australians in the future. Indeed, that is the only way to tackle the unemployment queues in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition to address the Chair and to ignore the unruly interjections from the honourable member for Bright.

Mr OLSEN: I am pointing out clearly how this Government has got it wrong. It is not working in South Australia's interests and we need to get back to some fundamental policy changes. We need a new direction for South Australia. We must crank up—

Mr Tyler: What's Greiner doing in New South Wales?

Mr OLSEN: Let us consider some comments that have been made by the Premier. In 1982, the Premier went to the election saying:

South Australia needs a new direction. It needs a new start. South Australia needs to start winning again.

In 1985, he said:

Three years on—South Australia is up and running, with the people behind us, our recovery is a reality.

But let us see how far we have in fact run: we have gone back, and since the Premier came to office we have had the lowest growth in employment of the mainland States: we are 6 per cent behind the national average. Over the past seven years, Western Australia and Queensland have created jobs at almost twice the rate in South Australia. When the Premier came to office, South Australia had 8.8 per cent of the total number of people employed in Australia. Now, that figure is down to less than 8.4 per cent. At the same time, South Australia has 10.6 per cent of the total number unemployed in Australia, compared with 9.4 per cent at the end of 1982.

Our sluggish labour market also shows up in figures for job vacancies and overtime worked. Our job vacancy rate is the lowest of that of the mainland States, while average weekly overtime being worked is the lowest for all the States. This picture will get worse, according to the latest figures on private new capital expenditure, which are an important indicator of future levels of economic activity. Those figures show that, in the March quarter of this year, South Australia's share of total private new capital expenditure in Australia was only 5.4 per cent. It is only half of what it should be. In the years 1983-84 to 1987-88, South Australia accounted for 7.3 per cent of this expenditure—only half the share of Western Australia and Queensland. In 1983-84, private new capital expenditure in South Australia was almost three-quarters the West Australian figure, but now it is down to well under half.

One of the tragic legacies of the present Government will be the way in which South Australia has been economically outperformed, economically thrashed for the first time in our history, by Western Australia, and as long as we have a Premier who will not admit the problem, who will not look at what policies need to be changed to stop this erosion of our position, we will only slip even further behind. Recently, this Government has just given blind, unthinking support to everything the ACTU has asked for in the current national wage case. It has given no thought to the jobs that will be lost if the unions which control this Government get their way in the negotiations that will take place in the next six months, or to small businesses, the people to be directly affected in the front line.

On the very same day that the latest labour market figures were released, the Premier, when interviewed for the *7.30 Report*, said:

The reason our unemployment rate remains . . . unacceptably high is largely based around an increased participation rate in the work force. It's if you like part of a symptom of success of a lot of new investment in this State. So I'm not as concerned about it as I might have been some years ago.

However, as the Premier was saying this, the ABS was producing figures showing a fall in South Australia's participation to a level lower than that in all States but New South Wales and Tasmania. Although the number of unemployed in South Australia fell by 4 100 in June, the number in employment increased by only 600. In other words, the fall in unemployment was due largely to more people opting out of the work force as South Australians continue to face the disincentive of South Australia having the highest unemployment rate of the mainland States. What the Premier said about the participation rate was completely untrue.

What he really means is that he does not want his failed record, his broken promises on jobs, on the election agenda. It has been a cruel hoax played on the unemployed.

The Premier does not want to be reminded of the promise he made to them in 1982 that 'in government our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way'. Without projects put in the pipeline by the former Liberal Government and their spin-off impact, South Australia would be even further behind now. Had South Australia created jobs, since the election of the Bannon Government, at the same rate as has occurred in the rest of Australia, we would have another 32 000 South Australians in employment today. Had we matched the record of Western Australia over the past seven years, 68 900 more people would have work in this State. Instead, more than 52 000 South Australians remain unemployed.

Given our distance from major markets, it must remain a key objective of South Australia to keep general costs down and this was one of the key reasons why we were able to transform this State industrially under successive Liberal Governments over a 30-year period. However, over the past seven years our low-cost State reputation has become very much a thing of the past. The Adelaide CPI, since the September quarter of 1982, has been the highest of all the State capitals except Melbourne. This has been fuelled by rises in selected Government charges as measured by the ABS. They have risen more in Adelaide over this period than in any capital except Brisbane. The rate of the rise in Adelaide has been 12 per cent above the average rise in all the capital cities.

Our faltering economic performance and cost pressures continue to take their toll in bankruptcies in South Australia. Last financial year South Australia recorded 1 495 bankruptcies, or 17.6 per cent—

Mr Tyler: You are criticising our boom—

Mr OLSEN: Did I hear correctly?

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: As well he would be embarrassed when he thought about that interjection.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Profit means losses. That was a great interjection. Last financial year South Australia recorded 1 495 bankruptcies or 17.6 per cent of the national total. In 1981-82, when the Premier was slamming the economic performance of the last Liberal Government, South Australia was recording bankruptcies at the rate of just over two a day. For the past two years they have been occurring at the rate of more than four a day.

There is a range of other indicators that paint a similar picture of South Australia falling behind the other States under this Government. In December 1982 this State recorded 8.8 per cent of building approvals in Australia; our current share is 7.6 per cent. Our share of retail trade is down from 8.5 per cent to 7.9 per cent and new motor vehicle registrations are down from 10 per cent to 7.6 per cent.

One reason for our declining share of building and retail activity and car sales is our reducing consumer market. Our population growth since the election of this Government has been easily the lowest of that of the mainland States. The population of Western Australia has grown at three times our rate. If our population had grown at the same rate as that in Western Australia since 1982, we would have another 124 500 people in South Australia—enough to encourage decentralisation, the regional growth, that we need so badly but have missed out on under Labor.

Faced with this record and the reality, what is the Premier now saying? He is no longer talking about the recovery that he said in 1985 had already arrived. Instead, in a document entitled 'The Bannon Government Building for the 1990s' which obviously was prepared for the election campaign and which the Government has been running since June, the Premier begins with the assertion, 'In 1989 South Australians are on the threshold of a new era.' So, 'Up and Running' has gone and the 'Dawn of a New Era' has gone. We are on the threshold of it now, whereas previously there was talk about its happening. Here, in one slogan, the Premier hopes to dismiss from memory the old era—the era of falling behind under Labor.

Just what does his promised new era hold for home buyers who are struggling with Labor's record interest rates—the poor in our community of whom South Australia has a higher rate than anywhere else in Australia, the 50 000 plus South Australians who do not have work, the young homeless, the people who must queue to get hospital treatment, and those too afraid to go out at night because of rising crime. With this promise of a new era the Premier is demonstrating, yet again, that he believes in the politics of the gesture, the gimmick and the slogan.

Yet again, he invites people to believe that he can make hard times easy. While he gets his election in, he wants people to suspend belief about the reality that is facing them. Nothing illustrates this more than his attitude to home buyers and how he embraces them in Opposition only to abandon them in their time of greatest need—when Labor put interest rates up to a record 17 per cent.

In this, the Premier's record is at its most cynical best. I will prove the point by reading into *Hansard* a number of statements that the Premier made at various times when interest rates were much lower than they are now and houses were much cheaper. I begin in early 1981 when interest rates were 12.5 per cent and the weekly payment for a loan to buy the average priced house was \$80.90. In a press release dated 30 March 1981 the Premier said:

Some families are now going without adequate food to meet the repayments.

On television, the Premier embellished this by suggesting that some families had even been forced to introduce dog food to their diets. I wonder what he thinks they are eating now! There was even a suggestion in the press release as follows:

... that the vitamin deficiency, scurvy, was showing up in Adelaide suburbs because some families were no longer able to afford fresh fruit and vegetables. Other families were having to put off having children because they could not afford it.

Just over three months later, with the prospect that the rate would go to 13.5 per cent, the Premier complained in a press statement on 6 July 1981, as follows:

It's quite clear that any further round of mortgage rate rises will be another blow to an already flattened South Australian building industry, and to the prospects of the average Australian being able to buy a home.

Mr Bannon called for home interest rate payments to be made tax deductible on a means tested basis.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes. Incidentally, under the Fraser Government—a Liberal Government—they were tax deductible. Where is the Premier's support now for a proposal to do the same in a much worse climate for home buyers? On 17 August 1981 the Premier announced a Labor Party campaign of protest meetings and newspaper advertisements to seek support for tax deductibility for home loan repayments. He complained as follows:

Repayments on the average \$30 000 home loan have increased by \$44 a month since the time in 1980 when Premier Tonkin urged a Liberal Federal vote 'for South Australia's sake.'

How true was Premier Tonkin's call at that time. So far this year, repayments on the average loan in South Australia have increased by more than \$156 a month. But, do we hear the Premier speaking up for South Australia's sake now? The Premier ended 1981 in a press statement dated 16 December, as follows:

Were Labor to be in power, we would be hammering on Mr Fraser's door demanding lower interest rates and more funds for the Housing Trust.

Well, Labor is in power now, but do we hear the Premier's hammering? He will not knock on Bob Hawke's door. He will not even pick up the phone and talk to him.

During 1982, interest rates in South Australia went up to a maximum 13.5 per cent—still 3.5 per cent lower than they are now. The average house price in Adelaide was just under \$47 000—less than half the present average price. What was the Premier saying then, when circumstances for home buyers were still nowhere near as tough as they are now? On 5 January of that year, the Premier lamented, as follows:

People are having to pay a higher and higher percentage of their weekly pay to meet home purchase—now an average of 21 per cent of income.

However, we do not hear the Premier complaining now when the affordability ratio is 30 per cent in South Australia. On 20 January 1982 the Premier flew to Melbourne—one of his stunts—to stage a home loan summit and promised:

We have got to work out what Federal and State Labor Governments can do to give real relief to home buyers. It is important that the State leaders work out mortgage relief programs that can be dovetailed into a future Federal Labor Government's home loan assistance plan. It is quite clear that tens of thousands of Australian home buyers cannot sustain any further interest rate increases. The house mortgage crisis is now one of the gravest threats to most Australians' way of life.

That was when interest rates were 13.5 per cent. On 5 August 1982 the Premier flew off again—this time to Canberra—for talks with the Federal Treasury, and the Premier said:

I will be pressing Mr Stone, the Fraser Government's most senior economic adviser, for an extension of the Federal Government's scheme providing tax rebates for some home loan repayments.

I do not need to remind this House that the Fraser Government actually provided tax deductibility for home loan repayments.

Mr D.S. Baker: Got blood from a stone.

Mr OLSEN: Where is he now? In 1982 the Premier was not satisfied that the Fraser Government had provided those tax rebates on home loan interest payments. In 1989, when the Hawke Government will not even entertain the idea of tax rebates, the Premier does absolutely nothing about it.

Soon after the 1982 election campaign had commenced, the Premier convened yet another meeting of Labor leaders in Adelaide. There was a lot of talking then, but where is the action now? In a press statement on 22 October 1982 announcing this latest meeting—the election build-up climate and election campaign stuff—the Premier stated:

We will be looking at ways in which the Federal and State Government can combine to control home loan interest rates. Our Liberal opponents do not seem to realise the incredible burden many families face because of mortgage repayments.

In his 1982 election policy the Premier promised interest rate relief with the complaint that:

Rising interest rates have forced many families into desperate straits in meeting their mortgage repayments.

A rate of 13.5 per cent was the limit.

Ms Gayler: You've got a short memory, haven't you?

Mr OLSEN: Let me just remind the member for Newland that it was during the 1985 election campaign—three years later—that the Premier made his infamous pledge: ‘Don’t blow up your interest rates. Vote Australian Labor Party.’ We all remember the advertisement. This was yet another promise from Labor about interest rates: this time the rates would not be deregulated. Bob Hawke came over with one of his specific promises (one of many which he has made and broken): ‘We will not deregulate home loan interest rates.’ Four months later when the election was out of the way, what did the Labor Party do? It deregulated home loan interest rates and the lid came off. During the 1985 election campaign the Premier also promised to increase the exemption level for stamp duty payable by first home buyers. At last, four years later and on the eve of the next election campaign, that election promise is finally delivered.

I have taken some time to detail to the House the Premier’s humbug and hypocrisy on interest rates, because it illustrates the central feature of his whole approach to politics—the absence of any consistency and principle. There is nothing more important to individuals and to families than the security of knowing that they can afford to buy and keep their own home, and Governments at all levels have a prime duty to do all they can to help people realise that dream. Home ownership is certainly central to Liberal Party values, because it encourages self reliance and an acceptance of responsibility for one’s own destiny. It also spreads the ownership of property as widely as possible. It makes for a more free and independent society.

Of course, Labor has different beliefs; Labor is not interested in the dream of home ownership, because it has turned home ownership into a nightmare, as interest rates rise under the hammer of its own monetary policies. The Premier’s whole approach to this issue has been cold, disinterested and cowardly. It has totally lacked any sense of concern, compassion or courage. He has regarded it as being smart to be slippery with the truth and silent when he should stand up for South Australian home buyers.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: I can understand the member for Briggs—

An honourable member: The fabricator—

Mr OLSEN: The member for fabrication, because he probably put those stunts together for the Premier in 1981-82.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Rann interjecting:

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

Mr OLSEN: When the Fraser Government kept interest rates much lower than they are now, when house prices were only half what they are now, and when the Fraser Government also allowed tax rebates on interest payments, the Premier demanded more. Without any semblance of conscience he played on the nerves of average South Australians. He promised that hard times could be made easy just by changing a Government, but what does he do now that home buyers have got much more reason to fear, to struggle, to face the reality of losing their homes and even the ability to keep their families together? He does nothing except criticise me for putting to the Federal Government that it should provide tax rebates on interest, just as the Fraser Government did.

The Premier has duped and deceived home buyers and he has been doing that for about seven years. His Party has led many home buyers to financial ruin and has thrown away the key to their future. This imposes on Labor a duty

to provide relief—and to provide that relief now. By virtue of their electorates, State parliamentarians are in a much better position than some of their Federal colleagues to know the suffering being inflicted by record interest rates. We are at a closer level of communication with those people. We have more direct and frequent contact with the people who are being hurt every day by high interest rates. There is no doubt that, even after the next Federal election, that suffering will continue for a period until a Federal coalition brings interest rates down with a new economic direction—and keeps those rates down.

The trauma of the Labor years cannot be transformed overnight. We cannot turn our back on those who have done as much as they can to help themselves. I make no apology for having urged my Federal colleagues, as well as the Federal Government, to appreciate this fact and to realise that some relief to prevent many family homes being lost must remain on the agenda. I will continue to press this point of view, which is more than can be said for the Premier and his hypocritical approach to the subject. He made interest rates a central issue during the 1982 and 1985 election campaigns, so he cannot claim that they should be removed from the agenda of the next election campaign when they are 3.5 per cent higher. The average house price in Adelaide has risen by \$20 000 since 1985 and the affordability ratio has increased from 24 to 30 per cent. The Premier has failed to provide promised tax relief to first home buyers over the past four years.

With his record, the Premier deserves to be hounded all the way to the ballot box as a Premier whose only interest is his own and who sees struggling home buyers not as people but, rather, only as political pawns. In considering the Premier’s record, the House would be aware that interest rates are not the only areas he sees as being fertile for exploitation. I remind members of a number of other things he said when seeking office in 1982.

On 12 August of that year he said: ‘There have been over 2 300 bankruptcies in South Australia during the past 2½ years and he described them as ‘another symbol of the very real recession gripping South Australians’. Over the past 2½ years we have had almost 3 200 bankruptcies, but now the Premier says that we are on the threshold of a new era. That is a little inconsistent. During the 1982 budget debate he called for a 12-month freeze on State charges because people could not cope with higher charges as well as higher interest rates. However, since 1982, ABS figures show that selected Government charges in Adelaide have risen by more than in any other capital except Brisbane.

Mr Hamilton: That’s selection.

Mr OLSEN: That is the term which the ABS circulates. You are trying to suggest that I have selected Government charges. If you looked at the ABS reports, you would know the term. If you looked, you would be better informed, and you would not offer such inane interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding whether the objections are inane, they are certainly out of order. I also ask the Leader of the Opposition not to refer to honourable members opposite as ‘you’.

Mr OLSEN: Our public transport fares have risen by twice the national average, while private motoring costs fuelled by higher petrol taxes and registration and licence fees have also risen more in Adelaide than in any other State.

On 24 October 1982 the Premier claimed that ‘of all political Parties in South Australia, Labor was the best qualified to handle environmental issues’.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bright is out of order.

Mr OLSEN: He said this standing outside the Grange vineyard of Penfolds at Magill as he launched Labor's environmental policy, promising to save the vineyard. There was no more vintage political mischief than that. I suppose the only thing that we can be thankful for is that Penfolds reds last a bit longer than mere election promises in front of their vineyard. In November 1981, when he launched Labor's campaign for the seat of Newland, he said:

In the north-east the transport question will again be vital. The Government's choice of the experimental and totally unproved O-Bahn system will be under scrutiny.

In a fortnight, the Premier will be there in front of the cameras, smile on, opening the second leg of the O-Bahn, hoping that he will get the credit for it and that it will help Labor to retain Newland. He will not get the credit and it will not help him to retain Newland. On Father's Day 1980—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I am glad that you are so interested, because you will love this quote. On Father's Day 1980—and this is the sort of thing that the member for Briggs would have generated—he released the following press statement:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Bannon, today made a Father's Day appeal to save the Queen Victoria Hospital. Speaking at the hospital with Labor's health spokesman, Mr Terry Hemmings, Mr Bannon said he hoped South Australians would give the Government the message that the hospital should continue its important role in our community.

Today we see that plaque unveiled at a combined hospital facility in North Adelaide. The Queen Victoria has gone off the agenda. The culprit of the demise of the Queen Victoria is, of course, this Government and this Premier.

Let us look at some of the quotes on crime. For example, in a press statement on 5 February 1981, the Premier said that it was frightening to discover how many South Australian homes were being broken into. Apparently the annual total amounted to the number of homes in two entire House of Assembly electorates. The latest police figures show that breaking and entering offences are now occurring in South Australia at the rate of one every 13 minutes. The number of homes involved amounts to almost four entire House of Assembly electorates.

In the same vein I return to the Premier's economic record. Before the 1982 election, he promised that the creation of an enterprise fund would be South Australia's economic saviour. I quote further from the press release to which I referred a few moments ago on bankruptcies. It also had the Premier saying this:

In Government Labor will establish a special South Australian Enterprise Fund designed to stimulate economic and employment recovery in South Australia. The fund, based on highly successful examples in the Canadian provinces, will inject investment into South Australia's export-based industries in order to secure a sounder employment base.

The Premier continued in this theme in his 1982 policy speech when he said:

In Government our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way. As a first step we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry. The Enterprise Fund will pump investment into high technology and export industries. The fund will get behind businesses which have potential to expand and create jobs.

Let me now trace how this promise was put into practice or, rather, how it failed completely to materialise in the way that the Premier said it would. The so-called Enterprise Fund came into being when Enterprise Investments (South Australia) Limited was incorporated as a public company in June 1984. The initial paid-up capital was \$10.7 million. The Government took up 200 000 class A shares at a cost

of \$100 000 which gave it effective control over the operations of the company.

At the close of the first year of activity, the year ended 30 June 1985, there was a profit of \$71 473. The directors reported that the company 'had demonstrated the effective role which a publicly financed venture capital organisation can play in financing the expansion of South Australian businesses which have potential growth'. They advised shareholders that 'progress had been rapid since the company's formation'. At balance date, equity investments had been made in four companies.

The progress continued during 1985-86, when a profit of almost \$120 000 was earned. Shareholders were informed that the company would 'further increase its rate of investment activity in the immediate future' and that 'the foundations had been laid for continuing growth and success'. But then, without warning, an unwelcome change came over the company's affairs. The report for the year ended 30 June 1987 was no longer couched in the optimistic language of the previous year. A loss of more than \$125 000 was recorded. With only the barest explanation, the directors revealed that the company 'expects to maintain its activities in the venture capital area through its interest in the listed company—SA Ventures Limited'. No elaboration was given of the nature and financial extent of this interest in SA Ventures.

These matters rested until December 1987, when the Government authorised its finance arm, SAFA, to purchase a parcel of shares held by the Sunvest Corporation in Enterprise Investments. SAFA paid 50 cents a share, even though the last price at which Enterprise shares had been traded was 35 cents. This market price no doubt reflected investor disappointment with the trading results and the fact that no dividends had been paid. No public explanation was given by the Premier for this use of public funds by SAFA to make a further investment in Enterprise Investments when that company's future was insecure and when the Government already controlled the affairs of Enterprise Investments through its class A shares and an SGIC shareholding.

Within six months of SAFA's purchase of the Sunvest stake, it announced a takeover bid for the balance of Enterprise shares held by the public. And, having been taken over by SAFA, Enterprise Investments then made a takeover bid for SA Ventures. Again, these moves were accompanied by no public justification from the Premier.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Did people get their money back on their shares or at a discounted price?

Mr OLSEN: At a very much discounted price. Why was the Premier so keen to remove Enterprise Investments from public scrutiny? The answer came with the directors' report for the year ended 30 June 1988 which revealed an operating loss of more than \$5 500, an extraordinary loss of more than \$1 million and a write-down in the book value of the company's investments of more than \$2.4 million. At the same time SA Ventures had reported an accumulated loss of more than \$1.5 million. Both of these SAFA-owned companies have now been wound up and replaced by a new structure. The track record is that they wound them up and set up a new structure with an initial capital of \$28 million supplied by SAFA.

Having experimented unsuccessfully and at some considerable cost to establish a viable and Government-owned venture capital enterprise, the Premier is now attempting to cover up the failure by making available \$28 million to try again. It is obvious that all the promises that the Premier made before coming to office about the Enterprise Fund failed to eventuate. It was to be the generator of thousands

of jobs. It was the excuse that the Premier put up whenever he was challenged about his Party's opposition in the early 1980s to the Roxby Downs development.

He would say, 'This is not the way to go. We have the economic answer. We shouldn't be encouraging the risk takers to put up their own money.' No, the Government should be in there as much as possible, risking other people's money. This Government has progressively increased its presence in the risk taking activities of private business: the Timber Corporation, SAMIC Ltd, the Clothing Corporation and the Central Linen Service are just a few other examples. The Government now has equity in more than 200 companies.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Including those in New Zealand.

Mr OLSEN: Including those in New Zealand. You could not really call it equity. It has some shares, but there is not much equity in the shares. When Parliament asks questions, we are quoted commercial confidentiality—we are not entitled to know. Similarly, we are not entitled to know much about the policy of the State Bank of borrowing increasingly large sums of money to be on-lent to interstate and overseas borrowers whose financial credibility will be dependent on the opinion of others, even though these activities are guaranteed by the taxpayers of South Australia. The bank has stepped beyond what most South Australians would regard as its traditional role, or even what was accepted as its new charter at the time of the amalgamation in 1983.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Whenever this matter is questioned, the Premier deliberately attempts to confuse—as the member for Briggs just did—legitimate questioning in the public interest with this attack-on-the-bank attitude. He does not want Parliament to scrutinise the fact that the bank's resources are now committed to a huge program of borrowing and lending on national and international markets, or the major risks involved. Shareholders in the ANZ, Westpac and the National have a right to question the borrowing and lending programs of the banks they own. South Australian taxpayers have just as much right to question what their bank is doing.

As Premier, I would welcome public scrutiny of the State Bank. I am sure it will ensure that the bank acts prudently in South Australia's interests. If we are going to be more competitive, more outward looking as a State, we cannot afford to let our major public institutions operate under a hands-off, sacred cow, untouchable mentality. There has to be accountability—full accountability and public accountability. SAFA is no longer restricted to acting as the professional manager of the borrowing needs of Government and semi-government authorities. It is now free to engage in any form of financial activity which it pleases the Premier to approve. It is expanding into property development and has a range of affiliated companies and trusts. The time has come to consider whether or not the State Government has gone too far in the provision of commercial and financial services which are already supplied on competitive terms—and how far a South Australian Government should risk substantial funds to this end.

This Government has the attitude that, when a business in public ownership fails financially, the resulting loss is simply met as a community cost and can be buried in the financial archives of the Treasury. What is demonstrable is that the policies of this Government, to make substantial investments in, and to provide even greater financial guarantees to, an increasing number of financial and commercial undertakings operating both within and outside the State,

have done nothing to stop the economic decline of our State.

The point is that, despite those policies, the economy has still been in full-scale decline, lagging behind the other States. Nor have those policies been concerned with the provision of essential services, which is the other point. They have not been about the provision of essential services for which governments essentially are elected. This Government has given greater priority to using public funds for financial and commercial undertakings, even in cases where the needs of the market are being competitively serviced by the resources of privately-owned businesses, than it has to ensuring adequate standards of health, in education, in community safety and in transport.

This Government has been more interested in regulating and competing with South Australian businesses than in having policy settings which give those businesses maximum opportunity to expand. Its fiscal, regulatory and labour relations policies are completely counter-productive to the key goal we must have for our economy to help it to become more competitive and more export oriented. I raised this issue in my 1987 Address in Reply speech. I said then that we should start the process in our schools as an investment in the quality of our future work force—our chief competitive force, our foundation for the future. I called for a firmer, more meaningful link between school and work.

I said we must have programs that connect students with their future responsibilities—programs that will convince the next generation that striving for success does really pay. I foreshadow today that the policies of the next Liberal Government will do this. Our economic and education policies will be geared to export. We are examining State tax incentives for export. Our industrial relations policy is based on productivity and workplace cooperation for export. Our secondary and higher education policies will promote excellence and enterprise in our schools and colleges—the principal ingredients for a better export performance. We will strive for bipartisanship in our export policies.

As Premier, I will invite the Leader of the Opposition to accompany me on official visits overseas aimed at boosting trade with and investment in South Australia. While we can have our differences on local political issues, we must be seen to be speaking with one voice to international business men and women about the benefits to them of doing business with us and coming to our State. I will convene regular briefings with business and union representatives and, again, I will invite the involvement of the Opposition. I will not expect the Opposition to agree with everything we do, but a more informed Opposition on key issues relevant to our economic and export performance will ensure more constructive parliamentary and public debate—and more public support for a sustained export effort.

There is no issue more important to our economic future than export growth. Achieving this will require a committed and cooperative effort from politicians, from business leaders, from union leaders, from business—large and small—in fact, from all South Australians. The Government does not have all the answers, and it will not be easy. This is the attitude Playford had, and it secured the fastest economic growth in our history. He successfully united people with different outlooks behind challenging but achievable goals.

Some of the things I have said this afternoon that I want to do to help our export effort also reflect my views about the need for a greater sharing of power in the community, to give many more people with talent and ideas the opportunity to participate and to contribute. More and more, Government is becoming like a drug, a quick fix, an easy diversion from some of the hard choices. Too many people

are becoming dependent on Government, and the habit is getting harder to kick. But if we do not, it will become increasingly costly—and ultimately ruinous to our economic health. My remarks in this respect are directed just as much to businesses relying on Government financial support in some of the ways I have referred to this afternoon as they are to individuals. We need Government which is much more straightforward, consistent and resolute; which is more efficient at what Government must do and less involved in what there is no need for a Government to do.

I have given many examples this afternoon of how this Government has failed these vital tests. It does not act with any sense of purpose or vision. Clearing a path through the maze which Government has become will not be easy, but then, most decisions worth taking are difficult. The next Government of this State will not reside from that task.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I, too, support the motion that the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech be adopted. I also express my condolences to the relatives of former members who have passed away. I must say that the contribution by the Leader of the Opposition was nothing short of amazing—55 minutes of diatribe and living in the past, and five minutes of what members opposite may do if and when they get into Government. That would really impress me if I was out in the community! Is that not good stuff to peddle to the community and to the business houses of South Australia?

The Leader said, 'When we get into Government the Parliament must speak as one voice', yet for 55 minutes he had the gall to downgrade this State and talk about bankruptcies. He was dishonest, to say the least, in terms of what he said were the reasons why we have this number of bankruptcies in South Australia. No mention was made of the setting up of the Small Business Corporation to try to help business houses in South Australia—none of that; just a diatribe, going back to 1979.

One would think that, as an alternative Premier, he would put forward positive policies and directions which his Government would adopt should it gain power. but no—a diatribe. The Opposition benches are bereft of talent, which is the only reason why he is Leader of the Opposition. It is obvious that, following the next State election, either the member for Coles or the member for Victoria will be the new Leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt that South Australia under Premier Bannon's leadership is moving towards a decade of exciting development in the 1990s.

Unfortunately, South Australia has an Opposition that constantly criticises and fails overwhelmingly to give recognition to the positive achievements and future directions being set in place by this Government. It is not short-term stuff but a long-term outlook into the 1990s. In terms of development and future directions of the Bannon Government, I will concentrate on initiatives in respect of the western suburbs of Adelaide.

The submarine contract has created not only 350 jobs thus far but it is expected that this will increase to 800 jobs by the end of this year. Such skills, new technologies and techniques—in both the short-term and long-term—have and will encourage new job opportunities in respect of the building and servicing of these new submarines. Coupled with this project, which has been a catalyst for many other industries and proposals, I note the decision by Pacific Dunlop Batteries to locate near the submarine site. This will provide additional jobs for South Australia.

Further, the Governor announced that major benefits will flow to our State's defence industry sector with the awarding of the Anzac frigate contract. Both major consortia have estimated that work in the order of \$500 million will be placed in this State regardless of which group wins the contract. This will attract major benefits to the manufacturing industry of this State, expanding our industrial and economic base. As I have said, new industries, technology and a keen interest in our low industrial disputation rate auger well for the future of South Australia into the 1990s, and particularly for the future of the western suburbs. In the industrial arena one has only to look at the industrial policies of the Liberal and National Parties to see what will happen in South Australia if they ever get elected to office.

An honourable member: Deregulation!

Mr HAMILTON: Deregulation my foot! I know what deregulation means, because we have seen it before. Employers say, 'Listen sonny, if you want the job, although the award is \$300 a week, we will give you \$200 and perhaps we will increase it later.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member can mention Mudginberri, but we know that that type of dispute resolution is not the answer to the problem. A Liberal Government in this State would bring unparalleled industrial disputation. Any agreement between an employer and an employee would mean nothing more than the employer having the ability to hang the sword of Damocles over the head of a prospective employee. An employer could say, 'Either you wear this sonny, or you do not get the job.' That would be the attitude of employers. The Opposition does not want the trade union movement in there protecting the rights of workers and protecting all the conditions for which they fought in the past. The Opposition does not want to see that. It wants employers to be able to dictate conditions and not have to upgrade industries. It wants the continued use of outmoded equipment, and it is willing to let the workers suffer. If the employers provided decent equipment and incentives, everyone would benefit, and I have no doubt about that.

The Governor announced that major benefits would flow to our State's defence industries with the awarding of the Anzac frigate contract. As I have said, this will provide major incentives not only to existing South Australian industries but to other industries that will be keen to gain a share of the cake in this area. At Woodville we have the centre for manufacturing, which is further evidence to illustrate the number of new jobs, techniques and skills that are being harnessed and promoted in the western suburbs. Indeed, I refer to the *Messenger Weekly Times* of 16 November 1988—not to a statement that I made but a statement by the Mayor of Woodville. He talks about not only industry at Woodville but also the new industrial estate at Hendon. The article states:

The Philips industrial estate at Hendon is to become the prime focus of commercial enterprise in SA with a \$50 million upgrade, creating 2 500 jobs.

It goes on to talk about the Moore Corporation, which is developing that project. It also states that the prime commercial centre will rival the 3 500 working population that existed at Philips in the late 1960s. The article goes on:

Mr Moore also estimated about 100 companies would be based at the Westside Commerce Centre within three to five years. Already the site has 50 tenants who are likely to continue leasing, including the SA Film Corporation and companies involved in micro-chip manufacture, high-tech component production, plastics, mineral research development and advanced chrome tooling.

All those ideas fit in with what I said previously about what is—and will—take place in Adelaide's western suburbs in respect of more jobs, skills and greater enticement for industry to come to South Australia.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You just concentrate on your sheep and I will concentrate on the western suburbs. The article continues:

The multi-million dollar commercial development has been hailed by the Woodville council—

this is not a Labor dominated council, but a council that is clearly saying what it believes will occur in the western suburbs—

which believes the centre will revive economic growth and development in the local area.

I agree with the council. One has only to look a little further to see the redevelopment at Port Adelaide. Why would K-Mart build such a multi-million dollar complex at Port Adelaide? Is it for short-term gain? Of course not. We all know that such big supermarket chains exist to maximise profit. They look for long-term benefits for the company and the shareholders. They see the future in Port Adelaide. They know that the submarine contract has acted as a catalyst in the western suburbs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You go back to your goats, sheep and rabbits. I want to talk positively about what is happening in South Australia. I am not interested in the constant carping, knocking and criticism of members opposite who, after the State election, will remain in Opposition because of their poor attitude to South Australia. Sir, I certainly become annoyed at the inane interjections of that fool opposite.

It is also interesting to look at some of the other industries being promoted in the western suburbs, and I refer again to the redevelopment of the manufacturing park on Port Road. I understand that the Department of State Development and Technology is to conduct a study in respect of further exploitation of that site, which is ripe for development as it is in the heart of the western suburbs. It is close to shipping and other transport—rail, air or whatever—but I will come back to that in a moment. I understand that the department is carrying out a study in respect of further development of the Centre for Manufacturing. This gives further evidence of the competence manifesting itself in our neck of the woods in respect of South Australia's future. The article to which I have just referred supports the view that I have expressed.

The Governor also announced that future sea links would not only enhance but also increase South Australia's competitive edge in terms of cargo handling. Instead of cargo going to Melbourne and taking 10 or 11 days to reach this State it will be landed on South Australian wharves. That will be of benefit not only to industry but also to those who are prepared to import goods.

Rather than repeat the Government's achievements and future directions, I direct members' attention to the contribution that was made last night by my colleague the member for Hartley. I thought it was a terrific contribution and I recommend it to any clear thinking person who is interested in the development of the State and in future job opportunities for South Australians. Coupled with the sea links, we should not forget the Adelaide international air terminal and Export Park, which will further enhance South Australia's export and tourism opportunities. To give further support to this, the Federal Government and Qantas have announced that 400 Qantas pilots will be trained in South

Australia as part of Qantas's \$23 million expansion program.

We hear a lot of criticism from members opposite about the building program in Adelaide. They are dishonest, to say the least, about what is happening here. Members opposite pick out the negative aspects and are not prepared to give a balanced view of what is taking place in South Australia. They look around and take glee in finding something on which they can denigrate South Australia. They love to see projects go to another State. But, indirectly, members opposite are jeopardising jobs in this State. They know it and I know it, and that is the reason for that diatribe of 55 minutes by the Leader of the Opposition today—not a positive contribution at all.

If an employer from interstate or overseas read his contribution, they would ask, 'What have we here?' The Leader's contribution was not honest; it was not a balanced approach that anyone would listen to, read and digest and say that, although South Australia has a few problems, overall it is not a bad place in which to work. Indeed, South Australia is the envy of many other States, for those who are prepared to look at it in a pragmatic light. We all know that a State election is on the horizon, so members opposite want to shaft industry in South Australia for their own political goals. They do not give a damn about the people—the workers—of South Australia; they care only about those of their own ilk—the industry. Members opposite look after number one.

Mr Meier: Absolute rubbish!

Mr HAMILTON: If the honourable member thinks that his Leader's diatribe of 55 minutes was absolute rubbish, I agree with him—it was rubbish. I now turn to some of the specific matters concerning my electorate. Since I was elected as the member for Albert Park in September 1979 I have had the honour and privilege of representing the people of the western suburbs. I have tried to do this to the best of my ability and have diligently applied myself to the electorate. The successes are rather large. Few successes—and I honestly cannot recollect one—occurred from the period 15 September 1979 until November 1982 when the Tonkin Liberal Government was in power.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, there was one. I am glad the member for Mount Gambier looked up when he did, and I give him credit for what he did when he was the Minister of Education. Because of my representations the then Government provided a child-care centre at West Lakes, and I applaud the honourable member for that. Knowing of my involvement, the then Minister gave me the honour of opening the West Lakes Shore Kindergarten. I had never before known a Government Minister to do an Opposition member such a service, and I give credit to the member for Mount Gambier for that. I believe that was done in recognition of my involvement in that area. But that is the only improvement that that Government achieved in my electorate. This is in stark contrast to what has occurred since 1983.

Mr Lewis: When did we put in the Football Park lights?

Mr HAMILTON: If you don't know, you fool, search it out for yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! From the look on the honourable member's face, he is quite aware that that remark is out of order and, in any case—

Mr HAMILTON: I withdraw, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat for a moment. Furthermore, all remarks should be addressed through the Chair. The interjections that were not addressed through the Chair, obviously because

they were interjections, are also out of order. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: I apologise to you, Mr Speaker, but I must say that your attention was distracted by the inane interjections that were coming my way. The record of achievements in my electorate under the Bannon Government has been quite remarkable. When David Tonkin, the then Premier, visited my electorate on 4 October 1979—the first official function I attended—to open the workshops at the Alfreda Rehabilitation Centre, he was asked for \$300 000 for a hydrotherapy pool. His stupid response was, 'Since becoming the Premier I have learnt three new words. The first two are, "How much?" and the third is, "No".' I was appalled at his reply, because that hydrotherapy pool would have assisted the disabled, those who had been injured on the job, those with arthritic conditions and those who had lost their limbs. I thought that if ever there was a challenge, this was it.

I harassed John Cornwall, the shadow Minister at the time, and I got him to commit himself and a future Labor Government by issuing a press release that he knew I could use later on. But, when Labor was elected, he delivered. However, we got nothing during the 3½ years of that conservative Government. Similarly, when we sought \$250 000 from the Tonkin Government's Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Minister of Local Government for a community centre on Bartley Terrace, what did we get? Nothing—only empty promises! However, one of the first things Terry Hemmings did when he became Minister was to meet with the board of the West Lakes Community Club, which operates out of the West Lakes Football Club. At that meeting Mr Hemmings said that not one cent had been committed to that project and, to his credit and Jack Slater's credit, they committed a Labor Government to that goal—and it was achieved. Not only \$10 000 was provided for a feasibility study but also \$225 000 was provided over a period of three years. The member for Stuart must also be given appropriate recognition for what occurred in that matter.

Let me provide another illustration. When I became a member of Parliament, one of the first things I noticed on file related to a problem involving my Royal Park constituents and a company called Allied Engineering. That company created havoc amongst the local residents because of noise. I do not blame the company entirely for the problem, but I approached the then Minister for Environment and Planning (the member for Heysen) about this noise problem. I looked to him, as the Minister responsible, for some assistance in reducing the noise level and alleviating the problem. It is on record that a constituent, who was of ethnic origin and very quietly spoken, came to me and said, 'Mr Hamilton, I have put up with enough. If you don't do something about this company, I will shoot the management.' That was a very serious statement indeed. The then Minister for Environment and Planning said that, if they have a particular problem, they should go to the Beaufort Clinic to get psychiatric treatment. That was his answer to that problem.

Mr De Laine: Disgraceful!

Mr HAMILTON: As the member for Price says, that was disgraceful. But when we came to office the Deputy Premier looked at the problem and assisted Allied Engineering's relocation to Wingfield. My colleague, the member for Price, now has the pleasure of trying to sort out those problems which I believe still continue today. That is one of many issues which were addressed in the Tonkin regime but which were not resolved until the Bannon Government came to office. Since then I have repeatedly harassed Gov-

ernment Ministers about these problems. I make no apology for my concerns about the need to ensure that the West Lakes waterway and West Lakes residents are adequately protected by appropriate regulations.

As a result of vandalism and crime in the area, I called public meetings to address the question of law and order. The reality is that, in this place on 17 November 1983, I asked the then Minister of Transport and Chief Secretary to investigate the feasibility of setting up a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in this State, and that is now a reality. I claim partial credit for the introduction of that scheme, because as a result of my request we now have a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in South Australia. That scheme is supported by the community, by the police and by the Inspector in Charge (Inspector Gary Cornish), who is one of my constituents. The scheme is very effective and I also give credit to Commercial Union which is involved in that area.

I believe that other insurance companies located here in South Australia should also negotiate with the Chief Secretary and Commercial Union so that they, too, can contribute to the Neighbourhood Watch scheme in this State. The scheme is an outstanding success and one only has to look at the number of petitions that were presented to the Parliament yesterday by Opposition members and at the waiting list to realise the success of the program. Even country members want the Neighbourhood Watch programs introduced in their respective electorates, and I do not blame them for that.

The \$100 000 hydrological survey of the West Lakes waterway is a reflection of the Government's commitment to ensuring that not only the problems in the waterway are addressed but also the future development of the Port Adelaide area which abuts my electorate of Albert Park is considered. The extension of the West Lakes waterway into the Port River will necessitate a considerable investment as well as alterations to the waterway itself. I look forward to the redirection of the sewage treatment works pipe that allows this effluent to flow into the Port River. I believe that it is a reflection on successive Governments that that redirection has not been undertaken. Over \$3 million has been spent on upgrading the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works and more money will be spent on that in the future. Unfortunately, one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear but, nevertheless, the Government has spent a lot of money in that area.

I understand that tomorrow a decision on the encroachment on the sand dunes in my electorate will be handed down. I sincerely hope that the Government has made the correct decision and that is to ensure that those residents pull back in that area. If the Government decides otherwise, it will receive very strong criticism from my constituents.

I also refer to the attitude of my ministerial colleagues in terms of addressing the needs of the aged in my electorate. I must say that every time I have made representations to those Ministers, I have been successful. Child-care facilities in the Woodville area will become a reality. Further, the need for occasional care and child-care in the West Lakes area is being addressed. The need for additional toy libraries will be addressed this week when I meet with some of my constituents. The revetment work program in the West Lakes area has to be addressed and moneys have to be committed to that program.

I am waiting for the Premier to address the needs of pensioners and superannuants in terms of concessions. I believe they should be given some assistance. The traffic control measures in relation to the West Lakes Boulevard extension have to be completed and I look forward to a commitment from our Government in that regard. The tenant management in the three Housing Trust estates in my area is another issue.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I thank the Governor for his speech in opening the 46th Parliament. On behalf of the electorate of Victoria, I congratulate him on his service to South Australia and also his wife, Lady Dunstan, for her support in his service to the State. I also acknowledge my loyalty to Her Majesty—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher is out of order in interjecting. In any case, he is particularly out of order because he is not in his proper location in the Chamber.

Mr D.S. BAKER: —Queen Elizabeth II, as Queen of Australia. I also express condolences to the families of those former members who passed away during the previous session of Parliament and they are James Heaslip (the former member for Rocky River), Leslie Nicholson (the former member for Light), John Ryan (the former member for Port Adelaide, and later for Price), the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill. Although I did not have the pleasure of serving with any of those gentlemen, I know that they made a tremendous contribution to this State.

As this will probably be the last opportunity I have to do so before the election is called, I also thank those members who will retire voluntarily. I know that some members opposite who sit on the back bench will retire involuntarily, but those who will be retiring voluntarily are the member for Spence, the member for Gilles, the member for Stuart, the member for Playford, the member for Peake and the member for Mitchell.

As a new member in this House, I must pay tribute to those members who were Ministers, because at any time that I have made representations to them they have been very helpful to me and to the people in my electorate. I thank them for that and for the bipartisan way in which they conducted themselves as Ministers of the Crown. I wish all those six people a happy and long retirement. I assure them that I have many happy memories of their service to the State.

In the few minutes that I have before the dinner adjournment, I must attempt to give members opposite, who do not seem to understand the position, a quick precis of what is happening to the Australian economy. Perhaps they will then begin to understand why we are in such a parlous situation and why we need a bit of leadership, not only at Federal but at State level, to try to address some of those wrongs.

Mr Becker: No matter how much you try, they'll never understand.

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is right. I must keep using one-syllable words. I was one of those members of the public and of this Parliament who, when Federal Treasurer Keating, who claimed to be the greatest Treasurer in the world, announced that he was going to float the Australian dollar—in other words, get into this deregulation kick which we had been asking him to do for years—thought that it would be very good for the Australian economy. It virtually brought the Australian economy into the twentieth century and

allowed the rest of the world to look at our performance. In particular, it allowed the rest of the world to judge our performance, and judge it it did. What it found was that we pay ourselves far too much and have far too many holidays in comparison with the rest of the world.

Mr S.G. Evans: And too many politicians.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have far too many politicians at State and Federal level. At present we have too many politicians on the Government side, but that will change soon because of the election.

Above all, we have a moribund regulated centralised wage system which the previous member was talking about. It is not what one pays a person that keeps one competitive with the rest of the world; it is that person's productivity. Until we can get our economy in order in this nation and start looking at productivity, not minimum wage rates, we shall not be competitive with the rest of the world.

Mr S.G. Evans: And quality.

Mr D.S. BAKER: And, as the honourable member said, quality. Until we can do that, we will never compete with the rest of the world. So the rest of the world judges the Australian economy, because the Treasurer deregulated only half of the economy, and that was the banking system and the dollar. Our dollar crashed, and it crashed dramatically, because the rest of the world said, 'Your economy is not in good shape.' With the increase in commodity prices it should have meant that this country once again was, to put it blandly, back on the sheep's back. It should have fixed our balance of payments, it should have made us competitive with the rest of the world and it should have enhanced our exports dramatically. But it didn't. It did not do that because it was a dirty float.

The Government had to force up interest rates so that it could suck in overseas money to prop up our balance of payments and deficits to keep the country afloat. If we were paying the highest interest rates, that is where the smart money in the world would go; and that is what Keating knew. He had to force up interest rates to keep the money coming into the country. In the end, that made the Australian dollar rise and that had a tremendous effect on this nation's competitiveness with the rest of the world. Now our balance of payments is getting further out of kilter. We have only to look at the monthly figures. We are consistently \$1.5 billion to \$1.8 billion in deficit, and there is no chance of it becoming less.

There should have been a deregulation of the labour market so that our productivity levels could move and our wage levels could move with productivity, but the Government was not prepared to do that. I was staggered to hear the Treasurer of this State on the radio this morning say that our high interest rates are an overseas problem because the rest of the world is keeping them up. That is incorrect. He does not understand basic economics. It is a dirty float. The interest rates are kept up by that one triumvirate in this country: Bannon as President, Hawke as Prime Minister and Keating as Treasurer. They are causing the interest rate hike in this country. It has been done deliberately because they are not prepared to show to the rest of the world the inefficiencies in this country and allow us to compete in the free enterprise society in which we should be competing.

There was an interesting editorial in the *Advertiser* on 27 July which set out clearly and succinctly the mistakes that have been made in not deregulating our internal economy. They have tried to use monetary policy to control imports instead of fiscal policy. In a fiscal policy we would have a broadening of our tax base, which would help to bring our deficits and balance of payments down and keep this coun-

try competitive in the longer term. Until we can do those sorts of things, we shall wallow along as a nation because, whether those people over there with narrow vision like it or not, we are an exporting country and we rely absolutely on exports for our standard of living. If we are not competitive with the rest of the world and we cannot export, our deficits will stay high and our standard of living, which has been falling, will continue to fall.

Inflation has started again. Our last CPI rate was 7.6 per cent against a forecast by the world's supposedly greatest Treasurer that in this financial year it would be 4.5 per cent. We can see what has happened in other countries. The British economy is now under control. Thatcher has deregulated that economy and got it going.

I believe in paying credit where credit is due. Let us look at our friends over the Tasman. New Zealand got stuck into it. The Labor Party had the guts to deregulate the economy and make New Zealand competitive with the rest of the world, and, all of a sudden, that nation is up and running. Inflation is down to 4 per cent as against our 7.6 per cent. New Zealand's inflation is below that of its competitors in the rest of the world. Its interest rates are about 12 per cent compared with 19 per cent here.

It is interesting to note what has been going on and who has been in power while it has gone on. The most powerful man in Labor politics in Australia today has got to be the President of the Australian Labor Party, the Premier of this State and also its Treasurer. While this debacle has been going on, have we heard one peep from the Premier, Treasurer and President? We have not heard one peep about deregulating our internal economy and we have not heard one peep about the high interest rates. One would think that he had a direct line up there from the way he crows in that corner seat. He is supposed to be able to get straight through to Keating and Hawke, but we have not heard one peep, on behalf of the residents of this State, about any attempt to try to fix these anomalies.

Members opposite, in some of their speeches, have asked what we are going to do about it. Yet we have the President of the Labor Party, the most powerful man in Labor politics, and he cannot stand up for the State because he has not got the guts to do it—not one whimper.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: It's atrocious.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is all right for the Minister. He would slap a section 50 on me if he could, but he cannot do that to members in this House. The Australian Labor Party is in the position it is because it is rudderless. South Australia has the same problems because it lacks leadership.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am afraid I cannot give any more bouquets to the voluntarily retiring members of this House. I have already done that, although they were not present to hear it. I was speaking about the Australian economy and the influence which there should have been on that economy by the President of the Labor Party, the Premier and Treasurer of this State, the most powerful man in politics in the country, who has not even whimpered any criticism of his Federal colleagues in sticking up for South Australia. I was saying that South Australia is really rudderless in its leadership. It is a bit like the *Island Seaway*: when the going gets tough we do not go out of port.

One of the former Ministers responsible for that is here tonight, but he has managed to pass the blame onto the new Minister—who still will not accept the blame for the *Island Seaway* debacle. As to the South Australian economy (after dealing with the Federal economy), it is really inter-

esting to look at how we have declined over the past seven or eight years of Labor administration. According to the current figures, we are the third worst off State in Australia in the inflation stakes because of our CPI. One does not have to look around the skyline of Adelaide for very long to see that there is a severe decline in capital expenditure in this State and in building activities, and one does not have to read the papers for very long to understand that capital investment is declining rapidly.

If we talk to business people in the State, we realise that there are predictions for the next few months which will be critical. In the last few months of this Government, people are closing the doors very quickly. One honourable member has told us tonight about the wonderful export park down at the airport, but I am reliably informed that the hotel component of that park, the tourism component, has been put on the back burner. No-one wants to take up the hotel option on that development because South Australia is in the doldrums.

That is pretty serious for a Government which has really hung its hat on tourism and on State development, and it is interesting to look at our position, compared with that of the rest of Australia, in regard to economic indicators for South Australia. The Leader put many of these factors very succinctly, and I would like to back him up. In population growth since 1982—since this Government came to power—the State ranks fifth lowest of the mainland States. Population growth is a pretty fair indicator of whether people are coming to the State and investing in it, and whether people are making this State their home and trying to build a life here.

In the employment stakes we are fifth lowest of the mainland States. When we go through all these economic indicators it becomes very clear that we are not ranking too well. If there is ever, in any economic situation whatever, one thing which says how a State is performing, it is the level of bankruptcies.

It was the member for Briggs—who is not noted for his economic intelligence nor his intelligence of any sort for that matter—who interjected quite rudely when the Leader was speaking and said that bankruptcies really do not say anything. The Leader did point out that for the past two or three years this State's bankruptcy rate has been the highest of any State, and that in each of the past two years there have been over 1 400 bankruptcies in South Australia.

One cannot just write that off and say, 'Sorry, that does not mean anything; that has nothing to do with it.' Bankruptcies are caused by factors such as the economic situation of the nation as a whole which, as I have pointed out, is not too good at all—in fact, it is abysmal. They also are caused if there is a poor economic situation in the State where those businesses are operating. In this State, as we have shown, taxes and charges are amongst the highest in Australia. We have a land tax system which rips the guts out of small business. Of course, in the past couple of days the Premier has said in this House that he will provide land tax remissions. However, what he has not said is that he will collect more from land tax this year than he did last year and he will still collect more from land tax next year than he will this year. This is due to the progressive nature of land tax, which falls squarely on the shoulders of small business. The Premier is trying to con people into believing that they are getting rebates.

How does he do that? He says that they are receiving a rebate on what they would have paid. We have example after example of small business people who are the basic employers of staff in this State whose land tax consistently has increased by 200 per cent and 300 per cent. When that

is coupled with high interest rates, it impacts on bankruptcies. If ever there was an economic indicator that showed the business acumen of a Government or Treasurer, if ever there was a business indicator that showed the level of business activity in the State, it is the level of bankruptcies. The level of bankruptcies in South Australia is at the highest level since the Depression. If anything damns the President of the ALP—and the Premier and Treasurer of this State—it is his economic performance in the small business area.

I turn now to the waste and inefficiency within the Government ranks. If ever a Government decided that it would compete with private enterprise, it has been the Bannon Government since 1982. It seems to have blind confidence that business is easy—that you just get out there, set up a business and away you go, because it is easy to make profits. The Government seems to think that it can compete with private enterprise, but on every occasion it does so on an unfair basis. It does not pay land tax, payroll tax or any of the other taxes and charges that are levied on business in this State. Still, the Government competes with small business and makes it less viable.

In respect of the South Australian Timber Corporation, the member for Mount Gambier has often pointed out in this House the scandalous waste of money in that organisation. There is not one business venture into which the Government has entered that has shown a return on capital on the taxpayers' funds invested. Not only has the Government invested in South Australia—and there may be circumstances when its philosophy can be justified in this area—but it has gone overseas. The Government whizzed over to New Zealand on the incorrect pretext that, after the Ash Wednesday fires, we needed more timber in South Australia. Although the former Minister is not quite trying to slide under his bench, he has a wry smile on his face, because following the Ash Wednesday fires we have more timber available in this State than ever before in the history of the pine industry.

The Hon. H. Allison: And the biggest and the best trees.

Mr D.S. BAKER: And the biggest and the best trees. They were all there, and they had to be processed quickly. The Government lurched over to New Zealand and managed to lose about \$25 million of taxpayers' funds in probably one of the most horrific and disastrous business experiments that we have ever seen. It is unfortunate that the retiring Minister will not be around to see that business sold up by the next Government to enable this State to get out of that venture and retain what taxpayers' funds we can.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Which Government?

Mr D.S. BAKER: The next Liberal Government, which is only a couple of months away, I remind the former Minister. At least with the previous Minister one could talk rationally about the economics of the situation, but the new Minister, in his usual belligerent style, said, 'Don't worry. You and the member for Mount Gambier don't know what you are talking about. We will have it all fixed up by the end of June. We put on a new man from private enterprise and we will give him a free rein.' I can tell the House that the Government did not give him free rein. It is well after the end of June and we have heard not a peep about the South Australian Timber Corporation's performance.

The Hon. H. Allison: And the bills are still coming in.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The bills are still coming in, and taxpayers' dollars are still going down the gurgler. That is another example of a Government which has no economic acumen trying to compete with private enterprise.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Is that how we got the surpluses?

Mr D.S. BAKER: You did that by overtaxing. I hate berating former Ministers who are voluntarily retiring; but I do not mind berating members like the member for Adelaide who will involuntarily retire in a few months. The former Minister should know better. Then, we had the Government lurching out to build a new ship—the Troubridge was not good enough, even though it had served South Australia very reliably for many years. Instead of calling tenders and constructing this ship through private enterprise, the Government designed it, and it thought that it could build it itself. The Department of Marine and Harbors got someone in, but they forgot the tank test and other things. So, we now have a \$24 million disaster sitting at Port Adelaide which can sail only in good weather. It cannot even take bottled gas over to the new abattoirs on Kangaroo Island—a new venture that is employing a lot of people.

The new ship cannot get out of port often enough to do that, so, it is left to the training ship *Failie*. We have the ridiculous situation whereby it is too dangerous for the seamen on the *Island Seaway* to sail to Kangaroo Island but it is not too dangerous for the crew of the *Failie* to do it. It is about time the Government got its priorities right. Perhaps the answer is to put a coat of paint on the *Troubridge* and start a reliable service to Kangaroo Island to look after this new venture which employs many people. Let us get Kangaroo Island moving again, because we are now approaching the season where the turn-off from the abattoirs is quite critical. The bungling in respect of the *Island Seaway* will result in unemployment on Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: Why don't you put a coat of paint on your flowers.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I will come to the environment next. Of course, members on this side have only just begun to highlight the Marineland debacle. If ever there was a project with a sniff about it, it is Marineland. Over the next few weeks the quite ridiculous business activities at Marineland will be highlighted. Some \$5 million of taxpayers' money has been wasted. The Government guarantee to the Bank of New Zealand was only \$2 million, and we want to know what happened to the other \$3 million that was used to placate the unions who held up that venture. It is a scandal.

I now turn to a few matters in respect of the environment. Last night I had to sit here and put up with a 30 minute speech from the member for Briggs. He talked about the greenhouse effect, Worldwatch and problems out there in the real world and overseas. He carried on in this vein for 30 minutes, reading every line of his speech. No doubt he gave it to the press this morning, chapter and verse. Of course, it did not contain one original thought. He writes for the Premier; I do not know who wrote this speech for the member for Briggs. It had no relevance to South Australia whatsoever and, frankly, it was a load of motherhood rubbish.

Let me turn to the environmental problems of this State. The next Liberal Government will address those problems, and we have already begun by announcing what we will do with the sewage and industrial outflows that pollute South Australia's waterways.

About 140 megalitres per day pour out from Bolivar into the gulf, causing severe degradation to the coastal areas and severe loss of seagrass and damage to marine life. We have said we will stop that immediately we come to Government, and convert it into a tree-growing operation providing about 10 million trees on 1 000 hectares. That is a very positive environmental approach that we are taking. It would cost \$93 million to construct a tertiary treatment plant at Bolivar. It has gone on far too long. Someone should be doing something about it, and it is about time we tried to protect

our fishing industry which is quite important to the income of this State.

We have also had a look at what is happening with Apcel and Lake Bonney. Lake Bonney is the largest fresh water lake in South Australia and, under the Government indenture, once the effluent reaches the boundary of the factory, it is the Government's responsibility. It is not Apcel's fault but that of the Government, and successive Governments have done nothing about it. It is very simple to fix. Trees can be grown over 1 000 hectares using that effluent. Those trees can be recycled through that plant and there would be no need for hardwood fibre to be imported into Australia in the future. However, there has not been one peep from this Government about that.

It took the member for Mount Gambier to highlight the Finger Point disaster where raw sewage has been flowing into the ocean for many years. This Government thought that it would get rid of the member for Mount Gambier, but it will never get rid of him. He will stick around longer than the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin because of his work and effort down there. Raw sewage was being poured out, and prior to elections, the President of the Labor Party has stated, 'Yes, we will fix it.' They had the bulldozers down there while they took some photographs, but immediately returned them to Adelaide. Thank goodness the member for Mount Gambier was on the ball and able to expose that. Finally, after all these years, they are doing something about it.

Raw sewage is still flowing into the sea at Port Lincoln. What is that doing to our prawn fisheries and tourism areas around Port Lincoln? These matters must be addressed. It is about time the Government stopped talking about the motherhood statements and rubbish we get from the member for Briggs, woke up, and started looking after the environment in its own backyard. The policies that have already been announced by the Leader of the Opposition addressed that fact.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, so ably moved and seconded by my colleagues the members for Fisher and Newland respectively, that the Address in Reply be adopted. At the outset, I join all members in expressing sympathy to the relatives and friends of past members—Mr Leslie Charles Nicholson, Mr James Alexander Heaslip, Mr John Richard Ryan, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Campbell Rymill, all of whom served for many years in the South Australian Parliament.

Paragraph 44 of His Excellency's opening address refers to the fact that this Government recognises the increasing importance of sea links and the need for our State to increase its competitive edge in cargo handling. Consistent with the recommendations from the national inquiry into the waterfront, the Government is continuing to implement a range of initiatives to improve efficiency. Also, the Department of Marine and Harbors, working closely with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, has helped to increase the frequency of calls by container ships between Port Adelaide and Europe. It is expected that a new service between East Asia and Port Adelaide will be introduced in the coming year.

There is no doubt that we will see some very major changes on the waterfront over the next four or five years. For many years the South Australian Government has tried to maintain a competitive edge consistent with the charter to cover our costs on commercial ports.

I now want to refer to inter-port competition. As we all know, the late 1960s and 1970s saw the start of a funda-

mental revolution in shipping which covered basic changes in ship technology and materials handling involving much greater specialisation and a capital intensification of the industry generally. The changes which occurred made it feasible to transport significant quantities of cargo quite long distances by land between coastal cities. In short, the major capital cities came into competition with each other for the first time, a situation known to other parts of the world for many hundreds of years.

In the main, through containerisation, the unitisation of cargo is the most obvious area of this competition. However, the advantages of competition have tended to be lost by artificial rigidities. Containerisation was not introduced through commercial evolution; rather, it was introduced centrally with a major involvement from the Federal Government. I am not critical of that fact; central involvement was probably necessary to achieve such a fundamental change. However, the way in which containerisation was introduced should be kept in mind when considering its current application and, indeed, to ensure that the system is not so inflexible that it is incapable of change.

It should have been expected that anomalies would develop and that decisions made at the time would have unforeseen implications. However, over the years since its introduction, there has been a tendency to invest Ten Commandment qualities to the arrangements which were made. One of these tenets was that cargo should be centralised wherever possible rather than being centralised where it would present a significant economic advantage. Indeed, at that time many saw no difference between those two propositions, and some people still maintain that that is the case.

Whilst I was Minister (and I know that this practice has continued) the Department of Marine and Harbors undertook a number of very detailed studies into South Australia's overseas trade. Those studies proved convincingly that, for the major trades, direct ship calls are more economic. Those figures have proved to be conservative for the European trade, and there is no reason to suppose that other studies will be less accurate.

These studies rely on actual charges made when, really, the present centralisation arrangements have been propped up by railways losing millions of dollars each year. As a demonstration of the lack of reality of the charge, for the ANU to take a box from the metropolitan area to the Victorian border—a distance of about 300 kilometres—including the lift-on train consolidation, the cost is just over \$80.

This cannot be anywhere near the real cost. We were criticised—not by the shipping line—for investing in a second container crane at the same time that railways were proposing to spend more than \$200 million on a standard gauge track between Melbourne and Adelaide. This investment could only be based on the carriage of overseas containers, a trade which, even with present long-standing and presumably amortised investment, can be handled as economically, or more economically, by direct shipping. Given the interest burden on a \$200 million investment, it is clear that the project would lift significantly the real cost of the relatively modest volumes carried between the two cities. Therefore, in terms of real transport costs, it does not make sense: ships are in the transport business.

Changes in the shipping industry during this period have meant that capital city ports, and some of the larger outer ports, have been obliged to compete to regain, or retain, a share of the business. They have had to equip themselves for this competition, and that has led to complaints of duplication of investment. As is the case with shipping companies and, indeed, all commercial organisations, ports

are not prepared to wither away without a fight in the face of new competition. On the other hand, this competition should be beneficial to the owners of cargo, especially with the development of incentive packages, which go wider than port authority charges. Indeed, competitive investment has not increased prices in industry generally: competition brings prices down. It is a fact that the economies of the States with direct services have benefited, and those without direct services have been disadvantaged.

South Australia has a right to pursue its own economic aspirations and, whilst much has been gained, further achievements are necessary, and it is very heartening to learn that more direct services will be forthcoming. A comprehensive three-year program to reform Australia's shipping and waterfront industries has been announced by the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications (Mr Ralph Willis). The program is based on the report of the Shipping Reform Task Force and the findings of the Interstate Commission on the Waterfront. Savings from the reforms would be about \$700 million per annum. A media release dated 28 July 1989 from the Federal Minister states:

Reforms to liner shipping legislation, to be implemented from 1 August, will affect some 60 per cent of Australia's international sea trade. The Minister for Transport and Communications, Ralph Willis, said the Trade Practices (International Liner Cargo Shipping) Amendment Act 1989 would create a more competitive containerised shipping environment for the benefit of Australian exporters.

'Under the provisions of the Act, shipping conferences (cartels) will in future receive only partial and conditional exemption from provisions of the Trade Practices Act,' Mr Willis said. 'Conferences and ocean carriers with substantial market power will be required to negotiate with representative shipper bodies concerning services offered. In addition, any cartel agreements between ocean carriers will have to be registered to ensure they were open to public scrutiny and met minimum standards.'

Mr Willis said that he had agreed to declare the Australian Exporters Shipping Association a designated peak shipper body. Under the new legislation the designated peak body can require conferences to negotiate for minimum service levels and freight rates. The Australian Exporters Shipping Association is an industry-funded body which represents a broad cross-section of Australia's rural and manufacturing exporters.

'This new legislation is a micro-economic reform aimed at freeing up the shipping market,' Mr Willis said. It should assist all exporters of liner commodities.

I trust that that legislation will assist South Australia. This is probably my last Address in Reply speech before the next State election. I want to say how very much I have enjoyed my more than 14 years in the South Australian Parliament. I believe that, as an honest politician, I have got on very well with all members from all Parties. I have certainly had great joy in working with all my colleagues within the Labor Party and, in particular, with the members for Mitchell, Playford, Stuart, Gilles and Peake, all of whom, with me, will be retiring at the next election.

I also want to place on record my deep appreciation to the people who have always supported me within the Spence electorate. I have always enjoyed a strong majority, and I know that they will continue to support a Labor Government.

I feel very proud of my own achievements whilst representing the electorate of Spence and also for more than six years as a Minister within the Corcoran and Bannon Governments.

Apart from cleaning up the tow truck industry and taking the rivalry out of the taxi industry by introducing the one plate system—which, incidentally, is working exceptionally well—probably my most important decision was to abolish the north-south transport corridor. That is why today the Hindmarsh area has become the national pace setter for inner suburban rejuvenation.

The once neglected suburbs of Bowden, Brompton and Ridleyton are being transformed into premier addresses by new housing and office and shopping projects, totalling more than \$300 million. The joint State Government-Hindmarsh council push will see the Entertainment Centre, seating 10 000 people and costing \$40 million; office development totalling \$154 million and creating an extra 3 000 jobs; and about 1 100 new houses, costing \$100 million and accommodating 2 500 people on the sites of former brickworks and factories in the Bowden-Ridleyton area.

We also fought hard and were successful in stopping the Tonkin Government from building the remand centre on land on the Port Road at Brompton. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I am very pleased to support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

At the outset I should like to acknowledge and commend the contribution that His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan continue to make in South Australia and the way in which they carry out the very important responsibility that they have.

I also recognise the contributions made by former members who have recently passed away. I did not know a number of them very well, although I did know Sir Lyell McEwin very well. He was a person for whom I had the greatest respect.

I saw a considerable amount of Sir Lyell while he was patron of the Caledonian Society, in particular the Mount Barker Caledonian Society. I am very privileged to have been able to take over the patronage of that society since the death of Sir Lyell McEwin. The contributions that Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill made in this Parliament in another place and in this State were quite remarkable.

I also acknowledge the current members in this place who will be retiring at the next election. We have just heard from the member for Spence, who indicated the enjoyment and pleasure he has gained from the position he has held in this place and in the Government. I enjoyed working with him while he was Minister and appreciated, the way in which he went about his duties and the responsible way in which he acted as a Minister. In 1975 the members for Spence, Mitchell and Mount Gambier and myself came into Parliament. We will miss the member for Spence.

I have also appreciated working with the member for Stuart, particularly as the previous Minister of Transport. It would be silly if I did not say that we had our ups and downs, and I will always condemn him for the decision he made on the closure of the Bridgewater railway. However, in other ways he was a very pleasant person to work with, and the contribution he made as a Minister in that portfolio will be recognised for some time.

I also pay a tribute to the member for Peake. I have enjoyed very much working with him in his capacity as Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. Unfortunately, at this time he is not with us in this Chamber as he is hospitalised. I have enjoyed working with him and always recognised him as a very loyal person—one who has accepted the responsibility with a certain amount of grace. I hope that all retiring members will enjoy their retirement.

It is always difficult to determine what matters should be brought forward in this debate, as the scope is very wide. I will vary my comments considerably. I will refer to some of the issues in my own electorate. In fact, I could spend a full half hour talking at length about some of those concerns, as a number of areas in Heysen are experiencing problems. Some positive things have happened in recent times, one

being the Mount Lofty Ranges review. A number of uncertainties relate to that review and I am disappointed with parts of it. It was expensive, costing well over \$2 million, and I had hoped that it would bring together the Government departments which have a responsibility in the Hills and which must confront the many issues.

Largely, that has not happened. There are still many conflicts between the E&WS Department and Tourism South Australia, for example. I am disappointed that, in all the time they have been working together, they have not been able to have a closer relationship and bring down more integrated policies. I am also disappointed that there is, obviously, still quite a conflict between the 19 councils in the watershed catchment area, the area involved in the review, and some of the departments, in particular, the E&WS Department.

There is a very real need for action—and for immediate action—to stop the loss of good agricultural land in the Hills over a period of time, as I recognise the advantages to be gained because of the closeness to the market. There has been much concern about the amount of land which has gradually disappeared, being taken over by one form of development or another. Everyone recognises the need for action to be taken to stem that loss. On the other side of the argument, a large number of people who own properties in the Adelaide Hills are being forced off those properties because they are no longer viable, and they have the very real problem of getting back some return on funds that have been put into those properties over a period of time.

Of course, that is what the review is about: trying to come to terms with some of those problems. I am very pleased that I was able to convince the Minister for Environment and Planning that the time for consultation should be extended. The document is daunting. There are two documents, of course: the investigations report and the management plan. There was a lot for people to digest, and it was important that more time be provided so that submissions could be sent in by a wide cross-section of people involved in the Hills. I am pleased that that extension was granted. That is one of the positive points.

One thing which is far from positive and which is of particular concern to me is water quality in the Hills. I have complaints coming in from all sections of the electorate, particularly from the more populated parts of the Stirling council area. I live in that area, and the quality of water is such that I would not want to wash a dirty dog in it at present. It is filthy. Many complaints are coming in from mothers who are facing considerable difficulties in washing their clothes, in bathing children, and in many other practical areas. It is scandalous that so much money is being spent in some areas on water filtration, whilst other large areas, particularly throughout the Hills, are being totally neglected.

Water quality is of particular concern to me, and I have taken it up on a number of occasions with the Minister. The other thing that sticks in your gullet is the fact that we hear so much about what people on the land in the Adelaide Hills need to do to preserve water quality in the metropolitan area. Farmers and people on the land have very stringent regulations to which they must adhere in the Hills so that the water quality for the metropolitan area can be protected.

While all that is going on, and while we are very conscious of our responsibility, very little is being done to improve water quality for those people who live and work in the Hills and rely on water for a large number of purposes.

The other matter to which I refer also relates to the local situation, and I raised it briefly yesterday in another debate

in respect of ETSA and my ongoing concern about the trust in this State. Yesterday I referred to my concern about the tree trimming operation. Again, today I have had three constituents contact me to express their real concern about action taken by ETSA and its contractors. It is an incredible situation in view of the amount that is being spent by taxpayers on an ongoing basis.

This is totally unsatisfactory and I am anxious to have the opportunity in the Estimates Committee to hear from the Minister and his ETSA officers. I hope we have the opportunity to debate the Estimates before the election. Last year ETSA officers were not brought before the Estimates Committees for questioning, but I hope they will be this year. I would be most interested to question officers and the Minister about the cost of tree trimming.

I was particularly pleased when the Deputy Leader gave notice in this place that, within a week or so, he will move a motion that ETSA should establish a fund of .5 per cent of revenue to progressively underground power lines in strategic areas in cooperation with local government to prevent the mutilation of trees. I believe that that is a popular move, and one that would certainly receive tremendous support from residents throughout the Hills. I receive numbers of complaints and representations from people who leave home in the morning from a street that provides a rural setting only to find when they return in the evening that most of their trees have been pruned hedge-like, so that a lot of the character of the Hills is being removed.

As I said yesterday, parts of the Hills are recognised for their species, both native species and introduced European species, but many trees have been mutilated under this system. I have taken up this matter with the Minister on a number of occasions and, although I have received correspondence I have received little satisfaction from him. I will wait to see what comes through the Estimates Committees about that cost. I was interested to note the following statement in the latest edition of the Mount Lofty Ranges Association *Newsletter* published earlier this year:

At last the good ol' *Advertiser* has seen fit to come down on the side of those of us who are not too happy about the fudging and buckpassing and pontifications about how expensive it would be if this whole State were to move into the present and someone decided that electricity should be buried. That would be a happy funeral, indeed!

I am looking forward to making a contribution to the debate on the motion to be moved by the Deputy Leader. Another matter of concern to me is the lack of respect throughout society for politics and politicians. I understand that to some extent, but I am concerned that so many people in society are totally frustrated with the system.

On numerous occasions people have said to me, 'What can I do to change the system?' As individuals in the community they feel they can do absolutely nothing to change the system. An article appearing earlier this year in the *Advertiser*, in which I was interested, states:

In the cool morning light of this new year . . . there are signs that a less festive spirit [than the bicentennial 1988] is abroad now in the community, that here is a growing impatience with the injustices and ineptitudes clouding our horizons as a nation. If 1988 was a year for reassessment, then 1989 could shape up as the year of response to the cracks and flaws that have been exposed; indeed, a year of change.

It starts at the top, of course. Australia's politicians, Federal and State, have never enjoyed so little esteem. Too many issues have been ignored, too many initiatives have been missed, too little sensing has been made of the temperature of the electorate and its wishes. Governments . . . increasingly have flaunted the arrogance of power . . . when serious questions are raised on policy matters the questioners are derided and abused. Such governmental overconfidence is a breeding ground for autocratic rule; it is dangerous and, ultimately, it will be stopped. With elections expected this year . . . there is an opportunity for the electorate to

demand an end of the disdain and contempt by a Government towards the people it purports to represent . . .

Never has the need for sensitive, responsive government with a consuming desire for moral and social justice been so acute . . . Above all, there must be a move away from the sort of reactive, rearguard, safe-thinking of self-serving Governments interested only in retaining power. Australian Governments will hold power in 1989 through their return to . . . political responsiveness. Old fashioned leadership . . . integrity, compassion and vision will have to be rekindled. New energy must be injected into tired Cabinets, new risks taken, and a new horizon found for . . . all Australians.

I believe that that is very much the case in this State. It is certainly time for a change. For 20 of the past 25 years we have had a Labor Administration in this State. People see the present Government as being arrogant, and it has not been prepared to listen. At present there is a definite move in the electorate for a change, and it is obvious that it will only be a very short time before that opportunity is provided.

I now refer to my concern about environmental issues, and there are so many areas to which one could refer. So much has been written and said about the environment. It is now clear that many different groups of voters are expressing concern about environmental issues. Many farmers and rural electors are worried about the alarming scale of soil degradation and salination. City dwellers complain about the pollution of the air, beaches and parks, and all Australians are worried about the health hazards associated with the depletion of the ozone layer and about talk of pesticide residues in our food.

Many issues can be lumped in the conservation basket, and articulate, well educated, well presented, well organised and well funded environmentalists are getting their carefully packaged message through to the electorate. The public is clearly worried—but what does it actually want? I believe that the answer is relatively simple—the public wants to be assured that Governments share their concern and are taking measures to solve a lot of these problems.

I now turn to some of the representations presently being made throughout the world about environmental issues. Only last month we learnt that in Paris leaders of the seven major industrial countries put the protection of the environment at the top of the world agenda, with a call for concerted international action to tackle the greenhouse effect of global warming.

Mr Rann: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I appreciate the honourable member's support. I was interested in what he had to say in his contribution to this debate. I was very pleased—in fact, delighted—when the honourable member decided to support a resolution debated in this House recently regarding the greenhouse effect, making it a much more bipartisan move as far as this Parliament is concerned. I was very pleased that that happened. If I had the time, I would cite newspapers from throughout Australia and their editorials chartering a future for the planet and urging a stronger Australian stand on the ozone layer. Many very important comments and contributions are being made in newspapers throughout Australia and the world. I was particularly interested to read recently of the impact that the environment movement is having in England. The Prime Minister of England (Margaret Thatcher) has made some very considerable moves in regard to environmental issues. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to refer to all of those.

I was not surprised last month to see the *Advertiser* headline, 'Government's failure to act scandalous, say conservationists'. The article referred to an apparent failure by the Government to act on a 1986 report on a review of the environmental impact assessment process in South Aus-

tralia. That lack of action was described as scandalous. The article states:

And Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) former president . . . urged the Government to 'dust off' the report and to make a 'clear concise mechanism' of environmental assessment that could encourage developers to invest in South Australia.

I am pleased that the Minister has now issued a white paper and has indicated that changes to EIS procedures are to be introduced into this House. I will be interested to see whether that actually happens. It has certainly been promised, but there have been many other occasions when we have been promised changes or legislation but it has not occurred. It is something that must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The concern that there is in the development industry and on the part of conservationists would suggest that it is an urgent matter that needs to be dealt with.

When I introduced planning legislation into this House in 1982 I recognised that, because it was the first planning legislation in Australia to include the environmental impact assessment procedure, there would be a need to monitor the legislation very closely. We have now had an opportunity to do that, and we have had an opportunity to recognise the failings in that legislation. When the Labor Administration came to office in 1982, the Minister who took over the planning portfolio set up a review panel of that legislation but, unfortunately, there has been a lot of procrastination on the part of those who have held that portfolio since that time. It is a great pity that it has taken some seven years for those changes to be recognised and for some action to be taken.

That leads me to the current development conflict. I was interested in a recent newspaper report of the comments of the present Minister for Environment and Planning in an address to the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. She said that one of the most striking aspects of the development debate was the apparent conflict between developers and conservationists. I suggest that that debate has been going on for a very long time, so one could hardly have a great deal of confidence in the Minister's having taken that long to recognise that it is a major problem.

Appropriate changes to the environmental impact assessment procedures should help the problem considerably. If inappropriate legislation is introduced, I assure the House that the Opposition will move the appropriate amendments to ensure that the legislation does what I believe all South Australians would want it to do.

I now refer to the Mount Lofty development. I do so, because only today during Question Time, in reply to a question the Minister for Environment and Planning indicated that I had changed my stand on this development on a number of occasions. That is not correct—it is an untruth. I have made it quite clear right from the time that plans for that development were first released that I had some concerns about it, but at the outset I want to say that I am not, and never have been, anti-development. I am not anti appropriate development on the St Michael's site at Mount Lofty. It is far too valuable a site not to be developed, and some pressure was put on the Government to ensure that it purchased the site so that a reasonable tourist development could proceed. I repeat: it is far too valuable a site not to be developed in an appropriate way.

The only concern I have relates to the scale of the development on the site itself. We are considering a development which will cater for between 500 and 600 diners, a 170-room motel and 1 300 square metres of retail development. I refer to those three areas only, but other areas would also suggest that the scale is inappropriate for the site. As I have said, I am not anti-development and, in fact, I remind the House that I encouraged developers when they came to me,

as Minister for Environment and Planning, to develop a restaurant on Windy Point. Members who have visited that restaurant would recognise that it is an excellent tourist attraction, but I believe that the difference between that development and the one at Mount Lofty is that we were able to bring it within the ambit of the hills face zone and other regulations.

I also suggest that official reports relating to that development should be made public, particularly those associated with fire and other forms of safety. Residents in that area have suffered on a number of occasions previously as a result of fire and they deserve to know the situation in relation to safety factors.

I would also like to have made public reports on the Highways Department's attitude to the substantial increase in the amount of traffic that will use the Summit Road between Greenhill Road and Crafers. I do not believe that it is too much to ask that those official reports be released. It is with pleasure that I support the motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion. I also would like to pay a tribute to, and to express condolences to the families of, the five deceased former members of this Parliament. I did not know four of them personally, but I did know one of them who was a predecessor of mine in the seat of Price, Mr John Richard Ryan, affectionately known by everyone in this place as Paddy Ryan.

Paddy was a former Speaker of this House. He held the seat of Port Adelaide from 1959 to 1970, until the redistribution when he represented virtually the same area as the member for Price until 1975, when he retired. Paddy was the Speaker of this House from 1973 to 1975 and served this House for nearly 16 years. He served five years in the army during the Second World War and before he came into this place, was, of course, a waterside worker. He was a very dedicated person who loved his union and its members. He held every office in his union, right up to the top position, as well as being a member of the Federal executive and a delegate to the ACTU. In addition, Paddy was the State President of the Australia Labor Party in South Australia. Even in his retirement, Paddy continued his involvement with the Parliament through his association with former members. In fact, he helped form that association. I extend condolences to Paddy's wife and surviving family.

I also refer to the retiring members—all of whom are on this side of the House. Of course, I refer to the member for Gilles (Hon. Jack Slater), who is a former Minister of this House; the member for Mitchell (Hon. Ron Payne), also a former Minister; the member for Stuart (Hon. Gavin Keneally), again a former Minister; the member for Playford (Hon. Terry McRae), a former Speaker of this place; the member for Spence (Hon. Roy Abbott), who was also a Minister; and, of course, the member for Peake (Mr Keith Plunkett), who has served in this place, and who currently serves this Parliament, as the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. I thank these retiring members for the friendship and assistance that they have given to me in the time that I have been in this place. 'Friendship' is probably not a strong enough word to use in connection with these people: 'mateship' is probably more appropriate. It is great to work in a team with these people. They will be sadly missed when they retire. I wish them and their families well for a long and happy retirement.

The Bannon Government is well prepared and has the credentials to meet the demands placed upon it in taking our great State into the last decade of the 20th century. The challenge ahead is a daunting one indeed. I am sure that we have the talents and the team in this Government to

meet that challenge. At the beginning of the 20th century, South Australia was basically a colony of Great Britain and enjoyed the protection and benefits offered by that coverage. After Federation, nothing much changed for most of this century, until England decided some years ago to enter the European Common Market. Of course, that decision created problems for Australia, and in particular South Australia in relation to our reliance on our primary sector. Suddenly, things started to change. We now need manufacturing and other industries to complement the primary sector in this State. We must also trade with South-East Asian nations and Pacific region countries. It is a completely new ball game. Now that we are not trading as extensively with Europe as we did previously, we must open up trading links in the Asian and Pacific region.

It is primarily through the efforts and initiatives of this State Government in responding to this challenge that South Australia is doing better than other States. I am sure that this State will reap the benefits from the foundations that have been laid during the past few years of the Bannon Government.

Business must get up to pace with the Government. Certain initiatives have been taken by the Federal and State Governments in relation to industry in particular, but industry is lagging behind. It needs to take up the many opportunities which are available, especially in relation to the Asian market and possibly later the Chinese marketplace. It will mean a tremendous amount of business for South Australia.

Ample assistance is being given in this direction by the initiative set up by the State Labor Government. Technology Park—that excellent facility—is giving ample assistance to business, in particular small business, as is the centre for manufacturing at Woodville in the old Woodville GMH plant and places like Port ITeC.

I should like to make a few comments about ITeC at Port Adelaide. ITeC stands for Port Adelaide Information and Technology Centre. It was set up about a year ago and has achieved remarkable success in such a short time. Since its inception last year it has trained about 90 long-term unemployed in computer and engineering skills. More than 60 per cent of those students have moved straight into jobs or further education, and another 40 per cent have joined Port Adelaide Job Club, which boasts a 90 per cent placement rate. In other words, about 95 per cent of the people trained at Port ITeC have been placed in jobs.

The great advantage with this centre is that people receive tailor-made training. The centre goes out into the business community, finds out what specialist skills are needed, and takes young people—not always young people; sometimes they are older people—and retrain them specifically and especially for the jobs that are there. That is a great initiative. It is happening in other areas of education, but in particular at the port in this set-up.

ITeC, which is funded by the Federal Government and the local council and by industry sponsorship, is doing a remarkable job. It provides training in typing, word processing, clerical and office procedures, repair and maintenance of electronic equipment and basic electronic circuit design. The courses are free for the long-term unemployed and disadvantaged groups such as migrants, single parents, the disabled and Aborigines. It is a great concept. I am sure that it will continue to play a large part in the development of industry, in particular in the western suburbs of Adelaide.

Manufacturing and export are vital to South Australia's long-term economy. To export we must import. Trade is a two-way thing. I know that at the moment imports are causing balance of payments problems for this country and,

I guess, for South Australia as well. However, we must get the balance, so we must import as well as export.

Much has been done by the Government in South Australia, despite the threat to the Port Adelaide waterfront in particular of an integrated cargo control and clearance system. It is a threat which has been hanging over us for some time. Despite that threat, the State Government has taken the initiative and set up a second container crane at No. 6 berth at Outer Harbor to cater for increased shipping and extended container facilities in Port Adelaide. Turnaround time has been reduced dramatically. With an excellent industrial relations record in South Australia, particularly Port Adelaide, ships have an accurate amount of predictability for movements in and out of Port Adelaide. That is one of the main assets with our excellent industrial relations record; turnaround time has been reduced by 50 per cent due to the second container crane and the predictability of shipping movements both in and out of Port Adelaide.

Those things, together with a lot of hard work by the Chamber of Commerce, the Government and the Department of Marine and Harbors, have been helpful in putting forward a very successful professional case. We have received benefits by getting a direct shipping service from Japan to Port Adelaide in recent years, and they have also been able to increase that run.

The European Shipping Conference calls to Port Adelaide have also been increased. It has been announced that the new Asian shipping link will start between East Asian ports and Port Adelaide later this year. The East Asia Shipping Conference line will switch its operations from Melbourne. The trade from East Asian ports it is to be redirected to Port Adelaide under an agreement that will generate widespread benefits to South Australia. The East Asia Shipping Conference line links Hong Kong, Taiwan and the Philippines with Australia. After months of top line negotiations by the Department of Marine and Harbors and the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the link has virtually been stitched up and, I believe, will be signed within a few weeks. The move will mean an extra 24 calls a year into Port Adelaide via the Asian-based line container ships, bringing an extra 10 000 containers a year to South Australia.

When the container terminal was first set up the number of containers coming into South Australia totalled 2 000. Now that number has expanded, through State Government initiatives to 30 000 and, with the extra East Asia shipping call will increase to 40 000, or a 30 per cent increase.

The present imports and exports between Adelaide and Asia are directed through Melbourne and carried by rail or road to Adelaide. It is estimated that the direct shipping route to Port Adelaide will save South Australian firms about \$2 million a year in direct freight charges. In addition, we will see multimillion dollar savings, as the service will eliminate delays in rail freighting goods to and from Melbourne, it will reduce the importers' waiting time by an average of two weeks and possibly up to five weeks, given the delays that occur at the Port of Melbourne and delays in transporting goods by train or road.

Elimination of delays caused by strikes and other industrial problems on the Melbourne waterfront will result in a faster and more efficient service for importers in South Australia, and there is an excellent industrial relations record in South Australia. The service will provide an increased range of export opportunities for South Australian industry; for example, many fresh fruit and food lines can be shipped to Asia. A wider choice of import goods will be available for people in South Australia, and there will be the obvious boost to employment opportunities in the Port of Adelaide.

It will also help to boost South Australia's reputation as a central link in Australia's transport system and it will reduce the cost to South Australian consumers of some imports. It will put further onto the backburner any threat of the Federal Government's integrated cargo control clearance system as far as this State is concerned. The many benefits for South Australia, in particular for the western suburbs, such as additional jobs and business opportunities, spin-off activities from extra business into Port Adelaide and so on, will all help to build up the local economy in the Port and surrounding areas.

These extra 10 000 containers will result in more cargo coming into Port Adelaide than ever before, even more than in the days when there were 40-odd shipping companies and something like 3 000 waterside workers in Port Adelaide. Today only about 180 waterside workers are employed there, because of improved methods and efficiencies and, because of containerisation in particular, more cargo is being landed here than previously but, unfortunately, there are fewer jobs.

I wish to highlight some matters that were raised in the Governor's speech, one being the waterfront inquiry that was set up by the Federal Government. The Bannon Government recognised the need for South Australia to become more efficient and competitive in the area of shipping and cargo handling. One recommendation of the national inquiry into the waterfront involved the Government, through the Department of Marine and Harbors, working closely with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the unions to increase the amount of cargo shipped into and out of Port Adelaide. This was one of the initiatives I have just mentioned—the extra East Asia line.

I have spoken briefly with the Waterside Workers' Federation and the Seamen's Union, and they are reasonably happy with most of the recommendations and are prepared to continue to work hard to protect the Australian shipping industry. I will cite some points raised in this document related to the reform of the shipping industry and the waterfront. The package to reform the waterfront and the shipping industry in Australia is very practical. It is based on commonsense and developed through full consultation with the employers, employer organisations, Government and trade unions—every area. It is not based on an abstract theory or ideological dogma. It is a practical agenda for cooperation and effective reform which will reap maximum long-term benefits for the industries, their customers and, indeed, all Australians.

As I mentioned before, the recommendations have been out for some time and were brought forward after full consultation with all those involved in the shipping industry. The Shipping Reform Task Force which was established was chaired by Mr Ivan Deveson, Managing Director of Nissan Australia. I remember from the 34 years I spent with General Motors before I came to this place that Ivan Deveson was one of the top people within the General Motors organisation. He has much experience and expertise. This task force comprised senior representatives of shippers, ship operators, unions and the Government, and led to the establishment in 1986 of the Maritime Industry Development Committee, representing shipping owners, unions and the Government. It has initiated a radical new approach to the operation of Australian ships using the concepts of multi-skilling, broad-banding of jobs and integration of functions. The MIDC initiatives resulted in crew sizes being further reduced. This will be an ongoing situation, and the unions, especially the Seamens Union, recognise this.

They recognise that their numbers will decline because of modern technology and modern vessels. Fewer and fewer

crew members will be needed on ships. The ships are bigger and more complex, but crew numbers are declining. It is a fact of life and something they have to live with, and I give full credit to the unions, in particular, for the positive way in which they have taken to this task of reforming the waterfront and the shipping industry; I applaud them for their attitude.

The alternative to going down that track is that Australia, as a trading nation, would have to use flags of convenience ships. That would be the last thing we would want to see, bearing in mind some of the flags of convenience ships that come into Port Adelaide. They are nothing more than rust buckets. They provide dreadful conditions for their crew. Usually the safety equipment does not work and the health of the crew is poor.

Such ships often have rats, cockroaches and spiders. Often toilets, showers and stoves do not work. There may be no running water and inadequate food supplies, and some of the crew are paid wages of about \$60 a month. Also, health implications are severe not only for crew members but they place at risk cargoes, especially foodstuffs, carried by these dreadful vessels. We should be guarding against such ships. Therefore, we need to get our own house in order and make our own shipping and cargo-handling industry more efficient and effective in order to combat the use of such ships.

I now wish to switch from commercial shipping to the related matter at Port Adelaide of defence. As some of my colleagues have done, I refer to the Australian Submarine Corporation. This Government is proud to have got that massive contract and work is continuing at the Osborne site to prepare for the building of the submarines. The eight-storey submarine hull and outfitting shop is nearly finished, and it completely dwarfs the nearby Eglo Engineering large shipbuilding shop which, in turn, dwarfs the other nearby large industrial factory buildings. The submarine project building is massive.

Some of the office accommodation has been completed on site and staff are gradually moving from the manufacturing park premises at Woodville to the Osborne headquarters, where about 350 people are now working. By the end of this year, it is scheduled to have 800 employees on the Osborne site. Work on the first submarine should commence next month. This will be an exciting start to what will be a long and complex project earning billions of dollars for this State.

Six type 471 submarines are to be built. The first will be commenced next month and the others will be progressively commenced with the first submarine scheduled for completion in 1993. The Navy expects to take delivery, after necessary sea and equipment trials, in 1995. The other five submarines are scheduled to be completed and launched at about 12 to 15 month intervals, and the flow-on economic benefits to the community and to the western suburbs of Adelaide in particular will be enormous over the life of the project.

In the year that the sixth submarine is launched and commissioned, the first submarine will come back for a major refit, and this process will continue for some years. The whole project will take about 20 years to complete. During that time and afterwards I imagine that the consortium could perhaps build submarines or other vessels for other countries.

In view of all the technicians who have come from within South Australia, from interstate and overseas and who will be domiciled within the local area for the rest of their lives, there will certainly be the expertise, as well as facilities and infrastructure, to take on other projects from around the world.

Another project which has been announced and which will complement the submarine contract is the Anzac ship contract for the eight frigates to be built for the Royal Australian Navy—and supposedly four frigates will be built for the New Zealand Navy, although now with the resignation of David Lange as Prime Minister of New Zealand there might be some doubt whether these other four frigates go ahead. Nevertheless, we will certainly be building the eight frigates for the Royal Australian Navy. Work, worth at least \$500 million, will be done in South Australia, regardless of who is awarded the contract to build these frigates. Bearing in mind that there are now 27 companies in South Australia which specialise in defence and aerospace work, undoubtedly many of those companies will be doing some of the contract work for the frigates and the submarines. That augurs well for South Australian industry.

Another exciting development in the defence vessels area concerns the naval survey vessels that are being built by Eglo Engineering. Several of the Paluma class survey vessels are to be built. I attended the launch of the HMAS *Paluma* on 27 February this year at Port Adelaide. The vessel was named and commissioned, and she is the first of several vessels to be built for the Royal Australian Navy. These ships will be used as survey vessels to chart around northern Australia and, in particular, the Barrier Reef area, to make sure that shipping lines are kept open.

The first plate of the HMAS *Paluma* was cut on 21 February 1988, with the vessel being launched on 6 February 1989, and being named and commissioned, as I said, on 27 February. It was a very efficient and fast job. Having been on the vessel several times, I can assure members that she is a beautiful vessel, which handles well and rides particularly well. These vessels are of twin hulled catamaran design, of 315 tonnes displacement, are 36.6 metres long and have a shallow 1.9 metre draught. These are specially built for shallow water survey work off northern Australia and they are also very suitable and capable in relation to deep ocean survey work. The HMAS *Paluma* and her sister ships, as they are completed, will work in pairs to improve the charting of Australia's coastline and Australia's shipping routes, especially around northern Australia.

The *Paluma* proudly wears the battle honours won by *Paluma 2*, which was a survey vessel that did patrol work in New Guinea from 1942 until the end of the war. At the commissioning it was nice to hear the senior naval officer (of Vice Admiral rank) say that the Royal Australian Navy had decided that, in future, vessels will be built in Australia where possible. This augurs well for our industry. Obviously South Australia will get a quite substantial share of the work with any naval vessels built in Australia, irrespective of whether they are built here, in Newcastle, Williamstown, or wherever. South Australia will obviously get a share of the work because of the ever-increasing capability of our ship building industry and facilities.

The *Paluma*, incidentally, provided a very good vantage point for the speedboat Grand Prix which was held at Port Adelaide in April and which was a resounding success. It is hoped that this will become a major international event, like the motor vehicle Grand Prix, and that it will continue for many years to come. I have run out of time sooner than I expected, and so with those comments I shall conclude my remarks and indicate my support for the motion.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and before referring to His Excellency's speech in some detail, I will refer to today's launch of 'The Chardonnay Experience '89' at the Hyatt Hotel. The Chardonnay Experience was launched

by the Minister of Tourism and the Managing Director of Berri Renmano Wines, John Pendrigh. The purpose of the Chardonnay Experience was not only to recognise the Renmano Chairman's Selection 1988 Trophy Chardonnay, which took the Show Wine of the Year Award, but also to launch the Riverland Wine Festival which is to be held from 17 to 19 November this year.

That launch clearly indicated to all those attending that the Riverland is alive and well and that it is producing some of Australia's premium wines. Those wines are now recognised as being premium wines not only in Australia but also overseas. A statement released following the launch entitled 'Riverland Wine Industry Comes Alive' was as follows:

The Riverland's 'sleeping giant' wine industry has awoken and will open its doors to the public in an exciting inaugural wine festival to be held on 17, 18 and 19 November of this year.

In an address to journalists at Adelaide's Hyatt Regency today, industry leader John Pendrigh, Managing Director of the large Berri Renmano wine group, said the Riverland has been undergoing a 'quiet revolution'.

Pendrigh said in his speech that the region's wine industry will stage the festival to reinforce the public interest which has been aroused by the Riverland's shift to emphasis from casks to premium bottled wine.

Dubbed 'The Chardonnay Experience '89', the festival is named in honour of the Riverland wine which earlier this year took out the prized 'Show Wine of the Year Award'—Renmano Chairman's Selection 1988 Trophy Chardonnay.

That is in vast contrast to the statements that were made by the Premier only two or three weeks ago, when his comments angered many Riverland people. Whether this came about as a result of the Premier being in the company of the Prime Minister, I do not know, but it is unusual to hear outbursts from the Premier claiming that the Riverland, the Murray-Darling Basin and South Australia are in dire straits, and that the size of metropolitan Adelaide and towns along the River Murray will possibly have to be decreased. In the *Sunday Mail* of 16 July this year the Premier is reported as saying:

We are facing the greatest environmental threat in our history and it has nothing to do with marinas or cable cars. What we are talking about is the death of the Murray River and of thousands of square kilometres of our best agricultural land. We are rapidly heading towards a position where we may be forced to simply close down some of our regional cities and scale down the size of Adelaide itself.

It is uncharacteristic of the Premier to make a statement like that. It did a great deal of damage, as far as people in the Riverland were concerned. The report continues:

In areas like the Riverland, excessive clearance and sloppy irrigation practices had caused the raising of the water table and the leaching of massive amounts of salt into the Murray.

I turn my attention to the point 'excessive clearance and sloppy irrigation practices'. I remind the House that it was the Premier who brought the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas to a halt and who is directly responsible for any sloppy irrigation practices that remain in the Riverland. It has been totally impossible for those irrigators in Government irrigation areas which have not been rehabilitated at this stage to implement improved modern irrigation practices which have a big bearing on reducing high water tables and the movement of salt from the irrigation areas into the river. So, whoever programmed the Premier on this occasion certainly did not do him any favour, because he should have been made aware of the fact that he is directly responsible for the current irrigation situation in the Riverland in South Australia. In fact, virtually all the private irrigation areas in this State have been rehabilitated. They have efficient irrigation practices and the worst irrigation undertaking in South Australia is presided over by the Premier.

It is high time that the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources honestly faced up to the fact that they, and not the people living in the Riverland, are the ones responsible for any sloppy irrigation practices in South Australia. In fact, those irrigators who unfortunately have to operate in Government irrigation areas which have not been rehabilitated are at a distinct financial disadvantage. They do not have the potential of those who are producing crops by means of improved modern irrigation techniques. Consequently, last Thursday I gave notice that I would move to seek the support of the South Australian Government for a \$1 billion package that the Liberal Party has been promoting to really come to grips with this overall problem. There is a lot more to it than just planting trees. While trees are an important part of the rehabilitation of highly saline soils and high water tables, they are not the total solution.

I do not think there is much that the Premier can teach people in the Riverland about growing trees, since the first wood lots planted in South Australia were planted in the Riverland. In fact, the first wood lot planted in this State for the purpose of drawing down high irrigation water tables was planted by a brother of mine in a section of the Government irrigation area in the Riverland where the Government does not provide any comprehensive drainage system. So, it was a matter of his determining a means by which he could reduce the water table in that area to save his own plantings.

He decided to do this by planting a wood lot approximately five years ago, and the eucalypts that he planted are now over 12 metres high. The water table at the time of planting the wood lot was within a third of a metre of the surface. It is now down 1.5 metres below the surface and the horticultural plantings (the vineyard) have dramatically improved as a result of it.

So, for the Premier to make that sort of statement is an insult to the people of the Riverland who have led the way in environmental aspects of dealing with high salinities, especially involving the planting of trees. I hope that we do not have a repeat of that action by the Premier. The anger of the people was certainly borne out by the Mayor of Renmark in his comments reported in the *Sunday Mail* on 23 July when he said, 'Renmark dying? No way!' The report continues:

Close down Renmark? Never, say the locals. Renmark folk ridiculed claims by the Premier, Mr Bannon, that regional centres may be closed down and Adelaide scaled down if nothing is done to improve the Murray's water supply.

That was an over-emotional reaction. As I said, it might have been caused by the presence of the Prime Minister, but it was certainly out of character for the Premier, because he is normally much more careful in what he says. I certainly hope that it does not occur again.

I have given notice of a motion in relation to endeavouring to gain a commitment from the South Australian Government to contribute its share towards the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin. That motion is based on the Federal Government's providing 70 per cent of the necessary funding, with the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia each contributing 10 per cent. Under those circumstances, \$100 million will be provided annually by the four Governments for the next 10 years, resulting in a total of \$1 billion. It is conservatively estimated that that sort of financial commitment will be necessary if we are to solve the overall pollution problems and the degradation which has occurred in the Murray-Darling Basin.

Besides planting trees, it is necessary to provide improved irrigation practices on farms. The irrigation undertakings in

Victoria and New South Wales are vast when compared with South Australia. The rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution systems—again particularly in Victoria and New South Wales where there are a lot of gravitational or open canals which waste an enormous amount of water—require funding. Those canals cause a lot of seepage which goes into the water table and creates a high water table in exactly the same way as do inefficient irrigation practices.

Engineering undertakings and constructions are required in the form of groundwater interception schemes, but there are priorities and each section to which I have referred has its place. It must be orchestrated as a complete rehabilitation scheme for the Murray-Darling Basin. It can be done, and it has been done in other countries. A particular example is the Colorado River in the United States which involves seven States. At this stage we are really involving only three States, because at this stage Queensland has not indicated any real interest in participating in the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

At this stage I believe that the responsibility still rests with the three States (Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia) and the Commonwealth Government, but it is a national resource and the Commonwealth must be committed to a far greater extent than is the case at this stage. If it is not, we will not make any headway whatsoever and the resource will continue to deteriorate. Paragraph 11 of His Excellency's speech states:

My Government, in concert with Federal Government plans, will be encouraging a much expanded rural and domestic tree planting program.

That is partly included in the rehabilitation for the Murray-Darling Basin. It also relates to the dry land areas of the whole of South Australia. The Federal Government is looking at the matter on an Australia-wide basis.

I received a letter dated 21 July from one of my constituents. Under the heading 'Re rural tree scheme and water subsidy' (and I think that the Minister of Water Resources should look closely at what this person suggests) the letter states:

I am planning to plant an estimated 700 Australian native trees in my 6.1 ha property at Chaffey in the near future, commencing next autumn with 350 trees.

My block is dry and I have domestic water supply only, which in effect is connected to the irrigation system. Consequently, water use for these trees alone would run into 500 kilolitres per annum until the trees establish themselves. Obviously, this amount of excess water is quite expensive being on domestic rates, making it more difficult for me financially, considering I receive only unemployment benefit as income.

Would the South Australian Government consider converting 500 kilolitres of water at irrigation rates to water these native trees, say, for a period of three years? I am seeking your assistance in order to make the tree planting successful. Without this form of assistance, it may be necessary to reduce the number of trees by 50 per cent at least.

That proposal has very real merit. Part of the total scheme proposed by the Liberal Party in its billion dollar package would provide exactly for that type of incentive. Some incentives need to be provided because the only way in which we will effectively reforest Australia is to have the people primarily involved in the process. Small incentives such as this could well mean the difference between reforestation going ahead on that property or nothing happening. Therefore, I put it to the Minister that it would be well worth her while to consider seriously this proposal as an option and as an incentive which could lead to further natural reforestation occurring. I now refer to paragraph 16 of His Excellency's speech, as follows:

During this session of Parliament two important capital works relating to water quality will be commissioned—Stage 1 of the Happy Valley water filtration plant . . .

The Happy Valley water filtration plant is the biggest filtration plant in respect of metropolitan Adelaide. Stage 2 of that plant has still to be completed and the Myponga filtration plant needs to be built, but one could say that the back of the water filtration program in metropolitan Adelaide has been broken. There is not now a great deal left to complete the filtration of water in metropolitan Adelaide.

It is now time for the Government to look at the condition of country domestic water supplies. The House would be well aware that during the period of the Tonkin Government we initiated the construction of the Morgan filtration plant, which filters water for the northern towns. That project was completed reasonably early in the piece—mainly for the purpose of controlling *naegleria fowleri* or amoebic meningitis. It was necessary to filter the water to enable the amoebae to be effectively controlled in that long overland surface pipeline, to ensure that the people in the northern towns of South Australia were safeguarded, as much as possible, against amoebic meningitis.

However, all of the towns receiving water directly from the River Murray probably receive the most turbid water in South Australia, because the water pumped from the River Murray, straight into the town water supply, has no opportunity whatsoever to settle. For that reason the full turbidity load in the River Murray—to a large degree, this depends on the amount of flow in the River Darling—determines just how much mud or turbidity will be in the water that is pumped directly into the domestic supplies of towns receiving that water, particularly along the River Murray in South Australia.

This matter was raised a fortnight ago by the mayor of Berri and it has been considered on various occasions in years past. As I said, the metropolitan Adelaide water filtration program is drawing to a close, but that program should now be transferred to country areas where water quality is in dire need of upgrading.

The Government should call for a registration of interest from engineering consultants and private companies, especially companies with branches overseas which may have had experience in this area in other countries, to put forward proposals on how the water could best be filtered in these small communities. Obviously the filtration plants would have to be different from the large plants that have been built in metropolitan Adelaide or the one built at Morgan to serve the northern towns. I believe that if a registration of interest were called for, engineering consultancy firms in this country, especially those with branches overseas, would be in an excellent position to put forward proposals for consideration of the type of filtration plant that would satisfy the needs of small communities.

People who live in country areas have just as much right to good drinking and domestic water as people in metropolitan Adelaide, and that should not be forgotten. Approximately 25 to 30 per cent of South Australia's population live in the country, and those people should not be ignored. The Government must also recognise that 50 per cent of the productivity and income earning of South Australia comes from those 25 to 30 per cent of people living in the country, and they do not have the benefits of all the facilities which are laid on in the metropolitan area. A reasonable quality domestic water supply is long overdue and should be considered seriously by the Government. I shall certainly continue to press the Government in that direction.

I wish now to refer to a letter that I have received from the Chairman of the South Australian Canning Fruitgrowers' Association, Mr John Deakin. He writes:

The recent court decision over two apple growers from the Adelaide Hills, who smuggled in apple cuttings from New Zealand into Australia, is causing our industry much concern. The final

penalty became a good behaviour bond together with 200 hours community work, and we consider this to be so light that we fear the deterrent will nowhere match the incentive to repeat a similar operation by others.

Because Mr Vorreiter, prosecuting, said that both Collins and Vickers had been aware of the very serious risk of introducing fireblight from New Zealand, and further that these varieties Regal and Imperial Gala were not legally in Australia under quarantine. In a statement to the court, Quarantine Chief, Rip Van Velson, said the cuttings could have wiped out large sections of Australia's apple and pear industry.

Dr Van Velson said an outbreak of fireblight in South Australia could result in a complete embargo on South Australian apples, pears, quinces and all fruit and nursery stock by Queensland, Northern Territory, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, and further international markets would be lost. He further said South Australia's 2 400 hectares were worth \$20 million annually, while Australia's national crop was valued at \$240 million. The Australian Canning Fruitgrowers' Association is to write to South Australia's Attorney-General (Mr Sumner) to protest strongly at the very light subsequent penalty.

My association has requested me to write to our local member and to a member of the council to proceed with this matter.

There is no doubt that the introduction of any plant material from overseas that could have the effect of destabilising the fruit industry in this country is a serious matter. Fireblight is a very severe disease which could very well wipe out the fruit industry, as Mr Deakin stated. Certainly in the years that I spent on the South Australian Phylloxera Board, which is responsible for importing new vine varieties into South Australia, it was regarded as a very severe offence if anyone introduced vine cuttings into South Australia as we are phylloxera free in this State. The introduction and spread of phylloxera in this State would be devastating to our wine and dried fruit industries.

I also received a letter from Mr Ken McNorton, the owner of Calperum station. He received a letter recently from the Pastoral Board advising him that he owed the Lands Department \$5 940. He simply received an account in the post backdated to 1 December 1984 for 'the balance of rent owing due to revaluation of lease'. The revaluation of the lease occurred back in 1984, but somewhere along the line the inefficiencies of the Lands Department meant that the additional \$1 180 was not added to his annual rental account. That went on for five years and suddenly he received an account for almost \$6 000. I honestly do not believe that he should be held responsible for the inefficiencies of the Lands Department or the administration of the Minister of Lands and be required to pay that sort of money some five years later.

Some 30 other pastoralists are in exactly the same situation. If the Government cannot run its affairs more efficiently and effectively than that, there is no way that the pastoralists concerned should, at this late hour, be required to find large sums of money such as \$5 940. That is straight out poor administration and accounting on the part of the department. The accounts should be waived. It should be a lesson to the Government and the department to get its house in order. I support the motion.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): The first matter that I bring before the House this evening is one that I raised in Question Time today regarding the proposed introduction of club keno into South Australia. I first make clear that I support the general principle of the introduction of this kind of game throughout the club network in South Australia. I have always believed that some additional financial support was essential if South Australian clubs were to compete with the fundraising activities which now cut into all of their normal and traditional mechanisms of support. I refer to the Casino, the TAB, and the Lotteries Commission's general operations, with scratch money and the like that are now available at the various agencies.

These changes in our gambling habits have, of course, severely threatened the traditional basis of support for the clubs, and the clubs for many years have sought additional facilities in this respect. Initially, they campaigned for the introduction of poker machines, but that did not find general favour either in this Parliament or in the community. Subsequently, at my urging and the urging of other members in this Parliament and of the Licensed Clubs Association, the clubs have campaigned for club keno. I believe that that is a much more acceptable proposition and one which eventually will be tolerated by the community and will form the basis of a substantial improvement to our club network and the facilities that the community is able to enjoy in those clubs.

However, I am very concerned at the way in which this proposal is being introduced. The first word of it, so far as I am aware, came with a brief *Sunday Mail* article which stated the bald fact that club keno was to be introduced in South Australia and which listed a few clubs that were to be favoured with the initial licences. Since then, of course, additional material has progressively been released to the community—and the clubs themselves knew nothing of it. Even those clubs that were successful were not aware of the proposal being advanced, and the unsuccessful clubs, those not named in the *Sunday Mail* article or in the subsequent Licensed Clubs Association publicity, were also unaware that they were able to apply for this or that it was even being considered.

The latest information that I have, apart from the Premier's reply to the House this morning, comes from a memorandum issued by the Licensed Clubs Association of South Australia, dated 1 August 1989, and I would like to quote a paragraph from that. The document is headed 'Club keno' and the second paragraph states:

Following discussions with the Licensed Clubs Association, the Lotteries Commission of South Australia has decided to introduce keno through its on-line network. Some 30 to 40 member clubs will participate in the pilot program, expected to be launched in early February 1990. I have enclosed a list of those clubs for your information.

The criteria for choosing these clubs was primarily liquor turnover, with some consideration to club opening hours.

The document goes on to state:

By now you will be aware of the recent announcement made by the media. Please note that it was the intention of the association to inform all members prior to the official announcement taking place. We will endeavour to keep you informed of any further developments.

That is a selective quotation from the document, but I do not believe that any other statements in it are relevant to the debate tonight and I do not think I have left out of it anything of importance. What is quite clear from that document is that the Licensed Clubs Association believes that the matter had been finalised, and I emphasise that 'the Lotteries Commission of South Australia has decided to introduce keno'.

Quite clearly, it considers that the decision has been taken and resolved finally, and there is a list of proposed licensed club keno outlets attached to the document giving a broad selection of clubs, mainly sporting clubs with a number of social clubs thrown in, but by no means taking in the whole field. While it is perfectly true to say, as the Premier did this morning, that it is only a pilot program, I believe that this will have a very damaging effect on those substantial and viable clubs and many of the smaller clubs that remain excluded from the program. Quite clearly, those which are able to participate in the pilot program will have advance information as to how it works.

They will acquire a reputation; they will acquire facilities; they will acquire expertise in the management of the keno

network; and they will acquire the financial backing which the other clubs will miss out on. This will give them a substantial advantage and will increase their patronage over that of many other clubs, even though those other clubs could well have been part of this pilot program and even though they enjoy the same substantial facilities as the clubs that have been selected. But because of lower liquor turnover, they have been excluded from the pilot program.

I do not consider (and I believe many clubs will agree with this) that liquor turnover alone is a sufficiently sophisticated criterion even when combined with the additional criterion of opening hours. Many social clubs take a community minded viewpoint that liquor turnover is not the be all and end all of the clubs' existence. They exist to promote services and facilities to members and to encourage community development in their local area. I know of many clubs in my own area, and I cite as an example the Elizabeth City Brass Band Club, which has done much good community work and which uses its excellent clubrooms as a first class base for many smaller clubs throughout the community that do not have the resources to provide their own clubrooms.

I single out that club as an example of a worthwhile club that should have been included in any scheme, not because it is unique in this respect, because I am sure that many other such clubs exist throughout the State, but because it is in my district and I am familiar with its operations. I believe that this matter should not have been undertaken in secret. It should have been undertaken on a public basis with discussion in Parliament and the community, particularly on an open basis in clubs, so that all clubs were equally able to put their case for inclusion. That would have been a much more reasonable proposition. If the matter had to be tested, perhaps it could have been done through one or two Lotteries Commission official agencies or on an agreed basis throughout the community.

At the moment, the closed consultation with the Licensed Clubs Association has certainly disadvantaged many valid and well established clubs in the community and it could have serious consequences for them. In addition, we have not been told how the profit-sharing arrangement is to work. We have been advised only through the Licensed Clubs Association's memorandum that there will be a profit-sharing scheme with the clubs receiving commission. We have no idea what that commission will be, and neither do the clubs. I do not believe that the matter can be assessed properly until we see some break-even or profit and loss analysis of what this will mean to the clubs involved.

We also have the problem, which has not been addressed, of what will happen to the small clubs, which will never be in a position to participate in these things. Many of these clubs offer a valuable community service and it is essential that their financial viability be protected into the future. Whether that can be done through some pool arrangement of funding or through special grants through the Lotteries Commission or by some other mechanism I am not sure, but that should be investigated properly prior to the launching of this scheme. An assurance should be given that smaller clubs will survive financially.

This is an excellent concept. I believe that the Lotteries Commission has every right to bring about this proposal, and there is a need. It has been discussed broadly for years, but suddenly we find ourselves at the edge of the precipice and, in fact, being pushed over that edge without adequate information. The matter should have been brought up more slowly and with more thorough community discussion and debate to ensure that the problems are resolved before the machines are installed. It will be too late then and I think

that the Lotteries Commission would do well to reassess not the proposal but the way in which it is implementing it to ensure that clubs are not disadvantaged and that those small clubs which provide valuable community services are looked after.

Also, the commission must be careful that the major clubs that now depend heavily for their financial turnover on bingo and other traditional fund-raising activities are not wiped out by the rapid introduction of club keno in other substantial clubs that will gain a massive financial advantage. Liquor turnover itself is simply not enough; we must have a more sophisticated analysis of which clubs are to be included and we must then have a protection scheme for the remaining small community clubs to ensure that they are simply not brushed aside. We also need to look at the consequences throughout the community of this change in the gambling franchise, and it is obvious that it will generate pressure for the introduction of poker machines in the Casino and possibly for draw poker video machines in hotels.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: I do not believe it is a soft option. It is a difficult option and one that this Parliament and the community need to investigate thoroughly. The consequences of this move have not been fully debated in the community. They have not even begun to be debated, and it is essential that the Parliament and the community look at this matter closely before we finally resolve the process.

The actual consequences of the scheme will be important to us and, while I am very much in favour of supporting the clubs through the use of club keno, I believe that we will be disadvantaging the very community that we seek to assist if we do not look at all the potential consequences, both economic and social, and their impact on the whole community.

The other aspect that I want to refer to this evening concerns the introduction of computer technology in this State. The State Government, of course, as is regularly the case, spends a fair amount of taxpayers' money on high technology equipment. Some of the most important emerging technology in this area is that of the microprocessor. Members will be aware that South Australia has a manufacturer of microprocessor-based personal computers in the firm of Micro Byte, which is located here in Adelaide. This firm has brought forward a number of very innovative Australian designs in personal computer technology.

I am very proud as a South Australian and as a member of this Parliament that we have a firm able to produce high technology innovative products here in this State. I know that the Minister of State Development and Technology would want to encourage this firm and others at the leading edge of technology in South Australia to do better things in the future, and of course one part of that encouragement is assistance with research and development, which the Department of State Development and Technology provides to any industry establishing in this State. I am sure that this firm, Micro Byte, and any other company setting up, will have received whatever assistance it could from the State Government in this respect.

However, there is one other important aspect that is not being given the attention which I feel it deserves. The State Government is a major purchaser of this kind of technology, and tenders and purchase agreements are frequently released for the public to bid on—and computers are a very prominent part of that. This country has a substantial balance of payments deficit with our overseas trading partners, and computers and personal computers in particular, will form

an increasingly large component of that balance of payments deficit.

We need to do everything we can to encourage not only import substitution manufacturing in this country but also the development of a large scale export market, because the Pacific countries and Asia—and even the USSR—are increasingly important markets for our personal computer equipment. This is not one of those areas where our high labour cost need disadvantage us particularly. In fact, the amount of labour cost content in the manufacture of personal computers is very low. Most of the money is incorporated in the actual high technology components themselves, and so the fact that our labour costs here are somewhat higher than is the case with many of our South East Asian competitors, such as Taiwan or Korea, is not particularly significant in this respect. It is quite possible for us to have a very major and competitive computer manufacturing operation in Australia—and I would hope that it would be based in South Australia.

I now turn my attention specifically to the problem which I see here. In a few examples (and I stress that this is but a few examples of this area—many successful contracts have been let) the Government has had a tendency not to take sufficient account of the local industry, and the products to which I have referred earlier have not been given the prominence in Government tenders which they might otherwise have been given. I am not seeking preferential treatment for the firm in that respect. It must win the tenders on an open and competitive basis. I do not seek to reinstate trade preference agreements with interstate trading companies.

I know very well that South Australia benefits from having free trade between the States in Australia, and we would only be disadvantaged if we sought to impose trade barriers between Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and, say, South Australia. It is to our advantage to have open trade, and what is important is that the Government does not exclude South Australian firms by the very nature of the tender it releases. I believe that it is the case that the Government has excluded—I would expect by accident, but that is equally as blameworthy—the South Australian firm from successfully tendering for important Government contracts in this State.

By the simple expediency of nominating a particular computer chip, the Government contract excluded our domestic manufacturer in South Australia. That of course resulted in an overseas derived product, even though it is assembled in Australia—not in South Australia—from being successful. The local firm was not even able to tender because of the error in nominating a particular computer chip that its product does not incorporate.

That is a most unfortunate incident, and I would not want to see it repeated. Unfortunately, we have had similar experience with the incorporation of *Hansard* text on CD ROM format being awarded to a Sydney-based firm, again without any competitive tender in this case being called, when a South Australian firm could have submitted a valid tender if registration of interest had been sought from South Australian companies. I believe that a similar case occurred with the production of a laser disc for use at the recent Brisbane Expo.

Without invoking the spectre of State preference, I believe that it is essential that the Government is coordinated in its policy approach to this matter even to the extent, perhaps, of preparing a register of South Australian high technology firms and the capabilities which they have in a specialised unit—whatever happened to the Data Processing Board in this context—to circulate amongst South Australian Government departments and authorities to ensure that

they are aware of the South Australian product and that the tenders and contracts are let on a general basis and do not exclude from consideration at the tendering process individual South Australian companies.

I believe that that is very important, and I hope that the Government will not repeat the recent mistakes that have been made in this area. Even though the tenders to date are not massive, they are a bad precedent and I know that they do nothing to encourage the formation of an important computer industry in this State that will contribute both to import substitution and to the development of an important export industry.

Mr Lewis: It won't happen again.

Mr M.J. EVANS: As the member for Murray-Mallee says, I hope it will not happen again. One of the reasons I am raising it here tonight is in the hope of ensuring that it will not. Another matter I would like to discuss with the House this evening, in many ways related to that matter, is freedom of information, privacy and access to computer databases. I notice in a recent issue of the *Government Gazette* and in recent media publicity that the Government has formed a privacy committee, consisting of some senior Public Service staff members, which has been constituted by proclamation of the Governor to act as a privacy committee in this State. The administrative arrangements for access to personal files have also been undertaken by Cabinet without any legislative backing.

While this is acceptable as an interim trial period for a pilot program, so to speak (to refer back to an earlier matter), I do not believe that it is adequate in the long term. Freedom of information has been shown in other countries, particularly in the United States, and certainly at the Federal and Victorian Government levels, to be a very important instrument of democracy, and it is essential that it is given legislative backing. Without that it will not have teeth. People will not have recourse to the law of this State to protect their interests, and I do not believe that the public will give final credibility to administrative arrangements which are promulgated by the very officials that they are designed to investigate.

These people deserve credibility. I have faith in the integrity of those who serve on the privacy committee, and in no way do I wish to denigrate their role. I am sure that they would work very hard as individuals to ensure that the spirit of the project was upheld. However, I do not believe that an aggrieved citizen would give it the same degree of credibility as they would a properly legislatively-based court process. Legislation is essential to provide these rights and, in the long term, it will be essential that we have proper privacy controls for citizens to regulate access to databases, which is a very significant and growing area with the Justice Information System and the massive spread of personal computer databases throughout the Government and private bureaucracies, and to also enforce adequate freedom of information legislation. Without these measures, the average citizen will not have a chance against the private and public bureaucracies which our modern civilisation has created and sustains.

Certainly, this Parliament will be less able to process complaints against Government if as individuals we do not have access to legislatively mandated freedom of information. There can be no substitute for that in the long term and I hope the Government will take that into account in assessing the importance of these matters.

I will conclude with a brief reference to the Government's recent decision to lift stamp duty exemption for first home buyers from \$50 000 to \$80 000. The legislation, which is yet to see the light of day in this House, is a very important

step for those who seek to take on home ownership. I am sure it will be an important plank in the Government's re-election strategy. However, this issue has broader implications, and I believe it is time we considered not just first home buyers but those who are now low income earners and living particularly in Housing Trust rental accommodation who may wish to purchase that accommodation but who may have previously owned a house.

These days it is not uncommon in families for one of the partners perhaps in a previous marriage to have been part owner of a house, and difficulty is encountered subsequently in purchasing another as a first home buyer. We need also to give attention to these people as they are in a special position. We need to get them back into home ownership if we can, and it is not just first home buyers who need stamp duty relief. Low income earners of all kinds, who are now in rented accommodation but who may not qualify under the first home buyer proposals, also need assistance and I believe that those people, many of whom are in Housing Trust accommodation in my area, need the benefit of this kind of assistance. I will discuss that matter further when the Bill is introduced in this House. I support the motion.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I would like to comment on the Address in Reply speech made today by the Leader of the Opposition, less in anger than in sorrow. It seemed to me that we saw the culmination of seven years of bitterness, bile and spleen, not so much from the Leader but from his staff. It was very much the swansong of the Leader of the Opposition, and not a swansong of someone about to become Premier.

I would like members to turn the clock back exactly four years from this night to August 1985. At that time, the Leader of the Opposition in that Wednesday morning Party room meeting was telling his colleagues that his campaign was on track. He held up a Morgan Gallup poll and said, 'My way is working', but he shot his bolt and took his Party backwards at the end of the year by losing seats. He shamed his Party and he knows in his heart of hearts that he would not be Leader of the Opposition today if Dean Brown or Michael Wilson had not lost their seats. The other night he told the ABC 7.30 Report that he was devastated by the defeat. I am sorry about that. We are not a Party of vindictiveness, and I am certainly not a member who enjoys vindictiveness, but politics is a tough race.

It amazes me that the Leader just did not know what was going on out in the electorate. Today, living in the Hills, he is still out of touch. He is persistent, as he told us, resilient and still telling yesterday's teams that the polls show he is on track. We have seen him borrow from his political hero, Jeff Kennett, and from Mr Greiner, and we have had WA Incorporated translated across the State, with no ideas, no ifs and no buts. Well, he is shooting his bolt again. Yesterday he panicked. He has been pointing to the Morgan Gallup poll week after week, month after month, using it in his Party room as an index of his supposed rise.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition panicked. He was told by a friendly journalist yesterday afternoon that the Morgan Gallup poll which would be published in today's

Bulletin would show him going backwards. He had peaked; he was spent. So he got his troops to cobble together a phoney poll supposedly based on 300 calls to bodgie up some figures and give it to a very obliging *Advertiser*. It is called damage control or, as they call it in the United States, spin control: let us see if we can pre-empt the *Bulletin* and someone might actually fall for it. Someone did—certainly the *Advertiser* fell for it. You can fool yourself only so much. In his heart he knows that he is a loser.

The *Bulletin* reports that following a poll of 1 004 South Australians the Bannon Government would have been re-elected. Support for the ALP rose 2 per cent to 45 per cent; support for the Liberal National Party fell 1 per cent to 41 per cent. The Premier's personal approval climbed 3 per cent to 72 per cent and his disapproval was down 3 per cent to a mere 19 per cent, according to the *Bulletin*. Also according to the *Bulletin*, that confirms his long held standing as one of the most popular leaders in the country.

On the other hand, Olsen's approval fell 6 per cent to only 41 per cent, while his disapproval climbed 7 per cent to 41 per cent. An equal number of people disapprove of his performance as approve. This, says the *Bulletin*, is his lowest approval rating since 1986. Fewer people see him doing a better job than the Premier. In a head-to-head clash—that crucial measurement of the poll—the *Bulletin* states that the preferred Premier, Mr Bannon, is favoured by a huge 62 per cent of South Australians, whilst Mr Olsen is favoured by only 20 per cent—62 per cent to 20 per cent. He is doing it his way again. Of Liberal Party/National Party voters, only 42 per cent said that Olsen would make a better Premier. In his celebrated 7.30 Report interview the Leader of the Opposition was asked whether he regarded himself as a charismatic and inspiring leader.

We then heard an amazing series of quotes: 'What you see on TV is not really me.' 'I am a much nicer guy when you meet me in person.' Later on he said, 'What you see is what you get. There is nothing phoney about me,' and that is despite the voice coaching, despite the acting lessons and despite the newly acquired makeup we have seen in recent weeks. No amount of coaching will change the fact that he will lose. The Leader of the Opposition had a staff member working for Mr Greiner. He had Premier Greiner over here giving speeches for him, and there was the Leader of the Opposition looking like a lovesick Bambi hanging on Greiner's every word.

Of course, today he is running away from the Greiner miracle, except to say today that the mass sackings in New South Wales were due to Greiner's anti-corruption clean-up. Some clean-up! Some corruption! The Greiner Government has shredded the education system and has caused unparalleled disruption to the public hospitals and welfare system. It is presiding over unprecedented increases in New South Wales interest rates and charges. Under the Greiner Government anti-corruption clean-up more than 20 000 crooked public servants have been lost, including 3 500 crooked teachers and ancillary staff. A further 13 500 crooked transport and road workers and 500 crooked corrupt health officials have been lost.

Mr Greiner has wielded a Liberal meat cleaver into the heart of essential services in New South Wales. The Liberals say that they care about education. The reality in New South Wales is that students are being dumped into composite classes which include children from three different years. The reality of liberalism in New South Wales is that teachers have to confront a class of 29 instead of a class of 19. The public transport system is being run down and half the New South Wales rail system will soon be shut down.

Under the Liberals, New South Wales is becoming degraded and dirty and its society is being divided. What Greiner has delivered is what the Olsen Opposition promises—what I call the Manhattan option—run down and unsafe transport, inferior schools, hospitals run by contractors and homeless sleeping in doorways. These are the consequences of a Liberal Government indifferent to the public interest and hostile to the public sector. Under the Liberal Party fairness has always been dumped as an objective and as the litmus test of Government.

At the same time that the public interest is being betrayed, we will see sound Government assets being put on the auction block, we will see a scorched earth policy in the blind ideological drive of members opposite to abandon the long term functions of State Government. The rundown of public services, the abandonment of fairness, and assets stripping of the public sector—these are, and will always be, the major dividing lines between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party.

'Is it fair,' Mr Olsen asks, 'to look at the Greiner record in Government?' After all, it was the first coalition Government to win office on the Australian mainland since 1980. Where else can we look to for an example of what an Olsen Opposition could bring forth in government? I am not surprised today that the former disciple is now running away from the Greiner prophet. When the Leader of the Opposition in this State was asked last year whether he would follow Mr Greiner's education policies, his reply was very instructive. He said, 'No, no, no.' Thrice denied! One could almost hear the cock crow.

Today, we heard the Leader's Address in Reply speech. Of course it contained no vision and no substance—just a whingeing, whining litany of failure. The Leader raised the question of corruption in New South Wales. I would like to join him. It has been proven that the Liberals corruptly and illegally channelled money into bogus, phoney Independents. The *Sydney Morning Herald* uncovered receipts showing that more than \$200 000 in donations to bogus Independents had been laundered through a Liberal company called Community Polling. All of the Independent candidates—surprise, surprise—channelled their preferences to the Liberals. It was corrupt and it was criminal. It is about to happen in this State. I am reliably informed that the Liberal Party is offering money through intermediaries for people to run as bogus Independents.

Articles in the *Sunday Mail* and the *News* suggest that we might see some crook goings on doing the next election. In Gavin Easom's column it was revealed that a businessman was offering big money to anyone who would stand against me as a phoney Independent. Let them come forward and try. Apparently my public stance against hard drug dealing has offended a few sleazy wheeler dealers in the Salisbury area. The *Sunday Mail* has confirmed the story, saying that this businessman has been running around offering to fund sympathetic candidates. The *Sunday Mail* states that this gentleman claims that he already has a couple of suburban councillors in his pocket. So much for independence! So much for honesty!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): After that rather pathetic diatribe, I think it is one of those classic occasions when one could issue a challenge to a member of this House to repeat those statements outside the Chamber. Let us hear the honourable member make those allegations outside the House. It is a happy coincidence—it can be nothing more than a coincidence—that the member for Briggs chose, amongst various other topics, to refer to opinion polls in his adjournment speech tonight. It just so

happens that I also intended to speak about opinion polls, but from a rather different standpoint from the one taken by the member for Briggs. I put the proposition that we have become plagued by opinion polls and that they are not doing us a service. I say that in the light of recent polls, which have shown the Liberal Party ahead of the Labor Party in marginal seats.

It is completely immaterial to me what these polls say about either Party, the leaders or, indeed, about any political subject. I wish to address the proposition that polling itself is starting to prostitute the whole political process. It is time that everyone who is concerned about politics took note of it and started to realise that we should be looking not so much at the polling but the principles for which, and by which, we stand, and the people whom we are supposed to be serving.

This feeling has been growing on me for some time. Therefore, I read with interest in the current journal of the Commonwealth Parliament, *The Parliamentarian* of April 1989, a commentary on the Candian general election written by Mr Patrick Boyer, M.P. He said that Canada has suffered from a plague of opinion polls which has become a distorting factor in Canadian elections. Mr Boyer—and I agree with him—says:

In our peek-a-boo age, our era of instant gratification, nobody wants to wait for election day any more. Trying to prematurely part the veils, pollsters and news media impatiently portray the outcome, citing their margin of error at the time, but less likely to look back on their inaccuracies when the real voter count is actually in.

Mr Boyer states three negative things which can be said about polling, judging by the Canadian experience. I suggest those negative things are equally applicable to the Australian experience. First, they tend to turn an election campaign into a horse race; secondly, in doing so, they tend to crowd out news coverage in the limited amount of air time and restricted columns of newspaper space; and, thirdly, they cause despondency among Party workers who see their Party slipping—when in fact a good election requires all Parties having their workers go enthusiastically door-to-door to carry their particular message to the electorate. That is the Canadian experience.

My own individual experience of polling was one of the factors which helped to get me elected. The Minister of Education will be familiar with the poll which appeared on the Monday of the week before the 1977 election which forecast that the Liberal Party would lose the new seat of Coles by three per cent. Far from making me despair, that poll result ensured that I worked harder than I had worked in my life—and that was hard indeed—in the last week, with the result that I won the seat of Coles. I am sure that the Minister of Education will remember that. The polling result may have simply confirmed what was going to happen; it may have distorted the outcome. Who can tell what the result would have been. But, in any event, the outcome did not reflect the poll.

It is important to realise that pollsters suggest that one cannot make a fully informed decision on the validity of any survey until one knows what the question is, if it makes sense and how it is asked. A loaded or biased survey can make a very big difference. That is continually happening. In the *Australian Quarterly*, published in the autumn of this year, in an article entitled 'Cracks in the crystal ball: opinion polling and the Victorian election', Derek Parker writes:

Of course, the political Parties have always been aware that victory in marginal seats was a prerequisite of winning Government, but—

this 'but' is applicable to every member of this House and to all political Parties in this country—

marginal seats now seem to have been elevated to the centre of the parties' campaigns. The ALP in particular appears to have adopted the strategy of transferring campaigning resources from safe to marginal seats. While this concentration can obviously save marginal seats, the long-term effect is the gradual reduction of strength in traditional areas. The experience of the 1988 New South Wales election—where the ALP lost a large number of seats which were rock-solid two elections ago—shows that this process can have dire consequences.

I suggest that those dire consequences are likely to be felt by the ALP in this election, but that in itself is not the point of my proposition. If we, as politicians, are so derelict in our duty that we allow our policies and attitudes to be determined by the results of polls, we deserve what I believe is occurring in Australia—a deterioration in respect for political parties and appreciation of their values, because those values are being distorted and degraded to some degree as a result of a perpetual concentration on the lowest common denominator of what the polls think.

A single glance at the headlines of some of the poll reports in recent years demonstrates that any blind Freddy could have determined what people were thinking at a given time. For example, I refer to the heading of a report in the *Bulletin* of 10 November 1987 which stated, 'Joh takes the Nationals onto the slide.' That was abundantly clear at the time. We had the obviously inaccurate impression conveyed in the polls of 24 May 1988 under the *Bulletin* heading, 'Polls elect Kennett, Howard'. Obviously that was off the beam, as was the heading in the *Bulletin* of 18 August 1987, 'Howard comes up trumps in Liberal leadership survey'. We go on to what I would describe as a statement of the glaringly obvious in the *Bulletin* of 28 July 1987—not a political poll but more a sociological and cultural poll taken not only in Australia but in all the major democracies in the world—under the heading, 'All the world agrees with the values of a life centred on the family'. One hardly needs to conduct a poll to come to that conclusion and, if a poll is necessary for us to reach that conclusion, our values in respect of family life cannot be very strong indeed.

On 22 March 1988 the *Bulletin* ran a headline, 'Thumbs down on poll ads', and stated that for the first time since the late 1970s political ads were streaking to the top of the most hated list with Labor Party advertising accounting for 75 of the political advertisements that were unpopular. Again, that should have been abundantly clear to anyone who had the ears to listen and the willingness to do so. It is time that politicians went out, assessed their own beliefs, listened to what people are saying and chartered their course of action on the basis of principle and not on the basis of the results of polls.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In addressing the House tonight I wish to take up a couple of issues that are of considerable importance to the electorate of Bright. These issues have been hobby-horses or intellectual ferrets of mine for some time and I thought that tonight was a time to give them a little more exercise. The first that I wish to take up is the need for filters on drains leading onto beaches right along the metropolitan coastline. This issue has been given a run from time to time, but it is time to take it up rather more seriously than it has been taken up in the past.

I refer to the south-western suburbs, where street drains lead to underground drainage, which in turns leads to drains that debouche or flow out onto the beach. People right through the south-western suburbs, particularly in summer-time, walk up and down the streets discarding milk cartons, straws, plastic bottles and whatever else they happen to be carrying. Right through summer rainfall is low and those materials blow into the drains. The result is that with the first couple of rainfalls in winter the drains flow at a rea-

sonable rate and materials wash out onto the beaches. There are various ways of handling that, but it seems that we have an inbuilt advantage in controlling the problem in that we cannot pick it up at the source where people distribute rubbish randomly but can pick it up where it comes out on the beach.

There are 32 drainage outlets from Port Willunga to St Kilda. There are a number of creeks and open drains, including the River Torrens, which all flow out to that section of coastline. It seems that the way to handle the huge pollution problem is to put some form of drains on the drainage openings at the beach. That would not necessarily cause the kind of problems that local councillors claim it would. It would not necessarily clog up as there are ways of designing them to obviate that. One of the ways has been suggested to me by a constituent of mine, Evan John from Hallett Cove estate. He has come up with a reasonably good design to prevent clogging.

However, I am not an engineer and it is not my job to appraise it. I simply make the point that, if you have diffused pollution coming from 200 square kilometres of the Adelaide Plains draining through 32 points, you are pretty stupid if you cannot see that the way to pick it up is at those points where the drains debouch onto the beach. That is the simple point that I have been making. However, there are several problems in that. Again taking the south-west suburbs as an example, if one turns to the South-West Drainage Act one finds that, while the Act is fairly vague, it says that councils are responsible for keeping the drains clean, or words to that effect.

The wording of the Act simply means that the drains need to be kept clean enough to prevent them from clogging and flooding. It is clear that whilst there is some obligation on the councils to clean the drains, it is pretty vague as to which council should clean which drain and when, and also how clean those drains must be to prevent them from flooding. It seems to me that there is some moral and legal obligation on councils to clean the drains, but the question is how we enforce that. Should the south-western suburbs, for example, share the cost among its councils? Should the Drainage Board levy each council? Should the councils, through their various regions (in this case the southern and western regions), contribute to the board to bear the cost of cleaning the drains, or should the cost fall on the, in the main, small coastal councils such as Brighton and Glenelg which have such a small proportion of the ratepayers but all the drainage outlets?

Should they have to pick up the cost of other people's litter? That is the question that they pose. My solution would be that the councils clearly have responsibility for litter and that ways need to be found, if necessary by legislation in this place, to compel councils to pick up that obligation. I do not think it fair for one moment that the small coastal councils such as Brighton, Glenelg and Henley and Grange ought to be obligated to pick up the load in terms of cost of cleaning the beaches.

Brighton council has taken the lead in one respect: it has negotiated with the people at Minda Home so that workers from the Verco unit at Minda do a daily sweep 360-odd days a year down Brighton beach to clean it. A group of residents at Brighton led by the late Mr Charles Merry some years ago, used to spend a couple of hours most mornings cleaning the beach. One group, involving a Sealcliff Park man, Fred Frey, is probably having some difficulties in staying together at the moment, but it spent most of this winter cleaning its bit of beach on the southern end of Brighton beach. Jack Mansfield, on the Esplanade at Brighton, spends a considerable amount of his time on the beach.

Those people have to put up with finding the occasional syringe and some fairly unsanitary things on the beach, and it is not fair to expect them or others to have to go through that routine. My solution is that there ought to be some overview from the State's point of view—that councils ought to be obligated to pick up the responsibility for cleaning. Whether they do it by cleaning as Brighton is doing, by hiring people to clean it, or whether they clean it by installing drains is up to them. I simply make the suggestion that, since it is diffuse pollution from a couple of hundred square kilometres going through 32 single points, the best way to do it is to put filters on those points.

I pay a tribute to the people who have worked so hard over the years—the Mr Merrys, Fred Freys and Jack Mansfields—and the many other residents of Brighton and elsewhere who have worked so hard in cleaning their part of the beach. They need to be recognised. But I do not think that that is the ultimate solution.

The second area to which I wish to turn again relates to Brighton, and that is the notion that we need to extend the alcohol-free zones along various parts of the metropolitan foreshore. It is fairly well known by residents of all seaside councils from Port Adelaide down to Willunga that in the summer months, in particular, people go to the beach to spend time. It is a reasonable thing to do. It is also reasonable, if there happens to be a pub across the road, that you would go to the pub to buy drinks. What we are finding increasingly is that, starting with Glenelg council and spreading ever farther south, increasingly more and more bits of the beachfront and the seaside reserves are being declared dry. The result in Brighton at the moment is that the only place within staggering distance of the bottle shop where you can buy alcohol from the pub to take away and consume it is the jetty at Brighton and under the Arch of Remembrance.

There are those in the Brighton RSL who are not that keen on the idea of people sitting under the arch all weekend drinking beer and then smashing bottles on the arch. Likewise, many families in the area use Brighton beach as a recreation place on Sundays and are not keen on having

their kids playing in the sand and rocks and being cut to pieces by bottles.

It is clear that the deposit legislation, while it works with people who are sane and sober, does not work with people after they have had a skinful. What tends to happen late on Friday and Saturday nights is that all the bottles laboriously stacked on one side are smashed because some lunatic decides that they are to be broken, and the pieces finish up on the beach and the footpaths.

I make the appeal that we ought to consider, and the Commissioner ought to consider, declaring some of those areas dry, not just the jetty and Arch of Remembrance at Brighton; we ought to go a step further and apply a ban on the sale of 375 millilitre bottles from some of those beachside hotels. Again, as with the litter, the problem must be cut off at source. I have written to the Commissioner with this suggestion. It is clear to me that tackling the problem at source is the way to do it.

I want to turn briefly to another issue, that is, the blasting and dust at the Reynella and Linwood quarries. A number of residents in the past summer—and I suppose during every summer prior to that—has had problems with blasting and dust. In brief, it seems that there is no solution to the problem of mining and residential development. They do not go hand in hand. But it seems that the problems associated with blasting and dust from vehicles moving around the quarry are not being handled as well as they might be handled by the existing legislation.

Either we need to tighten the Mines and Works Inspection Act or we need to enforce it a bit more regularly and strictly, because those residents with their ceilings full of dust and with minor damage to their buildings in some cases from blasting have a legitimate complaint. It seems to me that the legislation should be tightened up and the miners themselves should be a bit more responsible about the way in which they blast.

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 August at 11 a.m.