HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 October 1989

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

NURSING HOME STANDARDS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House deplores the lowering of standards in South Australian nursing homes as a result of deliberate polices set in place during 1988 by the Federal Government and which have seen a lowering of morale amongst service providers, a lack of flexibility in staffing and funding and a diminishing of standards in the provision of quality care for the aged.

When I drafted this motion some weeks ago—and I notice that a similar motion is being debated in another place at the moment—I had several concerns as to what the Hawke Government was doing in relation to the standards of nursing home care in South Australia. These concerns have been building up since 1986 and reached a peak in the middle of 1988. My concerns are numerous and I will run through them initially in summary form.

My first concern is the rationale and philosophy behind the Federal Government's plan to introduce its 60/40 formula—which was to provide 60 hostel places and 40 nursing home places for every 1 000 frail aged persons in the community—and whether the Labor Party will ever meet these bed shortages in both hostels and nursing homes. My second concern is the way Bob Hawke turned a blind eye to the high standards of nursing home care that we enjoy in South Australia.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, would you mind explaining to the member for Bright that he is out of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bright is clearly out of order. I just realised what it was the honourable member for Murray-Mallee was trying to draw to my attention. I remind all members that they cannot conduct conversations across the barrier into the Speaker's gallery.

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it proper for you to take a point of order from a member who is out of his seat?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair was under the impression that the member for Murray-Mallee was in his place at the time.

Mr Lewis: As I understand it, Mr Speaker, this is my place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold a point of order involving a member being a few centimetres to the right of where he normally sits. The honourable member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD: As this is an extremely important point in my speech, I will return to my second area of concern. It is of historical significance in South Australia that prior to 1986 we had a particularly good nursing home care system that was one of the best in the country. In fact, Victoria and South Australia prided themselves in having the best nursing home care in the Commonwealth but, since 1986, that situation has changed. It changed by a policy decree set in place by the Federal Government which brought South Australian nursing homes back to the standards which prevailed interstate. That is of great concern to everyone associated with the nursing home industry and potentially everyone who has loved ones who at some time or other will need to enter a nursing home.

My third area of concern is the failure of the Bannon State Government last financial year to match the $2.1 million available in Commonwealth funding under the HACC program, which includes the annual growth component. That was a disaster for those people being cared for in their own homes, and I will come to that point later. Fourthly, and flowing on from my third area of concern of the deplorable situation of the Bannon Government's depriving the frail aged of additional funding services, it did nothing about picking up the category 4 and 5 residents who could not get into nursing homes but were not sick enough to go to hostels, and I will refer to that shortly.

Fifthly, there is the obvious concern being expressed by nursing homes themselves about the difficulty experienced in providing the quality of life that we have come to expect for our frail aged here in South Australia, especially since 1 July 1988 when the Hawke Government progressively reduced the funding and the hours spent by nursing homes in respect of 'staff caring'. This followed the introduction of dependency categories, whereby all nursing home residents attract a set 'nursing hour' figure according to their dependency.

Sixthly, it has become obvious that the Hawke Government's application of the principle of equity of care in South Australian nursing homes meant that the frail aged in South Australia and Victoria would be seriously disadvantaged. In other words, South Australia would be relegated to the lowest Australian standard, to the lowest common denominator. After years and years in this State of building up nursing home standards, we were then struck back to the lowest common denominator. Australia wide this meant that, whereas South Australia had enjoyed average nursing home hours of about 22 hours per week, we were expected to drop back to the Australian figure of 17.12 hours.

The higher State figures had been set by State Government regulation in 1984 as part of an enormous amount of work done by the then Liberal Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Cashmore) and later by the Government's Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall). What happened? The Prime Minister stepped in and in one policy swoop—with little objection from the State Government—did away with that. He did away with that standard completely and South Australia has to revert to the national common denominator, instead of the Commowealth being brought up to the South Australian and Victorian standard.

If the Commonwealth was genuinely concerned about the aged, it would have done that. The House will recall that that era in our State's history was when grey power and the aged movement started to flex their muscles and show their concern. We had seen a lack of interest in the aged in the area of nursing home care, and then leading on from that a general lack of interest in the aged in all areas of Government administration but, suddenly, the aged became the flavour of the month as the Government tried to counter the grey power movement. It is patently obvious to anyone who follows these events that in the late 1980s the Government turned a blind eye to the aged, and it is only in latter months that it has done anything about this area.

My seventh area of concern is the impact of Care Aggregate Modules (CAM) and Standard Aggregate Modules (SAM), which determine the payment levels to nursing homes for their services. Let me explain. The Residential Classification Instrument (RCI) determines each resident's category based on their dependency, and the amount of hours that the home will receive to nurse them. The CAM and SAM levels determine the actual money provided in respect of these services.

It is a complex formula. It has depersonalised the care of the aged in these institutions. The RCI has caused nursing homes to experience great difficulty in achieving standards. Every nursing home manages to achieve standards, but they are not helped by the RCI, which is a guide for assessing the ability of a resident to perform various functions. Its use is important in distinguishing between a person who is a resident through frail age and someone who is a stroke victim. It assesses a resident's capacity to perform various functions. The assessment is carried out by a panel immediately after admission, and a category is assigned between one and five, depending on the services that the patient needs.

There are five categories: category 1 is the highest level of dependency and category 5 is the lowest level. Category 1 involves 27 hours of care a week and category 5 involves 10 hours of care a week. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a small table of a purely statistical nature that lists the hours of care per week for each category.

Leave granted.

Hours per week day and per week of nursing and personal care deemed appropriate for each category

RCI	Hrs per Day	Hrs per Week
Category 5	3.86	10
4	3.86	13
3	2.86	20
2	1.86	23.5
1	1.43	27

Mr OSWALD: In the past, funding was determined by the total number of residents in the home. However, under the new funding arrangements, each individual is actually assessed. It is obvious that the nursing home will opt for those patients who require a greater number of hours of care. Indeed, the result is that category 4 and 5 patients, involving the lower level of hours of care per week, have not been able to get into nursing homes and have had to opt for hostel accommodation. Thus a class of frail aged persons who are not sick enough or dependent enough to gain admission to a nursing home can also not get into a hostel because they are too sick or too frail. The Federal Government's net is not picking up the category 4 and 5 patients; they are living in their own home. This is of great concern to everyone involved in this area.

Let us consider the hypothetical situation of a nursing home with a mix of patients between category 1 and category 4 and with the average nursing hour figure of, say, 20 hours—that is, there would be several category 4 patients but mainly category 3 and category 2 patients. Whilst that level of care may be all right for low dependency residents—indeed, some of them may not need 20 hours of care—nursing homes are filling up with category 1 and category 2 patients and, to a lesser extent, category 3 patients, who, in fact, require more than the 27 hours of care allocated to the nursing home. Indeed, some residents need almost continuous care, in some cases up to 40 hours a week. Nursing homes are not getting allocations, therefore staff are not available to provide the additional service and we are witnessing a strong move towards making nursing homes take more dependent residents but not paying the homes for the hours needed to look after those people. One does not have to use much imagination to understand the problems of administrators of nursing homes when they have to work under those conditions.

This raises the question of what is expected of hostels in relation to these category 4 and category 5 applicants who wish to become residents. Generally, hostels are not structured or resourced to cope with high to moderately dependent patients, for example, those with dementia, advanced stages of incontinence and so on. We are already hearing of hostel managers who are reluctant to take in category 4 and category 5 patients, first, because they are not geared to nurse these people and, secondly, because of the funding implications. Not only are the homes not set up for these residents but the level of funding makes it almost impossible to gain their cooperation. I have been provided with some interesting figures: for a category 4 person in a nursing home in South Australia, the fee recovery on a daily basis is $24.50 for the CAM module and $29.07 for the SAM module. Whereas, in a hostel, the fee recovery is only $14.35 for personal care, plus a mere $2.25 for the subsidy for administration costs. This totals $16.60.

In relation to the subsidy for a person who is in a nursing home, if a person goes into a hostel they receive only one-third of what they would attract in a nursing home. Where do these people go? The nursing homes cannot take them because they are being encouraged to take high dependency patients. The hostels cannot or will not take them, because they are not geared up medically to look after them, and the funding is not there for them. So, we have a situation where people end up in private homes being looked after by their family as best they can, perhaps involving an aged relative, be it a husband or wife, or whoever. The Bannon Government would not match the Commonwealth HACC funding, which funding meant that these people at least had some means to survive in their homes. This is not my idea of a compassionate Government here in this State.

Earlier I expressed my concern about the failure of the Government to match the HACC funding from the Commonwealth. It is a very real problem. This involves people for whom I have a great concern. Members on both sides of the House to whom I have spoken about this share this concern. However, members do not seem to be able to get through to Cabinet here or to the Federal Government that those people in categories 4 and 5, whom we must be looking to protect, are not being picked up by the net. We have a responsibility at State level, when we pick up the provision of services, to see that HACC funding does do something about providing some support for these unfortunate residents.

I shall conclude by summarising very briefly some other concerns that I have in this area of care for the frail aged. These are all relevant to my motion. First, there exists a 28-day leave provision. Members are probably familiar with this provision. What happens is that residents are reluctant to actually take up this leave provision, where they can leave the nursing home for up to 28 days, and this is because they think they might need that time for a hospital visit. I will explain that further.

If leave taken by a resident exceeds 28 days, their nursing home bed is no longer available to them. Ordinarily, a person can go out to hospital for a week and know that their nursing home bed will be there when they return, or they can go out to relatives for a few days at a time over the course of a year, knowing that their bed will still be there. However, immediately the 28 days is up, they no longer have a bed. As a consequence, people stay in these nursing homes. They do not go out to their relatives because they are frightened that if they ever get sick and have to go into hospital for three or four weeks, and their leave exceeds 28 days, they will not be able to go back to the nursing home. This is pretty traumatic for anyone who has been away from the nursing home for a week, say, knowing that there are only 21 days left and that if the time for leave is

exceeded they will not have a nursing home bed to go back to. This constraint should be removed immediately.

In dealing with the frail aged of ethnic, non-English speaking background, it is necessary on many occasions for staff—nurses and administrators—to spend a considerable time with residents and also with relatives, counselling and talking through any problems that there might be. This takes additional time. Yet, the situation is that they are locked into this Commonwealth Government decree of allocating, on average, only 17.12 hours per week for the average patient and, as I said initially, that varies, with between 10 and 27 hours available to spend with a patient or a resident. It just does not work, when the staff have to put in this additional time.

The third area concerns hospice care. Each nursing home provides some sort of hospice care, and it takes an enormous amount of time with the patients. Medically, they may have to be turned regularly and treatment must be given to them. An enormous amount of time has to be spent with them and also quite a bit of time has to be spent counselling the next of kin. Once again, the staff are locked into these quite ridiculous hours, which do not allow for any additional services to be provided in the nursing home.

Fourthly, the funding formulae do not properly take into account any rehabilitation. Both the State and Commonwealth Governments have very high standards in the rehabilitation area. They are time consuming standards. Once again, when applied to patients in nursing homes the time is not allocated to implement these standards and therefore they start to drop.

My fifth point is that there is also some concern about the 90 day residents. These residents can be readmitted after being out of the nursing home for 90 days, and they are reclassified. However, if one is a permanent resident in a nursing home and one is, say, classification four and over the course of a year one slowly deteriorates, one should be made a classification three. However, what acutally happens is that one cannot be reclassified for 12 months. So, although the nursing home builds up the number of hours it spends on a particular patient, it cannot go back to the Commonwealth and arrange for any additional funding.

My sixth point is that these vacant bed days and the time between the patient leaving or passing on from this world and the next patient coming in is such that nursing homes are viturally forced into putting a new patient in a bed within hours of the previous resident passing away. That is a most traumatic experience, particularly for staff. If, for example, a lady has been in a nursing home for five years, she knows the staff and has developed almost a family relationship with them; that room belongs to Mrs X and everyone knows it is her room. However, the situation is so mercenary at the moment that, if that lady passes away at 8 a.m., by 8 p.m. there is enormous pressure on the nursing home to have the bed filled by 8 a.m. the following morning. The nursing home rings around to relatives asking, 'Is mum ready? We have now got a bed.' Every nursing home administrator to whom I have spoken has said that there should be at least a couple of days grace where that nursing home can pick up a bed subsidy to allow for a reasonable changeover period and to allow the nursing home staff to adjust to the fact that someone has died and moved on.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And to allow the family of the deceased to come and collect their belongings in a decent time.

Mr OSWALD: As the Member for Coles points out, this would allow the family of the deceased to come and collect their belongings. It is not unreasonable for a Government to insert something such as this. The resident classification instrument—RCI—for a person with full dementia demonstrates the need for an urgent review of the philosophy behind the Labor Government's plans for care for the aged. I have demonstrated that there are problems out there in the area of care for the aged. Plenty of articles have appeared in the newspapers: I have dozens in my possession but I will refer only to two. I do not want this to be my speech night, as others in this industry have even more detailed knowledge than I. Under the heading, 'Cutbacks hit aged homes', the *News* of 16 March this year states:

> South Australian nursing home patients are suffering due to Federal Government funding cutbacks, according to administrators. And some privately-owned homes could close under pressure. Staff have been cut to less than 18 hours of care per patient per week. Resthaven Homes administrator, Mr Kelvin Dickens, said homes had to choose between services, which was making patients more dependent and lowering the quality of living. The Voluntary Care Association National President, Rev. George Martin, said the national schedule of hours was difficult to assess, because funding assessments ranged from 10 hours a week for a mobile patient to 27 hours for a totally dependent person.
>
> The final figure allowed to each nursing home was taken on a State average, which meant that the elderly in South Australia now get less care, and dependency rises as support service[s], that maintain mobility, are removed. South Australia now has 3 351 nursing home beds in voluntary or non-profit organisations, 3 249 in privately run homes and 5 410 in hostel-bed accommodation. Mr Martin said patients were still getting basic care in most homes, but extra services contributed to the quality of life for patients, and the support had been seriously eroded by Government cutbacks. One nursing home worker said patients who fell during the night were not found until morning. He said Mr Dickens was brave to speak out because the Prime Minister Mr Hawke's father was in a Resthaven Centre. 'However, Mr Hawke senior is mobile and unlikely to see effects of staff cutbacks just yet,' he said.

Three or four months ago, under the headline, 'Not enough funding to care for our patients, say the nursing homes', the Mitcham Messenger newspaper—or another local newspaper—contained an article that stated:

> Federal funding arrangements are depriving nursing home patients of adequate care, say local nursing homes.
>
> Mitcham Private Nursing Home Director, Lois Wear, said although a new system of categorising all residents had been operating since July last year the effect on nursing and personal care standards was only now being felt.
>
> Mrs Wear said the amount of time allocated to each patient was unrealistic and insufficient. This has put undue stress on staff and patients . . . Mrs Wear said she had been forced to cut more than 11 hours from the weekly staff roster since the new system was introduced.
>
> 'You can't take that many hours away without it having a drastic effect on our standards of care,' she said.
>
> 'Every time I get a new resident and they are categorised by the Government, my staffing hours drop further. We have one stroke patient who can't do anything for herself. She's totally dependent on us to dress her, cut her food—she can't go to the toilet herself, she can't walk by herself. She came out needing only 2.88 hours a day when she should be having at least four hours,' she said.

We have a major problem in nursing homes. The Federal and State Governments have an obligation to review the whole administrative and funding procedures, and certainly we should be looking to return to South Australia those standards that existed in years gone by.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That this House urges the Government to place both the construction of the proposed facilities for an entertainment centre and its recurrent administrative functions in the hands of a non-

government agency or agencies in order to avoid the unfortunate consequences of cost overruns and blowouts in the construction phase and the unnecessary risk of administrative cost escalation becoming a burden to the taxpayers of South Australia.

We learn from Premier Bannon and other members of his ALP Government that we will not get the entertainment centre in South Australia unless the Government builds it and owns it. By that I presume that the Government means that it will run it. That means that it is prepared to sign a blank cheque not only for construction costs but also for recurrent administrative costs. Whilst the Government has indicated that it is willing to retreat from the position of a blank cheque for running the entertainment centre, it is clear from past examples in recent times that it is prepared to squander taxpayers' money on the construction phase.

This willingness on the part of the Bannon ALP Government to constantly allow cost overruns and blowouts to occur clearly illustrates the big difference—the basic difference—between me and my colleagues in the Liberal Party—indeed the future Olsen Liberal Government—and the Bannon ALP Government. We in the Liberal Party are responsible and experienced and have demonstrated our understanding of the need to apply these qualities to our future administration of government. This is why these underlying features appear in all our policies. This is in stark contrast to the Bannon ALP Government, which not only cannot manage Government involvement in business ventures in which it should not be involved but which also has shown that it is not a responsible administrator that can be trusted with taxpayers' money.

The Bannon ALP Government has constantly trotted out publicity about a clutch of big ticket items, talking them up as though they are an essential part of the strategy to build up South Australia's economy when in fact that is not so. Not only are they irrelevant to the strength of the South Australian economy but also they are counter-productive in that they are destructive of investor confidence when those investors see the profligate way in which the Government squanders money it has taken from those investors—from their enterprises and their businesses—as well as from individual citizens in the rake-off in which it has been involved. The Government has not known, Mr Acting Speaker, where to draw the line or how to hold the line if it ever attempted to draw it in the first place. It has made a botch of our involvement in the 12 metre yacht race and wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars on that.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Not only that; I dare say, in my judgment, it ought never to have been undertaken (as a Government enterprise) by the Government on its own. I can think of a no more stupid way of spending taxpayers' money. In addition, I will provide to the House a list of enterprises in which the Government has been involved since 1988 that illustrates the basic point I am putting to the House.

There has been the introduction of a Crouzet ticketing system which was supposed to cost less than $5 million. That has an actual cost now of over $11 million, a $6 million difference. There has been the construction of the *Island Seaway*, that disastrous floating supermarket trolley with twisted wheels and an inability to direct itself. The original cost was $10 million in 1985. The Government built it and it is at least $21 million, and it still did not get it right. It still had to go back and modify it and spend more millions on it. I have not had a close look at those modifications so I am unable to say whether or not they will be effective and successful. However, there is an $11 million increase involved in the ultimate cost compared to the original stated cost.

The Government then introduced a new computer system. This Government knows as much about computers as the Minister for Housing and Construction—nix. The consequential outlay was $11 million where it was supposed to have been about $4.5 million. That is another $6.5 million. The Government does not know who to go to to get advice and when it gets that advice more often than not it ignores it unless that advice suits its political ends.

A caravan park was sold by the Storemen and Packers in my electorate. That cost the taxpayers over $200 000. There is the Engineering and Water Supply Department spending $152 000 on providing tea and coffee to its staff. They are the kinds of enterprises in which the Government ought not to be involved. There was the collapse of the contract with the Ethiopian Government to help alleviate the effects of drought in Ethiopia. It cost the Services and Supply Department $5.7 million. The Government subsidy on the ASER project, a blank cheque, was supposed to be $1.25 million in the original estimate in 1983, and we now know it is $4.34 million in 1988 and we know it will be in excess of $3 million a year from then on.

That illustrates the point I am making. The Government does not know where to draw the line and if it does draw the line it does not know how to hold the line in the final analysis, anyway. There is the failure to implement the promised cuts in employment of public servants in administrative and executive officer classifications. The Government does not know where to draw the line and hold the line when it gets there. That has cost $4 million a year.

The payment of rent for vacant teacher houses wastes over $360 000 a year. Then there is the conversion of toilets undertaken in Parliament House. The original estimate, we were told by the then President, was to have been about $80 000, but it ended up costing over $210 000—another $130 000 literally down the tube, flushed away. There was the introduction of the central sterilisation system at the Royal Adelaide Hospital which surgeons said was unnecessary and which cost $1.1 million. There has been the blow-out, to which I refer in my motion, in costs of fitting out new Health Commission offices in the CitiCentre building of $1 million.

In 1989 we saw the implementation of the Justice Information System (that is, a computing system) which was supposed to have cost $21 million, but the time we get to the current day we find it has cost over $75 million. One does not have to be an arithmetical genius to work out that that is an over-run of $54 million. That is a big ticket item if ever there was one. There has been the failure to control sick leave abuses in the public sector—the Government does not know where to draw the line and, when it draws the line, it cannot hold the line—which cost $10 million a year. There has been the provision of $10 million for loss on investment in the New Zealand timber mill; and a blow-out in the cost of the scrimber project which was originally estimated at $12 million and is currently estimated at $34 million and is still rising. So, the South Australian Timber Corporation's share is over $10.5 million.

I can go on, but will not. I do not want to detain the House unnecessarily. I have illustrated that there is no department, no Minister running a department and, indeed, no part of the Government, that I can see, that understands what responsibility means. No Minister has any experience of risking their own finances, whatever they have earned by the sweat of their own brow, to continue earning their living. They have ignored those kinds of responsibilities that underline the difference between the Liberal Party and the next Liberal Government led by Mr Olsen and the current Labor Government led by the Hon. John Bannon.

This Government has made a mess of Marineland and has cost the State taxpayers over $6 million in the process—and this could have been avoided quite easily. What is more, the Liberal Party has responsibly supported proposals that were for the benefit of South Australia; there is no question about that. We have constantly warned the Government what it should do to avoid the pitfalls in these excursions into the big ticket item project developments; there is no doubt about that. The Liberal Party has also consistently tried to show the Government, through questioning and counselling Ministers, what steps they should otherwise take before committing taxpayers' money; but that is ignored.

At the same time we have sought information from Ministers about what they are doing, and that information has not been forthcoming. Instead, we simply get a bucketful of abuse, and mouthful after mouthful of contemptuous, supercilious, arrogant abuse as these Ministers attempt to discredit our genuine interest in our State of South Australia and our concern for the taxpayers. Also, while they are doing it, those Ministers attempt to shore up their own flagging public fortunes by abusing us, and then accuse us of being dishonest, trying to get the public to believe that politics is our interest in raising those questions.

How ridiculous and how stupid! What we are really trying to do is to get the Government to understand that it must be more responsible in the way in which it applies other people's money and that is what this motion is about. The Government must try to avoid the unfortunate consequences of providing a blank cheque to this project and to its future administrators.

Let us take a look at the record as it stands in the public domain in relation to statements on what this entertainment centre will cost. In 1985, prior to the last election, we were told that the cost was to be about $40 million. Then, in September 1986, it had climbed to something over $60 million (this is a capital cost, not the recurrent administrative expense which I will leave aside for the time). Then in December 1988 the Premier found that it was to cost only $25 million, and that is a fairly substantial drop in anyone's language.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I do not know what entertainment would go on down there, but $25 million would provide a lot of bull but not much fight. In January 1989, two months later, we were told that it was re-estimated at $35 million. In February 1989, when we were told there had been no advance, no change and no increase, the bid was at $40.7 million. However, we will all wait and see. In fact, I doubt that we will have to, because in a very short time the Liberal Party will be in office and the ultimate cost will be pegged. It will not be allowed to blow out in the fashion that the Government seems inclined to allow all these projects to blow out.

When we analyse the figures, we find ourselves in a situation where the record of the Government is parlous and its reputation is in a sorry state. It is a great pity that that is so, because in 1982 and again in 1985 the Premier promised us such a bright future; that was our future then, which means now—the present—and we do not have any of the things that were promised. Therefore, the Government cannot be trusted to deliver on its promises; not only does it break specific commitments and promises but also it cannot deliver the kind of economic future it has portrayed to the public of South Australia. That is largely as a consequence of its incompetence, its unwillingness to be responsible, to accept good advice and—whenever we try to assist—to share information to make consensus decisions that will be in the best interests of the future of all South Australians.

We are seven years from the beginning of what—according to the Premier and members of the Government—promised to be such a bright future, but I do not see anything bright about that future at this time. Indeed, we see the Government, under the Premier's leadership, thrashing around trying to find some big ticket items to talk up and promote the notion that in the 1990s things will be different from what they have been under Labor in the 1980s, yet the same strategies are there for dealing with public administrative responsibility as demonstrated by the Government's policies and attitudes in relation to the entertainment centre. Therefore, the same strategies are likely to produce the same dismal result in the 1990s if we in South Australia allow the ALP Government to continue to govern us during that decade. There is no question about it: the proposed entertainment centre—a facility which the Liberal Party strongly supports in principle—should not be another folly.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I have never denied that, and no-one on the Opposition side has said that we are opposed to the entertainment centre. Just because we have said it and no-one has reported it does not mean that we do not commit ourselves to it. The proposed entertainment centre under a Liberal Administration would indeed be an entertainment centre built jointly, in this instance with the Basketball Association. That would save the taxpayers of South Australia $20 million—$20 million that could be well applied to those other areas that desperately need funds which the Premier continually tells me and other members of the Opposition he cannot afford to provide.

In the electorate I represent, we have roads coming to pieces: there are potholes in major arterial roads between Murray Bridge and Karoonda—potholes six inches deep, four feet long and three feet wide—and the Premier says that he cannot afford to fix them. Someone will die on the road first; tyres are shredded on it regularly, and why on earth the Government cannot take the useful advice we are offering it in that regard is beyond me. As a State, we should limit our exposure to risk by limiting the amount that we will commit to the entertainment centre and place both its construction and ultimate administration in the hands of non-government agencies. Only by that means will we see the money applied wisely to that purpose. It will not be wasted. The entertainment centre must not become another fiasco in which there are cost overruns and blowouts in its construction.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Like the swimming centre.

Mr LEWIS: Like the swimming centre: that is yet another example. If we are serious about this, the Government should join me and others on this side of the House in committing ourselves to this form of project. Every time the Minister of Housing and Construction, on behalf of the Government, gets involved in one of these ill-advised projects, the Opposition warns the Minister of the likely consequences, but that advice is ignored and we end up spending a lot more money than we need to spend. Just for once cannot the Minister and the Government accept the advice, through my pleadings, and allow the construction of this facility to be undertaken by someone other than the Government with the bottom line drawn on the Government's commitment and then hold the line? I ask the Government not to cave in to the Building Workers Industrial Union, the contractors or anyone else resulting in the sum committed by the Government being increased. The Govern-

ment should stick to what it says. We should not allow a repetition of the exhibition—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I remind the Minister that I am a positive person. I am trying to ensure that the Premier can find the money necessary to retain essential services in electorates like mine. Cuts are being made in our police staff and in our schools. The Government is reducing the numbers of schools in electorates and the range of curriculum options, quite against the public statements made by the Minister of Education and/or his Director (when the Minister grabs him by the back of the neck, stands him up, and says, 'You say this because it is unpopular'). All Ministers demand that their departmental heads make all the unpopular statements and give all the bad news. When they have something which they think will win favourable publicity and kudos for the Government, of course, those Ministers personally announce it. More often than not it is one of these big ticket projects, which cost a lot of money, and they end up not only spending that money but a great deal more as well. Then the Premier comes back, in answer to our pleadings, and says, 'We don't have the money to do all the things that the bleating members of the Opposition suggest should be done.' That is terribly unfortunate. We should not allow circumstances to arise in which we see a waste of money on this entertainment centre, like other projects.

Mr Rann: It's a waste of money now: is that the view of the Leader of the Opposition as well?

Mr LEWIS: It is the view of this member of the Opposition. If only the member for—

The Hon. H. Allison: The fabricator.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, the fabricator.

An honourable member: The nuclear fabricator.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to other members by their electorate name.

Mr LEWIS: I apologise if I have caused offence, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Briggs well knows that what I am saying is correct. If he had been in the Chamber when I gave members the benefit—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: If he had been here he would understand and know that what I have said is correct. I urge the House to support this proposition. Let us say that we all care and that we will not allow a repetition of past mistakes that we have seen. It will not hurt the Government. I am quite sure that all arms of the media, be it electronic, radio, television or print, will provide the Government with very favourable publicity if it lets the construction and the administration to a non-government agency, so that the entertainment centre does not end up sucking out of the Treasury the money which has been obtained from hard bitten taxpayers in South Australia and squandering it through the incompetence of the Government in its administration of such projects. Let us not expose ourselves to that risk again.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN POPULATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House deplores the declining population share in South Australia compared to other Australian States, which indicates the stagnation which has occurred during the life of this Government.

We well recall the crocodile tears shed by the now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, prior to the 1982 election when he said that the great tragedy which had befallen this State was the fact that we were losing our greatest resource—our people. Of course, it was all doom and gloom. We well remember the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) and his Deputy Leader (Mr Wright) day in and day out in this place painting a picture of unmitigated doom and gloom: the State was on the rocks and there was not a glimmer of light anywhere.

Mr Rann: And you lost.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, the member for Briggs, who is well known as the 'Fabricator' and the veracity of whose statements even his own colleagues doubt, as we well know—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I would take a point of order on that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You take your point of order, but we all know that the honourable member had his white car picked out. He was proclaiming that he was the new Minister-elect. He had even interviewed the drivers of the white cars to see who was suitable. However, to the eternal credit of the Labor Party it had the good sense not to elect the Fabricator.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to return to the motion before the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly. I was most disappointed, Sir, that you did not make the grade. Mr Deputy Speaker, you did not make the grade, but at least members opposite had the good sense not to elect the Fabricator! Let him chip in as much as he likes during my remarks: I will take him on any day of the week on any matter before this House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding the flattering remarks to the Chair, the Chair asks the Deputy Leader to come back to the motion before the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will come back to the motion but, of course, we know that the Fabricator was very busy even back in 1982, the year to which I refer. I just hope that one day he may see fit to climb out of the gutter and, if he does, he may receive the accolade of his colleagues. In deference to the Chair, I must return to the resolution. I should like to pursue at length the personal attributes of the member for Briggs, but I am not allowed to.

The fact is that we had these crocodile tears from the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) about our declining population. What has happened since his election to Government? From a position where South Australia was gaining in population share during the life of the Playford Administration, particularly, we now have a sorry history of steady decline in terms of an Australia-wide comparison. In fact, South Australia's population has been growing more slowly than that other States or Territories for most of the time that the Labor Party has been in office in this State, which has been for the majority of the past 20 years. I refer to a table that demonstrates this fact quite clearly. It shows that over the 10 years from 1972 to 1982, South Australia's population grew at an average annual rate of 9.6 per cent compared to 14.1 per cent for Australia as a whole, so the rot really set in during the life of the Dunstan Government.

Table 1 shows the estimated resident population in South Australia and Australia from 1971 to 1988. During the June quarter in 1971, when this census was taken, South Australia's population was 1.2 million. At that time, Australia's population was 13.06 million, and South Australia had 9.2 per cent of the total population. In 1972, after the first year of the Dunstan Administration, it had declined to 9.1 per cent. By 1982, it had declined even further to 8.8 per cent

and in 1988 it was 8.5 per cent of Australia's population. I have left out much of the detail of this table which shows the actual population figures from 1971 to 1988, with some indicating the percentage of the Australian total. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in *Hansard.*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member give the usual assurance that it is purely statistical?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Can the Deputy Leader inform the House of the source of that information?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not sure that anyone needs to reveal the source when seeking leave to incorporate statistical informtion.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Estimated resident population, South Australia and Australia, 1971-88

Estimated resident population, June quarter	South Aust. ('000)	Aust. ('000)	S.A. as % Aust.
1971	1 200.1	13 067.3	9.2
1972	1 214.6	13 303.7	9.1
1973	1 228.5	13 504.5	
1974	1 241.5	13 722.6	
1975	1 265.3	13 893.0	
1976	1 274.1	14 033.1	
1977	1 286.1	14 192.2	
1978	1 296.2	14 359.3	
1979	1 301.1	14 515.7	
1980	1 308.4	14 695.4	
1981	1 318.8	14 923.3	
1982	1 331.1	15 184.2	8.8
1983	1 345.8	15 393.5	
1984	1 360.0	15 579.4	
1985	1 371.2	15 788.3	
1986	1 382.6	16 018.4	
1987	1 394.2	16 263.3	
1988 (preliminary)	1 408.0(p)	16 531.9(p)	8.5

Source: ABS 1 311.0 Time Series Service (microfiche)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me assure the Minister that the source is the ABS, so I did not dream up the figures. If it had been the Fabricator, they would have been dreamed up. The Minister knows that I would not quote figures that are a figment of my imagination, although I would not share that confidence if it was the member who just left the Chamber. We know what he has done to reports in the past, when he has doctored them and torn out pages to give a false impression. I assure the Minister that the figures are correct.

The resident population increase for Australia was 14.1 per cent over the 10 years from 1972 to 1982, whereas South Australia's increase was 9.6 per cent. For the six-year period from 1982 to 1988, the increase in resident population in South Australia was 5.8 per cent against a national average of 8.9 per cent. So, if the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition in 1982, was weeping crocodile tears about our declining population, he should be running out of handkerchiefs as he weeps copious tears at the decline—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —which has accelerated during his regime and, as my colleague interposes, likewise with interest rates. In 1982 the then Leader of the Opposition was weeping copious tears about the fact that interest rates were about 12 per cent—now they are up to 17 per cent and look like moving to 18 per cent.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: He doesn't want to know about it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, he does not want to know about it, and he is also Federal boss of the Labor Party where he should be in a position to have some influence. The result of South Australia's slower population growth is that our State's population is making up a progressively smaller percentage of the total Australian population. For example, in 1972 South Australia made up 9.1 per cent of the Australian population; by 1982 it was only 8.8 per cent; and in 1988 it declined to 8.5 per cent.

Regarding population increases due to births and inward migration from interstate or overseas and declines due to deaths and outward migration, again, interstate or overseas, on almost all of these counts South Australia has consistently shown lower growth than other States or Territories. I have a summary of what has occurred. First, as to natural increase, South Australia has had the lowest total fertility rate in Australia, apart from the ACT, and the crude death rate is higher than the Australian average. The result is that our population is reproducing itself more slowly than the population in any other State or Territory.

In 1988 our population increased by about .6 per cent through natural increase compared with .8 per cent for Australia as a whole. I would suggest that these figures are a reflection of the fact that the average South Australian is poorer than his interstate counterpart. The budget papers indicated that clearly. Average weekly income in South Australia has grown more slowly in this State than elsewhere. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WELFARE CUTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House calls on the Leader of the Opposition to clarify his attitude to the welfare cuts proposed by his Federal coalition colleagues.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 999.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I appreciate the opportunity provided by the member for Bright for me to clarify a number of areas relating to the Federal Coalition's attitude towards welfare and community services. I will say more about the contribution of the member for Bright later. I want to clarify the situation and use this opportunity to be positive about the Coalition's excellent stance and the policies that have been brought down on community services, the retired incomes policy and many other policies. In passing, I might add that I thought the member for Bright's contribution in this debate was appalling, and I will refer to some of those issues later.

In a positive vein, I want to refer to some of the policies of the Federal Coalition, which believes the primary responsibility for welfare and personal security lies with the individual and his or her family. However, the Coalition is committed to providing assistance to all people in the community who need it. Labor's centralised and interventionist approach to the provision of health has taken community care and concern out of community service programs. On the other hand, a Liberal-National Government will emphasise community involvement. It recognises the essential role of professional agencies and professional helpers. The Coalition is committed to encouraging and promoting the role of voluntary, community, charitable and church organisations in the provision of care.

Let us now consider disability services. I will give a brief summary and, if I have the opportunity, I will refer to these matters at length later. As far as disability services are concerned, the Federal Coalition is dedicated to helping people with disabilities to achieve their full potential and to exercise maximum control of and independence in their life. A Liberal-National Government will continue the Disability Services Act but, unlike the Labor Government, it

will adopt a flexible approach to its implementation. The Coalition's administration will be decentralised and will consider the views and needs of individuals, their families and care providers. I will support that all the way.

The provision of aged care is a major challenge facing Australian Governments. Again, the Federal Labor Government is failing totally to meet that challenge. Labor's aged care policy is causing concern and trauma within the aged community. One only has to talk to those involved in institutions and to those dealing with the aged to realise that that concern exists. On the other hand, the Federal Coalition recognises that the varied, changing and growing need for care and accommodation for the aged requires a more flexible and diverse system in addition to an improved system of assessment. A Liberal-National Government will provide aged care based on three types of accommodation: living at home or with family; hostel accommodation with access to care; and nursing home accommodation. In Government, the Coalition will review the basis upon which the standard aggregated module and the care aggregated module have been implemented and will review the resource needs of residents, the basis of industry regulation and the protection of residents' interests.

The Liberal-National Government will review the Home and Community Care Program to define clearly its national objectives, to provide specific guidelines and to review administrative links between Commonwealth, State and local government and program delivery agencies, and it will act on the Auditor-General's Report. The Coalition is totally committed to providing access to quality child-care. The Liberal and National Parties will encourage the provision of child-care by the private sector. They will further recognise the need for a range of child-care options. The Coalition Government will continue to provide assistance to enable low income families and individuals access to child-care. Financial assistance will be targeted on a needs basis. Funding will be to the child and to its family, not to the child-care centre. Again, I strongly support that policy.

Let us now look at the subject generally. A Coalition Government will aim to provide assistance through the community services program to Australians who, for various reasons, often physical, are not able to participate fully in or to manage alone with the demands of our society. The Liberal and National Parties believe that the primary responsibility for welfare and personal security lies with the individual and his or her family: it is not a function of government alone. They acknowledge and are committed to providing assistance to those in our community who, for various reasons, including physical limitations, are unable to manage alone. Effective assistance programs must be flexible and responsive. I do not believe that anyone would disagree with that. At present, many community service programs are rigid, bureaucratic and poorly targeted.

The Liberal and National Parties will review the aims, scope and administrative procedures of all programs, in consultation with care providers. The aim of the Coalition will be to provide targeting of assistance, cost-effectiveness administrative flexibility, programs responsive to individual needs, and closer integration and consistency with assistance available through the social security system. To achieve these goals, in government the Coalition will consider the views of program participants, their families, care providers and representative organisations in the program development review and administration.

The Coalition will ensure that programs help people to help themselves and will support and encourage the work of charitable, voluntary and private organisations. It will encourage and strongly emphasise the involvement of non-government organisations in the delivery of personalised quality care and administration of programs. The Coalition will encourage general community involvement in both physical and financial terms, and will work through families, local communities and voluntary organisations whenever and wherever possible.

Through close consultation and evaluation in the development of programs, the Coalition will ensure that optimum resource use and cost-effectiveness is the underlying base of all programs. Regional committees will be established to ensure that programs are directed to the specific needs of the area. They will emphasise flexibility in the range of assistance provided and organisational structures available. The Coalition will limit Government involvement to defining program goals and assessing the effectiveness of those programs. It is not the role of Government to dictate, in detail, administrative procedures. Again, I hope that all members of this House would concur in that.

Let us look at the matter of care and support for people with disabilities. The Liberal and National Parties acknowledge that disability does not lessen the right or the desire of people to participate in our society and, in particular, to enjoy the opportunities that are offered. The Coalition is concerned that people with disabilities are often isolated from society, frequently by programs and those who seek to provide help. The aim of the Liberal and National Parties is to provide greater access and more effective integration with the community at large.

However, it is recognised that there is a need for flexibility in this objective to allow the views of the individual, his or her family and care providers to be considered. Although the Liberal and National Parties support the principles and objectives of the Disability Services Act, they share the concerns of many care providers over its implementation. Certainly, those concerns, as I said earlier, have been brought to my attention as a member of State Parliament. I am sure that they have also been brought to the attention of many of my colleagues, certainly on this side of the House.

What of the fulfilment of potential? The policies of the Liberal and National Parties aim to assist people with disabilities to achieve their full potential and to exercise maximum control and independence over their lives, to relieve the effects of disability and to provide continuing support to help manage the pressures and stresses of daily living. As I said earlier, the policies of the Liberal and National Parties cover education, training, placement, employment, social support, the home and work environment—and so I could go on.

What about the matter of independence and security? The Minister might be interested in what the policy will be in regard to independence and security, which is a very important area. In reviewing and developing programs, the Coalition will ensure that where possible appropriate services are provided within the mainstream community. In particular, the Coalition recognises the fundamental importance to those with disabilities of a place to live and paid employment, and of their being competent and self-reliant and participating in community activities, feeling secure and having choices and options in life and a positive self-image. Members opposite cannot argue with any of those points, nor in fact with any of the policies to which I have referred.

There are many other areas that I want to refer to. If the opportunity is provided I certainly want to amend the motion before the House. I intend to do that but at this stage I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ANTARCTICA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House strongly supports the principle of Antarctica becoming a World Heritage Wilderness Park and opposes the notion that Australia should become a signatory to the Antarctic Mining Convention; and further, this House supports the Federal Government proposal to negotiate a comprehensive environmental convention for Antarctica.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1007.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I had the opportunity to speak briefly on this motion previously, on the last opportunity we had to discuss private members' business, when I amended it so that the establishment of a park would come under the auspices of the Antarctic Treaty. In my last contribution I briefly referred to the fact that, on 2 May 1989, the Liberal and National Parties announced their decision to oppose Australia's becoming a signatory to the proposed convention on the regulation of Antarctic mineral resources. I made the point that to that date the convention had been enthusiastically supported by the Federal Labor Minister for the Environment and the Foreign Minister but, following the decision of the Coalition Parties, under pressure from vast numbers in the Australian community, the Labor Government some weeks later announced its own belated opposition to the signing of the convention.

There has been considerable division in the Labor Party over this matter and it is interesting to reflect on some of those divisions. For example, on 14 April 1986 the Science Minister, Mr Jones, opened the meeting of consultative parties in Hobart, where he expressed general support for the development of such a regime. On 2 June 1988 Mr Duffy, as Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and Minister Richardson issued a joint media release in which they welcomed 'the successful conclusion of negotiations for a convention to regulate any future minerals activity in the Antarctic'. On 21 September 1988, just a few months later, Treasurer Keating wrote to Foreign Affairs Minister Evans, stating:

I do not believe that Australia should sign the convention until we attempt further to negotiate provisions that better protect our national interests.

He further stated:

[The] signature would mean we would, in effect, concede our economic claims over Antarctica for virtually nothing, forfeiting our sovereignty over Antarctica and opening up the possibility of subsidised production competing with Australian mineral producers.

In his letter, the Federal Treasurer focused on the questions of subsidised mining and the inadequacy of environmental protection measures. He made the significant point that:

Serious contention may have been avoided in Antarctica for over 30 years, but I suspect that this is because the basic question of who benefits from resource exploitation in Antarctica has previously not been addressed very seriously.

To avoid the pursuit of our legitimate interests in the context of the convention would certainly avoid contention but it also means acceptance of a convention at considerable potential cost to Australia.

I could go on with what Mr Keating had to say. I could also refer to a number of the contrary reactions on the part of the ALP and the Federal Government. On the other hand, the Coalition—the Federal Liberal and National Parties—have been firm in their view in the policy they introduced regarding this matter. The environment policy of the Coalition released in October 1988 pledged support for the Antarctic Treaty and the agreed measures for the conservation of flora and fauna; the exclusion of military activity from the Antarctic; a reaffirmation about claims of sovereignty; particular protection of the regions marine ecology; and to ensure that 'any minerals regime is developed only within the strictest environmental protection guidelines'.

On 24 November 1988 the Coalition Parties made perfectly clear that they were far from satisfied with aspects of the convention and that it should be giving this matter early and important consideration. On 3 May 1989 the Senate adopted a motion moved by the shadow Minister for the Environment, Senator Chris Puplick, in the following terms:

That the Senate—

(a) is of the opinion that:

(i) the Antarctic continent should be protected as fully as possible from threats to its unique environment;

(ii) it is incompatible with the above to allow any mining activity to take place in the Antarctic; and

(iii) the proposed convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities is flawed in a number of respects including being an inadequate vehicle for the proper protection of the Antarctic environment; and

(b) as a consequence, calls upon the Australian Government to:

(i) refuse to sign and ratify the proposed Minerals Convention;

(ii) take steps to convene a meeting of the Antarctic Treaty parties to develop an effective regime to prohibit mining in the Antarctic; and

(iii) increase its own level of environmental and scientific activities in the Antarctic.

Three weeks later, under considerable political and public pressure, the Hawke Labor Government finally decided that it would decline to sign the convention, having held out for as long as possible in the hope that France would decide not to sign, thereby relieving Australia of the necessity to make any decision at all.

For some time there has been a proposal for the whole of Antarctica to be turned into a world park. The impetus for this has come from a variety of sources. For example, some of the conservation groups have seen this as a reflection of their view that Antarctica is really the common heritage of mankind—a view that I share. On the other hand, some members of the United Nations, notably led by Malaysia, have seen this as a way of breaking down the Antarctic Treaty regime which they regard as being too dominated by Western and more developed nations.

The Liberal and National Parties at the Federal level have expressed their opposition to the world park idea as now formulated, as was formulated in the resolution before I amended it, for two reasons. First, because they wished to continue to assert Australia's claims of sovereignty over Australian Antarctic territory and, secondly, because they do not want to see any weakening of the Antarctic Treaty regime itself. The Coalition believes the treaty has served Australia well, and has served the international environmental system well. There is a fear that attempts to weaken the treaty and the risk of importing United Nations politics into the treaty regime would be disastrous.

A more sensible proposal might be the establishment of the Antarctic Treaty Park, and hence my amendment moved in this House. We are looking to some sort of national park firmly based within the scope of the Antarctic Treaty, and we are not derogating from the sovereignty claims of relevant national parties as was contemplated. Within such a regime adequate arrangements could be made for the management of issues such as proper conservation practices and scientific research.

The decision not to sign the minerals convention and to press for an international regime to prohibit mining in the Antarctic was made by the Liberal and National Parties on the basis of sound and careful analysis of all the facts. The overriding concern of the Coalition was the proper protec-

tion of the unique and fragile Antarctic environment. It is these concerns and principles that will determine the future of Antarctica. I commend my Federal colleagues for the strength they have shown in this debate, and for the positive policies by the Coalition. I am pleased to support the resolution in its amended form, and call on the House to support that resolution but only in its amended form.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I thank the honourable member opposite and his colleagues for allowing this to be brought to the vote today because I regard it as important that a vote be taken on this issue as soon as possible. The reality is that negotiations are going on in Paris at this moment under the Antarctic convention, and that Australia and France, working together for once on an issue, are seeking to obtain support of other nations and particularly those of the South Pacific for this principle. From my reading of the news as it comes in, they are gaining ground and there may be some cause for optimism that we will have a treaty, a wilderness park negotiated under the terms of the Antarctic Treaty. I accept the amendment moved by the member opposite, and urge members to support the amendment and indeed to support the amended motion.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT STUDY

Adjourned debate of motion of Mr Ingerson:

That the Government and in particular the Minister of Transport be censured for the discriminatory action taken on the recommendations of the Fielding study into public transport.

(Continued from 7 September. Page 800.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My reasons for moving this motion are highlighted in comments made by the Auditor-General in his report where, under 'Significant Features', he states:

- The cost per passenger journey of providing services over the past five years has increased by 23 per cent in real terms . . .
- The major contributing components of that increase were:
  - depreciation, amortisation and interest—up 82 per cent in real terms;
  - administration and general expenses—up 21 per cent in real terms;
  - patronage—down 17 per cent.
- In the same period income (per passenger journey) from:
  - traffic receipts increased by 36 per cent in real terms;
  - the Government's contribution towards the cost of providing services increased by 38 per cent in real terms.

That clearly highlights why Professor Fielding was initially asked to look at the STA in total and to make significant recommendations in relation to policy, direction and changes that could be made in the medium to long term to the STA's existing framework.

The first point of the Auditor-General, that the cost per passenger journey of providing services over the past five years has increased by 23 per cent in real terms, clearly illustrates the situation facing this and any future Government in relation to the cost of public transit within our city. Also, it is important to add another couple of statistics: in 1982 the cost of the STA to taxpayers was $1.4 million per week; and in 1989 the cost to taxpayers is $2.67 million per week—an increase of $1.27 million per week over the life of the Bannon Government. Clearly, this cost escalation has to stop, and one has to look at ways and means of achieving that while, at the same time, still providing the public with a service that is commensurate with what it is prepared to pay. Governments, being the custodians of the public purse, have to make those decisions.

The Auditor-General also said that over the past five years there has been a 17 per cent reduction in patronage, and that comment is very interesting. So, this $1.27 million increase per week to South Australian taxpayers and the 17 per cent reduction in the number of people using the transit system surely highlights a major problem for the Government, a problem which, unfortunately, it has swept under the carpet by not taking up the majority of, if not all, the recommendations that Professor Fielding put forward in his very good presentation on State transit. What also needs to be highlighted, as Professor Fielding and others have shown, is that the cost of transit by all modes—bus, tram and train—has continued to escalate, and I cite particularly the significant cost increase in relation to trains, which is of concern to all.

I now turn to one of the major recommendations that the Government ignored, that is, the separation of policy direction and setting from the operations of the STA. That was quickly pushed to one side by the previous Minister of Transport, and I note that this Minister has not been prepared to take up what I believe is probably the most important recommendation of Professor Fielding, that is, the need to remove from the daily decision-making process the actual policy direction that an organisation should take. In relation to this, the recommendation of Professor Fielding is as follows:

The Government should create a Metropolitan Transport Authority (MTA) with at least the following functions:

- To procure transit services from a range of suppliers including the STA, taxicabs, and private bus operators.
- To ensure provision of an integrated and comprehensive network that meets the travel needs of the commuter, local travel in the outer suburbs, and the requirements of handicapped and frail citizens and those without access to automobiles.
- To issue guidelines for local government authorities on traffic planning . . .
- To be the licensing authority for buses, taxicabs and other public conveyance vehicles . . .
- To own major transport facilities that might be used by different transportation operators.

Basically, he set out a system which would enable the STA to be restructured so that the policy direction and policy making body would be separated totally from the operation or management side. Whilst we have a board structure now that one would believe would do that, the comments made by Fielding on his investigation into the STA and the studies that I have read in America—particularly those of Wendel Cox—clearly indicate that this sort of recommendation is in line with modern management techniques. I believe it would make a significant difference to the operations of the STA.

Professor Fielding also clearly pointed out that there is a need to have a positive business plan. It is interesting that the Government, some 2½ years ago, announced that we would have a strong and positive business plan for the STA, yet today we still have no policy and no specific business plan to which the consumers and taxpayers of South Australia can be specifically directed. As well, it is important to note that the Auditor-General has said that the consultancy which began in May 1987 still has not been completed, but hopefully the objective will be to finish this work towards the end of this financial year. It is noted in his report that the objective will be to provide a high level of service and save some $22 million.

That plan was put out 2½ years ago. If the STA is being run by this Government in that way, and one does not have to have management plans ready in under 2½ years, it is no wonder that we have the escalating cost of the STA, as I demonstrated earlier—an increase of $1.2 million per week to the taxpayers for a system which they obviously do not

think is good because some 17 per cent fewer people are using the system than used it five years ago.

Another recommendation of the Fielding report was to bring together the Taxicab Board and the licensing of private buses. Other safety issues were related to both of those areas. To bring together all of those transit operators under the one board and to give each of them some sort of direction is sensible. For philosophical reasons, I guess, the Government has just ignored that important recommendation of Fielding's, because he has clearly stated that there is a need in the future to bring together public transit services operated by the State Transport Authority, the private taxicab operators and the private bus operators as well.

That very positive recommendation put forward by Fielding has been ignored. Fielding suggested that one of the most significant reasons for separating policy and operations is that it gives the board the opportunity to consider its future planning guidelines; in other words, to decide what is the best transit system for the State and, more importantly, how we can best provide that system for the benefit of all taxpayers not only financially, but in the provision of services. There is no point in having a service that the public does not use and there is no point in spending the money that we are spending on the transit system if people are leaving it at a great rate.

It is interesting to note that the Liberal initiative of the O-Bahn is the only transit area which is having a rapid increase in use. That highlights the very good forward planning, sensitive nature and commonsense demonstrated by the previous Liberal Government. This Government has continued with that plan and I congratulate it on doing so, but it is important to note that it is the only service in the STA which is increasing in patronage. All other services are declining and causing concern. Fielding clearly highlighted the need to separate management and policy functions, but that was quickly scrapped by this Government.

The next thing that Fielding highlighted was the need for competitive tendering. Clearly, if we are to provide the community with a worthwhile service—in other words, a service that is cost effective and utilised by the community—we need to reduce the cost of the existing set-up. There are many ways in which that can be done. Fielding recommended competitive tendering. For obvious philosophical reasons, the Government has run away from competitive tendering in this area.

Fielding recommended the use of private buses and taxis in several areas. He spent some time looking at the school bus system and strongly recommended—a recommendation not taken up by the Government—that the private sector should be more involved in the school bus service. The cost to the community of the school bus service could be dramatically reduced and the service could still be provided with the same efficiency, but that suggestion has been ignored and put aside because it might save some taxpayers money. Therefore, nothing has been done.

Fielding recommended some changes in the supply of services to the handicapped. I note that the Government has picked up some changes in the access cabs area, but it has not done anything about the most important part, which is to extend the services to enable other types of vehicles to be used. There is no doubt that the development of the access cabs scheme has filled a need, but many people are handicapped in ways that make it difficult for them to use the system. It has been put to the Government on several occasions that if we had mini buses converted to provide for kneeling technology, they would be able to fulfil a very important role in the supply of access cabs to the handicapped. That has been ignored. We have continued with the same fixed method, and a very important argument put forward by Fielding has been ignored.

Fielding also recommended that there should be contract tendering for community-based services and for the extension of new services, yet none of those recommendations seems to have been taken up by the Government; they have just been ignored or put aside. The next area at which Fielding looked very carefully was the need to supplement the STA in the area of high-cost services during peak hours and in the outer suburbs. It would be a fairly brave Labor Government that looked at supplementing peak services instead of operating a system in which we have a whole bus structure geared only to the peaks, which causes a massive capital cost. That recommendation has been ignored.

It seems to me that all of these areas that have been ignored have a fundamental similarity: the Government would be required to use the private sector. Some interesting studies have been done on the use of the private sector in transport, both here and overseas. The most important fact to come out of the studies is that the private sector can supply the same public service at 40 per cent less cost than the public sector can. That seems to be the theme going through this whole exercise of ignoring all those recommendations that would involve the private sector.

That is a tragedy, because it is costing the taxpayers of this State considerable sums of money unnecessarily. It has been interesting that, in discussion, many people involved with the STA were concerned that many of the comments made by Fielding suggested, in essence, that services should be privatised. That is absolute nonsense. We see that the United States is moving towards contract tendering in almost every possible area of transit, and doing so for two reasons. First, the public service authority that is owned and controlled by the State (in this case, the STA) would continue to remain under such control, but the services would be contracted out and, consequently, there would be a very significant reduction in cost to the community. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FLORA AND FAUNA PROTECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That this House expresses its support for legislation similar in purpose to the Victorian Parliament's Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act 1988 which recognises the protection of endangered species and endorses the formation of a select committee to inquire into that legislation and similar provisions in other like legislation for the purpose of presenting such a Bill to the House at the earliest available opportunity.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1005.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): On the previous occasion when I rose to debate this issue relative to flora and fauna protection, I was able to identify the genesis of the scheme as put into place by the Victorian Government, and congratulated it for the action it had taken. I pointed out that there were various facets of the Victorian legislation which I believed required the earnest attention of members of both sides of the House. I will come back to that a little later.

I want to put on record one or two examples which were placed on the record in Victoria and highlight the need behind the action which has been contemplated. The Hon. Mr B.T. Pullen of the Melbourne province, at page 1159 of the Victorian Legislative Council *Hansard* of 4 May 1988, drew attention to two particular circumstances which, whilst

they are overseas, have a similar consequence so far as South Australia is concerned. He drew attention to the fact that the records show that Iceland, when it was first populated, had a very heavy timber cover. Today it is practically treeless, and that is a direct result of the activities of the population that went into Iceland and made use of the timber for a variety of purposes, not taking any heed of the consequences of their actions. Indeed, because of the climate and the intrusion of mankind into Iceland, today it is still almost treeless. Quite obviously, the people of Iceland need to take heed of the type of legislation to which I am referring to restore a great deal of cover or afforestation which is necessary, as we in Australia are doing in many respects.

The Hon. R.S.D. de Fegely of the Ballarat province, when drawing attention to various aspects of the legislation, pointed out the extreme importance of there not being a threatening effect in the legislation. The people who were to be affected by the Bill should not feel, if they made any evidence available of almost extinct animals or flora or, if they were to find on their property a species which had been listed or identified in the press as being near extinction, that they might draw everybody to their property and in the future would be unable to enjoy the amenity of that property, whereas given some legislative protection, they would be more than happy to share that extinct species with the public at large and not find themselves run over by legislation.

With regard to the farming community—and it has been expressed often in this House by a number of members—circumstances have caused a number of people to keep to their own confidence information which might otherwise be of advantage to the population at large because they fear the intrusion of do-gooders or Government inspectorial services. My colleague, the member for Eyre, has spoken on that aspect on a number of occasions. One of the things to which I referred in relation to this piece of legislation was the importance of providing the opportunity for the community at large to participate in its formulation so that the end result (coming from a select committee, I trust) would be acceptable to the population generally. I believe that that is a telling point in relation to this measure.

Unfortunately, we do have a position that some conservationists are, in effect, total preservationists. They do their own cause and the cause of those who would dearly like to assist in a conservation role a great deal of harm when they go to the extreme. I have been heartened in discussions over recent months with a number of people directly associated with the mainline conservation bodies in this State, and a number of people from interstate whom they have introduced to me, that they have been able to identify very clearly that the hierarchy or top management of these organisations have come face to face with the reality of requiring that a proper judgmental attitude be adopted to many of these issues.

Finally, before passing this measure over to Government members to take the adjournment, I draw attention to the grave problem which exists in respect of feral animals. It is in this area of the handling or disposal of feral animals—be they cats, donkeys, camels, or whatever—that the matter is taken seriously. There should be a clear recognition of feral animals and plants, although the term 'feral' is not frequently used in relation to plant life, except at Belair National Park where there is a great deal of concern now about the attitude expressed by the department in respect of exotic species which are not natural to South Australia. Unless there is a correct attitude to the removal of feral animals or species from our existing landscape, there will be an ever increasing problem in obtaining the best results as envisaged by this legislation.

The motion falls into five sections, which I will detail. First and foremost, the motion requires the House to express support for the concept, and I hope that that will be forthcoming. Secondly, it draws attention to the phrase 'similar in purpose', which allows an adaptation to South Australian conditions of the best that is available, not only from the pioneer Victorian legislation but also from other pieces of legislation or other representations which we may get from within Australia or by the records which are available from overseas, so that we are not tying ourselves to a definitive end result.

Thirdly, it is important that the legislation is given the greatest opportunity of success by turning the matter over to a select committee which has the opportunity to approach it in a completely impartial way (and there are examples of quite an impartial approach to new and existing legislation in this State). It is important that the legislation is approached on that basis so that there is a major measure of support across the Parliament when the enabling legislation is introduced. My motion also picks up the fact that time is running out. It is necessary to do this at the earliest possible moment, without being foolish enough to take action which is not well thought through. I envisage that it would be between nine and 15 months before enabling legislation is brought before the House. I commend the proposition to the House.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

PETITION: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

A petition signed by 81 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review its approach to environmental management was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that following a flagrant breach of the guidelines for the privilege of recording Parliament by a number of television stations yesterday, I wrote to the general managers of Channels 2, 7 and 9 withdrawing that privilege until further notice. I am sure that all members will agree that harassment of a member of the public or a member of the Parliament in the corridors of Parliament is intolerable and must not be allowed to occur at any time.

As a result of my letter I have received apologies from two of those stations undertaking to abide by the guidelines. With those apologies I have, in concurrence with the President of the Legislative Council, decided to lift the restriction on those two stations. I view the breaching of the guidelines extremely seriously, and any future breaches will result in definite penalties.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I would like some clarification of the guidelines. I understood that the filming was conducted outside the Liberal Party room. It is not an infrequent occurrence in this place for filming to take place outside the Labor Party Caucus room. It seems to the Opposition that there is a lack of consistency in the observance of these guidelines. For instance, one of the guidelines states that there should be equal time in the media devoted to Government mem-

bers and Opposition members. Anyone who watches television would see that that guideline is not being upheld.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, you have had some complaints from this side of the House on numerous occasions. The Opposition cannot understand your ruling last evening when, as I have said, television stations are regularly invited to film events outside the Labor Party Caucus room. On this occasion the filming occurred outside the Liberal Party room. The Opposition seeks a more equitable application of the guidelines in relation to access to the operations of this House by television stations.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of all honourable members to the guidelines incorporated in *Hansard* on 7 May 1985. Clearly, Parliament is the most significant institution in South Australia, and access to its precincts by television crews, regardless of their importance in the dissemination of information, is by invitation and in accordance with strict guidelines. They have no right to intrude. Of course, members can conduct interviews in their own rooms at all times. Press conferences in rooms set aside for press conferences, either the second floor press conference room or some other area of the building with the acknowledgment of the relevant Presiding Officer, are also clearly open to television crews at any time.

Access to the Chamber is under specified guidelines only. Nowhere else in the building is considered a public thoroughfare for the television cameras. They are allowed in those areas only with the consent, on behalf of their members, of the relevant Presiding Officer. On the occasion referred to last evening, the consent of the relevant Presiding Officer was not obtained either for the area outside this Chamber, in the case of the House of Assembly's Presiding Officer, or in the area outside the Liberal Party room which is on the Legislative Council side of the building. The specific instances on previous occasions when filming has taken place outside the Government Caucus room have always been with the consent of the Presiding Officer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members have any questions, the Chair will attempt to oblige. I cannot accept interjections. The honourable member for Victoria.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Albert Park. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Mr Speaker, could you inform the House which channels you have banned from filming in the House today? Could you also explain why, not 15 minutes ago, filming was taking place in Centre Hall?

The SPEAKER: The filming that took place in Centre Hall was an example of the type that I mentioned a moment ago of a press conference being conducted in the building with the consent of the relevant Presiding Officers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a matter of two sets of rules. The Chair believes that an interjection of that nature constitutes contempt for the Chair which cannot be tolerated.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Which channel is now banned and for what period of time?

The SPEAKER: I appreciate that question from the member for Victoria to which I have not yet replied on account of the requirement to call the House to order. To date apologies have been received from Channel 7 and Channel 9. Notwithstanding the fact that I had verbal indications by telephone that an apology would shortly be arriving, no apology has yet arrived from the ABC.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Could I request that in future when an application is made to you as Speaker, or the future Speaker, we have an arrangement to have such applications made in writing? It is easier for a Government to make a verbal request for the opportunity to film a different part of the House to a Speaker who sits in that Party Caucus room and takes part in the decision-making than it is for the Opposition and minority Parties. I believe that to make sure that it is 100 per cent down the line, the request should be made in writing so that people will not be suspicious of any arrangements.

The SPEAKER: I accept that as a reasonable suggestion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: For further clarification, why is the *7.30 Report* of Channel 2 banned when it did not breach the guidelines?

The SPEAKER: In the light of the correspondence which arrived just this moment, the ABC and the *7.30 Report* are no longer banned.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Government Management Board—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Department of State Development and Technology—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Department of Agriculture—Report, 1988-89.

Veterinary Surgeons Board—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1988-89.

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

South Australian Harness Racing Board—Report, 1988-89.

QUESTION TIME

HENLEY AND GRANGE COUNCIL

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm that the Government has received a recommendation from the Local Government Advisory Commission affecting the councils of Henley and Grange, Woodville and West Torrens that, by a vote of three to one, the commission has recommended that the Henley and Grange council be split up between the councils of Woodville and West Torrens, and was this recommendation considered by Cabinet before it was referred back to the commission?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any recommendation on this matter being considered by Cabinet. I will refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Local Government for a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Premier consider introducing legislation to provide to individuals who are the

subject of allegations raised under the privilege of Parliament the opportunity of replying to those allegations?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question, which has particular relevance in light of recent events in this House. I understand that in Federal Parliament, in the Senate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —certain procedures are available whereby persons whose affairs are discussed in some adverse manner have rights in respect of having some sort of reply inserted in *Hansard*. I do not know the details of that or the orders under which that is provided, but it is certainly something well worth considering, particularly, as I say, in light of recent events. Parliamentary privilege is a very valuable thing: it is one of the cornerstones of our democratic rights.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But like any privilege—and this is certainly a privilege that goes well beyond—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. I call the member for Victoria to order and ask members to behave themselves with the appropriate decorum. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Victoria has not been here for very long and perhaps can be forgiven for not fully understanding some of the traditions of the Houses of Parliament in this area.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Heysen has been here much longer, and it seems he does not understand either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Recent events in this House have certainly indicated the need to look at this question, because it can leave a member of the community very severely exposed. I am not suggesting that we should curtail parliamentary privilege, but I come back to the point that there is a responsibility on all members of Parliament to ensure that they try to exercise it with some care. Possibly, at some time or other, we are all guilty of going too far in this respect and, perhaps, by so doing, abusing the privilege.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Hanson says 'rubbish', he never is. If it were some other honourable member, I might have taken that interjection a little more seriously. If the member for Hanson does not even have the modesty or decency for a bit of self-criticism on this issue, I am very disappointed, because he has been here since 1970 and has had a few things to say about people in that time.

Too often allegations are thrown around this Chamber, often preceeded by phrases such as, 'I have been reliably informed' or 'It has been suggested to the Opposition' or whatever its couching, and what follows is put into the public domain and allowed to have free publication, in many cases without the right or the opportunity for the individual to make any sort of reply. We have to be a little careful about how we exercise that power but, equally, some form could well be found whereby individuals so named might have some reasonable way in which they can put their case on the record. Why I think it is important is not because of the cut and thrust of debate in this Chamber—members of Parliament are quite able to look after themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is unfortunate when politicians resort to imposing writs on each other for their remarks, because the cut and thrust of debate in or out of politics requires severe consideration of that. Therefore, I am less concerned about us as politicians. We are in the game. We are paid to do it and we are part of it. Whether or not we like it, we have to cop a lot and we give a bit out, but somebody who is not a member of Parliament, a politician or involved in the political process ought to feel that they have some kind of redress. It reflects on all of us as members of Parliament, both Government and Opposition. It demeans the institution of Parliament and it demeans politics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order and ask all members to treat this answer, of all answers, with appropriate courtesy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The very way in which the Opposition is reacting to this I think proves the point. It does none of us any good in the general community if we are seen to be recklessly using the privileges of Parliament. What I am trying to say was very well expressed by radio announcer Mr Vincent Smith on his 5AA program this morning, and I consider gives an indication of what would be the ordinary commonsense person's response to this issue. He said:

> But then Dale Baker, an Opposition frontbecher who aspires to the leadership of the Liberals, thought that he would lead another attack on the Government and the project in the Parliament yesterday, and he brought into question the death in a helicopter accident of a friend of Alan Burlock. It was along the lines of police were recommending that the accident be further investigated. It was an extraordinary point for the Opposition to raise. What was the implication of the question? What inferences would people normally draw from the question?
>
> Of course it was asked under the protection of Parliament, Mr Burlock has no right of reply, so the Opposition was prepared to ask a question which had bizarre implications, which must have been grossly offensive, among other things, to Mr Burlock, and all because the Opposition wants to nail the Government for being incompetent.
>
> Now, I don't know Alan Burlock from a bar of soap, never heard of the man until last week, he's obviously a financially successful man who knows how to handle himself in business, he's a property developer, which is no game for whimps, but if I were him I'd be outraged by what the Opposition has done. I think he referred to it as sleazy. Well, that's mild, and that's the problem. I don't think the Opposition knows that it is sleazy, I don't think they know. They're unable when they get themselves on one of the rollercoasters of indignation which they so much like to ride, they forget how to and when to apply the brakes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order and I warn him.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Smith continued:

> They cannot make the distinction between hard tough politics and sheer sleaze. No taste, in this case, no taste at all. And it is a lack of taste which translates into lack of political judgment, a lack which will lose them even more ground, put them further behind than they are now in the public opinion polls. Its a serious shortcoming in an Opposition because it's such a glaring shortcoming which cuts across the standards of common decency and courtesy which most people adhere to. Perhaps it's the thrill of the chase, the scent of blood which clouds the judgment? Whatever it is they made a grave mistake yesterday, and one from which it will be difficult to recover. They tried to hurl some mud and it stuck, but it stuck to them, the Opposition.

I quote that as an example of what I would suggest the ordinary commonsense person in the community is thinking in respect of the events of yesterday. If it just reflected on the Opposition, that would be fine, and I would have no cause for complaint. Unfortunately, it reflects on us as well, and it reflects on the institution of Parliament. I appreciate

the question of the member for Adelaide. This sort of response demonstrates that action is clearly necessary if the reputation of Parliament is to be maintained and enhanced.

I do not believe that it is necessarily a matter for legislation. It may be possible, as I understand is the case with the Senate, that Standing Orders could accommodate the sort of suggestion I am making, which is that in some way individuals could have their replies or response on the record. In that instance, I would suggest that the appropriate action might be for the honourable member to refer the matter to the Speaker and the Standing Orders Committee to see whether or not something appropriate can be done.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier, and I intend to test his sleaze in court. Why has the Premier again failed to fulfil the Government's commitment to reduce the number and cost of executive and administrative officers in the Public Service? I refer to the Premier's commitment given in his 1984 budget speech, as follows:

> We have set in train action designed to achieve a substantial saving, in salary terms, over the next two to three years in the overall number of persons in the executive and administrative officer classifications.

This commitment was reported in the *Advertiser* under a front page headline on 28 August 1984, as follows:

> South Australia's Public Service 'fat cats' will have to cut their total salary bill by 15 per cent as part of a savings strategy to be outlined in the 1984-85 State budget on Thursday. Mr Bannon revealed the new targets in a 'no soft options' briefing of about 40 senior public servants, including departmenal heads, on Thursday.

However, information contained in the Annual Report of the Commission for Public Employment tabled yesterday shows that the Government has repeatedly failed to fulfil this commitment. The report shows that the number of administrative and executive officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act at June 1989 was 1 109. This was 158 more than at June 1984 when the Premier promised a 15 per cent cut.

Mr Olsen: So much for his promises!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The increase last year alone was 70 additional AO and EO officers. In relation to the Premier's commitment to reduce salary payments for officers at these levels, I also refer to the full extent of the substantial salary increases received last financial year by senior officers. For example, in the case of the Director-General of the Premier's Department and the Under Treasurer, the new salary is $102 522—a rise of 23.5 per cent on their salary and allowance level for the previous year, according to information the Opposition has obtained through the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me make a number of points—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me make a number of points about public sector employment. First, public sector employment as a percentage of persons in employment has quite markedly decreased under this Government, and that is a major achievement when one considers the various functions that Government must perform. Secondly, in terms of administrative employment—that is, persons employed in administrative functions—South Australia has the lowest number per capita of any Government in this country. That is a pretty good record. Yes, it is true that there has been an increase in some areas since that policy was announced. One of those areas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 'In contravention', interjects the honourable member whose colleagues have been calling, for instance in the health system, to ensure that there are more appointments, that more persons are employed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If one examines the figures, one finds that part of the changes in public sector employment derived from the changed treatment of certain health units that have been brought into the system. Those health units were brought in with the composition of employment embodied therein including executive and administrative officers. After all, that is partly what all units comprise. The program to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred has been implemented and has been successful. Certainly, it has not achieved all its targets, and I make no apology for that because the way in which we have deployed all our numbers functionally has ensured that we met the basic priority needs of people in the community.

We have ensured that, in the portfolios of health and law and order—police and correctional services—appointments have been made. I am not at all embarrassed about that. They are fulfilling community need. It has also been done with the total public sector employment reducing as a proportion of the labour force with very tight efficiencies. The Deputy Leader then referred to chief executive officers' salaries, which are determined by the remuneration tribunal—an independent body established by this Parliament and given an independent brief to fix those salaries. The Government is in a position to make representations to it, but we do not fix the salaries. If the honourable member wishes to change that system, let him introduce an amendment to the legislation or propose a different policy.

As to the salaries he quotes, I point out that the CEO determination by the remuneration tribunal looked at changed relativities among all levels of CEOs. Some, indeed, received quite considerable increases. As I recall, some got no increase at all as a result of that investigation. So, on balance, nothing untoward happened. It is in the hands of the remuneration tribunal. If the Opposition thinks that we should change that system, let it propose that in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader to order for the second time. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the latest South Australian unemployment figures?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to enlighten the House regarding the latest unemployment figures in South Australia. In spite of the knocking by the Opposition the economic strategies of this Government are well in place and are achieving what the Government set out to do. We now have the second lowest rate of unemployment in Australia. The figure seasonally adjusted for September was 6.2 per cent, which is a great tribute to the efforts of this Government and the South Australian community, in spite of the Opposition and its efforts to undermine the economic strategies being applied in this State. Indeed, if we go back to 1982, when we were rightly given the task of running this State, the unemployment figure was around 9 per cent. We have established real growth in employment in this State over this period and the past 12 months has seen

significant growth. The figure for the past 12 months indicates that unemployment in this State has dropped 2 per cent since the same month last year. That is very significant and shows a long-term trend in the right direction.

The Australian figure for unemployment as a whole has increased from 5.9 per cent to 6.1 per cent seasonally adjusted, whereas South Australia has gone against the national trend and seen unemployment drop. It reinforces the strategies of this Government and I am delighted that the member for Henley Beach has asked the question. I know of his interest in this question and in this State's economy. Employment is going in the right direction, which reinforces the economic strategies put in place by this Government. The unemployment figure for youth in this State has dropped from 24.5 per cent last year to 18.1 per cent this year.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not. The member for Mitcham cannot cope with those figures. For a start, he cannot understand them. He has difficulty working out the impact of the figures and does not understand the strategies of this Government. Obviously it is very painful for him to he told the economic truths of this State and where we stand. It is significant that we are level with New South Wales at 6.2 per cent seasonally adjusted, Victoria being the only State in front of us, with the rest of the States behind us.

Queensland, with a conservative Government in office, has a 7 per cent unemployment rate, and that is significant. We have a policy in place about which I am sure the Premier and the Minister of State Development and Technology will be happy to further enunciate in terms of long-term strategies for our manufacturing and technology industries. This unemployment rate of 6.2 per cent is the lowest level since monthly surveys were introduced by the ABS in February 1978. We are seeing a significant trend; that trend represents good news not only for South Australians but also for the whole economy. I am delighted to see this trend, given the shambles in the economy left to us by that lot opposite. We had to accept it: we have done so and, given the background trends, we can see the long-term strategies—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: They find it hard to accommodate this. The economic spokesperson—the one-time spokesperson for the environment—finds it hard to accommodate these figures, and also finds it hard to realise that this Labor Government, the Bannon Government, has put in place strategies that mean job opportunities, training opportunities, opportunities for the young people of this State and opportunities for all the community. I am delighted to be part of this Government that has achieved this figure; that is a record for this State. It represents a great economic indicator for South Australia.

WOOMERA ROCKET RANGE

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Who does the Premier hold responsible for Aboriginal communities not being adequately consulted about plans to use the Woomera Rocket Range as an aerospace testing ground and what action is the South Australian Government now taking to ensure that this happens?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister of Transport not to interject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct the Minister of Transport not to interject.

Mr GUNN: On the Channel 9 *A Current Affair* program last Wednesday, the Premier was asked about advice the Defence Department gave in May to Maralinga Tjarutja that their lands would be affected by new activities proposed for Woomera. Questioned about a department fax to representatives of Maralinga Tjarutja advising that these activities would involve, and I quote, 'the testing of war materials and training exercises, the firing of rockets, and recovery of rockets and payloads', the Premier appeared to be taken by surprise, asking the reporter: 'Are you sure that is the fax?" Even though these plans have been public knowledge for at least five months and Aboriginal communities have expressed serious concern about lack of consultation with them.

Later in the *A Current Affair* program, the Premier said that the Defence Department would need to negotiate access to Aboriginal lands, and he added: 'It would be my view that an agreement should be negotiated, but I think it was undertaken in what was, in retrospect, a bit of a clumsy way.' The Premier has made a number of statements lauding the potential investment in these new activities at Woomera, but it appears there has been a complete oversight of the need to keep Aboriginal communities fully informed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the question from the honourable member because, while I think that it is true, as he suggests, that the consultation was not carried out in the best manner, there were good intentions on all sides. I briefly recount what has happened. Incidently, much of the problem stems from an article that appeared on 25 July 1989 in the *Bulletin*, that was critical of the Woomera plans and particularly referred to this aspect of disquiet among the Aboriginal people about what they understood to be the Defence Department's desire simply to intrude on their land and to have free and open access without adequate consultation.

The DSTO drafted a memorandum of understanding that was aimed at setting up agreed ground rules for entry by officers of the Defence Department, contractors and so on into that portion of the Woomera prohibited area, which was also referred to as part of the Aboriginal freehold land. As the honourable member would be aware, because I am sure he has looked at the maps, we are talking about the small portion of the Woomera prohibited area, west of the 133 degree east line. Under the powers that exist, the Commonwealth has total access to that land. In other words, Commonwealth powers override State legislation under which the land grant to the Maralinga Tjarutja is made.

Notwithstanding that, one would expect that that section of the area would be treated with sensitivity. I am not suggesting that the Defence Department has not treated it with sensitivity. What it was trying to do was misinterpreted. It was trying to say, 'Because we have absolute rights, but we recognise that this portion of the land is part of your freehold as well, we would like some memorandum of understanding of access which can therefore lay down the rules under which this proposed commercialisation of Woomera would take place.' Essentially, it was trying to clarify the position.

When I referred to it as being a bit clumsy, I think it conceded that it probably was not the right way to go about it because it could be misinterpreted, and was, as revealed in the article in the *Bulletin* to which I referred. In other words, in view of the sensitivity of Aboriginal land rights matters, rather than rely on the Defence Force Regulation (DFR 34) the department thought that a special access agreement should be negotiated.

It forwarded this draft document to the Maralinga Tjarutja by facsimile, which was followed by a meeting and presentation at Hope Valley in May 1988—Hope Valley and the main area that the community uses is outside the prohibited area—at which it was explained what was going to happen. It was made clear that the department was not talking about rocket firing, missiles landing, and things of that nature; it was saying that there would be minimal ground entry into that section. This indicated that the area had not been properly defined, because the future use of Woomera was still being determined. There might be overflight by service aircraft.

The department wanted to have a good neighbourly relationship with the community to ensure that there was no unreasonable intrusion and that everyone understood when and what was happening. The memorandum that was produced was not meant to be a stand and deliver final position. It was the beginning, as the department saw it, of a process of consultation. Unfortunately, it was interpreted as a directive almost from the Defence Department and that is where things seemed to get off on the wrong foot. Since then it has been made clear that the memorandum is negotiable. There is a willingness to consider particular arrangements in relation to that small portion of the land on the western extremity of the overall range, and further consultations will be necessary with the Maralinga Tjarutja.

As to the role of the State Government, we are interested in protecting the rights of the Aboriginal community. After all, this Government introduced the legislation that secured Aboriginal land rights access, and, as the project develops, the Minister of State Development and Technology, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and I will be kept up to date. Our officers are part of the negotiation and consultation process. I think everybody believes that we will be able to reach a satisfactory conclusion or agreement.

Let me come back to the starting point. If the Defence Department, the Government, or those users wish to ignore that small portion of the land, they could do so. They are not doing so. They are sensitively addressing the issue: we are delighted that they are, and we will work with them to ensure that the community's rights are protected.

CHILDREN'S CARE PROGRAMS

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister of Children's Services say what support the Children's Services Office can give to those primary schools wishing to set up their own out of school hours care programs? Three of my primary schools have Government funded out of school programs, and next year I shall have more than 3 000 primary students in my electorate. Several schools would like to begin such programs on a self-funding basis but, in order to do so, would appreciate the assistance of the Children's Services Office to set up the local management structure and arrangements.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her interest in the provision of children's services in the community. As a result of the new joint Commonwealth-State Child Care Development Program, outside school hours care services will be effectively doubled during this financial year. Sixty new funded services will be established, predominantly sponsored by primary school councils. Twenty-five services have already been established, and the remainder will be in operation early next year.

Each of these new programs is supported by regional and central staff of the Children's Services Office. Each program is required to establish a constitution and management structure, and to set up accounting procedures suitable for the expenditure of Government funds. Finally, an agreement is signed between the sponsor and the Commonwealth and State Governments in relation to the operation of these programs, a number of which were previously established and which were unfunded. In view of the significant increase in the number of new services at this time, the honourable member will appreciate that the number of staff within the Children's Services Office available to attend to these matters is limited.

However, schools wishing to establish unfunded or self-funded programs should not hesitate to contact the Children's Services Office. They should firstly register their interest in receiving Government funding should additional moneys become available. They should also obtain from the office a copy of the recently released Outside School Hours Care kit, which provides a great deal of information relevant to the establishment of a new service. The kit also contains valuable information about such important matters as insurance needs, programming, parent involvement and the like for the conduct of a successful program of this type.

TRIBOND CORPORATION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology correct a statement by the Director for State Development and Technology, Mr Rod Hartley, that the Tribond company had decided to place the company in receivership, and will he ask the Zhen Yun company whether it is a fact that the company had funds in Adelaide in early February which would have ensured the Marineland redevelopment did proceed, avoided the need to force Tribond into receivership, and saved South Australian taxpayers $6 million so far? In Monday's *Advertiser* the Director for State Development and Technology, Mr Rod Hartley, was quoted as saying:

> The Tribond directors, not the State Government, decided to place the company in receivership.

This is not true. It is a matter of fact that the Bank of New Zealand acted to put the company in receivership on 13 February this year so that it could recover funds owing which the Government had guaranteed. The Opposition has further evidence that this action could have been avoided if the Government had decided to support the project.

On 26 January this year an agent for Zhen Yun, Mr Gary Chapman, informed the Tribond Corporation that Zhen Yun had lodged $11 million in American dollars with the State Bank of South Australia to fund the takeover of Tribond and the continuation of the project. This is consistent with every other piece of evidence relating to events which occurred in late January and early February this year, showing that Zhen Yun wanted to proceed with the project but the Government would not maintain its support because of Greenpeace and union pressure.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It was not for the Department of State Development and Technology to call in the receivers, because, the way company law operates, that must be done by one of the creditors. On 13 February the Department of State Development and Technology advised the Tribond Corporation that Zhen Yun would not be taking over the Tribond Corporation and, in the circumstances, the directors of the Tribond Corporation advised that the receivers should be called in.

The information that Mr Hartley made available was in a letter to the *Advertiser* in response to reported comments

by Mr Ellen. He said that the decision to call in the receiver was taken by Tribond itself. I want to make a very important point with respect to this. The financial problems of the Tribond Corporation existed much longer ago than 13 February this year. Indeed, the Government saved Tribond from going into receivership many months before that. I suggest that, if the Opposition really wants to have a genuine investigation of this issue, it starts asking some questions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. I call the member for Victoria to order for the second time and I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the third time, which is far more than members normally get by way of a warning. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Opposition should start asking a few questions concerning the financial difficulties of the Tribond Corporation in 1988 and the number of times the Department of State Development and Technology made contact with it to discuss these matters. The fact is that that company could well have been placed in receivership in the middle of 1988, if not earlier, because of the financial problems it faced. That is the real truth about receivership. It was saved from going into receivership by many months due to Government action on that matter. The reason that was the case was that we knew that the centre could not be allowed to collapse with the obvious problems that would create for the animals. Also, we were endeavouring to help to try to find investors for that site. Yet again the Opposition has come back with the suggestion that the Government forced the dropping of the Marineland component. I do not know how much evidence has to be placed on the public record about this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I'll look you in the eye and say it because—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! First, I warn the honourable member for Victoria that another interjection in defiance of the Chair will be his last. That is his third warning. Secondly, I warn the Minister that it is clearly in breach of Standing Orders for him to conduct himself in that fashion by referring to members opposite as 'you'. His remarks, regardless of provocation, must be directed through the Chair. Thirdly, I ask all members for their cooperation. I understand that in the lead-up to an election period there is an escalation of political activity. That does not excuse rudeness. The Chair has no intention of allowing the House to collapse into total disorder, and I remind honourable members that on one afternoon two weeks ago I had to call the House to order 66 times in the space of a little more than two hours. I ask all members for their cooperation. Now that the temperature of the House has subsided somewhat, I ask the Minister whether he wishes to continue his reply.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I certainly do, Sir, and I apologise for the use of the word 'you' in my previous comments. The point is this: we have put much evidence on the public record about what actually took place in respect of this matter. I remind the member for Victoria about the facts confirming the conversation that took place between Mr Lawrence Lee and me on 2 February. I also remind him of the letter from Mr Lawrence Lee that I read into *Hansard* in this place yesterday. I might introduce another piece of evidence in this matter. On 7 April this year, solicitors then acting for the Abels wrote to me about certain matters relating to the payments that were made, and they made a couple of statements in that letter:

> On 8 February our clients were formally advised by your department that Cabinet did not approve the Marineland aspect of the Zhen Yun redevelopment proposal . . . on Saturday 11 February our clients were required to execute heads of agreement.

I want to point out, and this is well known to the Abels, that that was refuted in a letter from Crown Law dated 21 April. That is another piece of evidence indicating this has not been the case. Crown Law has access to all the information on this matter—as does the Auditor-General—and, as I have indicated, we would also make it available in a briefing to the Leader of the Opposition which he chooses not to take up—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, if we are referring now to the confidentiality agreements which, as the head of the Law Society says, is a quite normal commercial practice, the point I make on that is that we did have a letter from the solicitor acting for the Abels. We are now awaiting a reply to the letter which went from the Crown Solicitor to the Abels on that matter. When that reply is received, there can be further discussion on that matter.

I want to make this point, and it means being repetitious because I have made it many times before: the Government reiterated to Zhen Yun on many occasions that the agreement to the issuing of permits for the taking of dolphins into captivity, first made in 1987, would be honoured. As I said in the no confidence debate in this House, that was advised, for example, amongst many other times, in my meeting with Zhen Yun in November 1988. It was repeated in a letter from the Department of State Development and Technology to Zhen Yun in December 1988.

It was confirmed again in a conversation on 26 January between myself and Mr Lawrence Lee, and at all stages the Government said that it would honour that commitment, if that was what Zhen Yun proposed. Now we have the fact that a detailed business plan came through on 2 February which had dropped the Marineland component and as I indicated, nowadays there are many questions about the economic viability of such proposals as indicated by Underwater World in Western Australia, the Oceanarium in Singapore, and also according to reports that I have, by the Ocean Park development in Hong Kong, a development which would be well known to the Zhen Yun Corporation.

The fact that the Opposition tries again to raise these smears when they are not sustained by the facts is disappointing. I repeat: the decision was made by the Zhen Yun Corporation. That is the fact of the matter and I ask that the Opposition finally accept the facts and the truth of the matter.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the House of the impact on unemployment of the State Government's policies on economic development?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is inidicative of the difference between the two major Parties in this State and of the real options available to the South Australian community. On the one hand, we have a Government committed to employment growth and proper economic development, against an Opposition whose only charter by its own public performance is that of negative bickering designed to destroy any opportunity for economic growth within South Australia. They are the facts of the matter. Every major positive development proposed for South Australia gets the negative bickering of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The mouth almighty from Mitcham continues to be part of that team.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister not to reflect on another member. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise. I note that the member for Mitcham did not take exception to the phrase, but I certainly note the point you make, Mr Speaker. In 1985 the Government instituted the document 'Principles for Economic Development' and that clearly laid out the framework of this Government's thinking, on what we wanted for South Australia and what we have been aiming to achieve. The reality is that by 1989 the substance of that document has been achieved, and that substance is sound economic and employment growth.

Yesterday in a reply in this House I mentioned that from 1983 to 1989 there had been a 21 per cent growth in the average employment figures for this State: 113 000 extra jobs in South Australia. Now my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education has given the excellent news about which I would have thought all members in this place would be happy and excited and would have applauded, but in fact the Opposition chooses not to. It shows an unemployment rate that is the second lowest in the nation (although the member for Mitcham chooses to constantly ignore that by means of his interjections). That means that, in the period since December 1985 and the publication of 'Principles for Economic Development', employment has increased by 12 per cent, and due to that growth 70 000 South Australians now have a job where they did not have one before. That is how such statistics should be looked at—70 000 people who did not previously have a job now have a job as a result of the economic document 'Principles for Development', as implemented by this Government. Those principles involve recognising the fundamental importance of manufacturing to South Australia's economic prosperity, the importance to South Australia of high technology industries and exports, and that is the kind of strategic approach we have been following.

An interesting symbol has come to light in the news in recent days. This morning's paper carries a report of a development that will employ many people in the electorates of the members for Briggs and Playford and also in my electorate. I refer to the Liebherr development, which is now proceeding, starting with 100 people and ultimately employing 300 people. When I first saw that name I thought that it rang a bell: that was one of the projects which the Liberal Party when it was in Government touted as a big development which it would nab for South Australia. The reality is the Liberal Party failed and did not in fact nab the project. The Opposition made such a mess of South Australia's economy between 1979 and 1982—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —that the company did not proceed with its plans at that stage and went on with other investment plans. We have been able to attract it back to South Australia and under a Labor Government it will go ahead. It was a failure of the Liberal Government.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm that during a meeting at 10.30 a.m. on 23 June this year she admitted to Julie Greig, a representative of the Friends of the Dolphins organisation, that it had been the Government's decision to stop the Marineland redevelopment? Julie Greig, who is also a constituent of the Minister, arranged this meeting because of her concern about the fate of the dolphins. She challenged the Minister about how the Government had handled this matter and, finally, the Minister blew her cool and said, 'You know perfectly well—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member that the introduction of remarks of that nature is clearly comment. The honourable member for Hanson can continue.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, all that the honourable member said, in colloquial terms, is that the Minister got angry.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order and refer the Deputy Leader to the lists regularly supplied to members, and which have been drawn to their attention regarding the use of pejorative and colloquial terms. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: It has been reported to me that the Minister said to Mrs Greig, 'You know perfectly well it was a Cabinet decision.' The Opposition regards Julie Greig as a woman of integrity who would not misrepresent or misunderstand this key admission by the Minister as to what really happened in Cabinet to scrap this project.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member has already asked that question on notice and I have answered it. It is interesting that he obviously did not like the answer I gave then, which was an unequivocal 'No'; I did not say that to Mrs Greig. Further, I did not blow my cool, as the honourable member is asserting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Although it was not out of order for the honourable member to reply to the partly offensive remark obviously directed at her, it was nevertheless not helpful to the Chair's attempts to control the House for the Minister to refer to that matter. The honourable member for Fisher.

GLENTHORNE

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House of the State Government's representations to the Federal Government advocating that the area of land known as Glenthorne at O'Halloran Hill be retained as open space; and, further, will the Minister indicate whether she has received any indication from the Federal Government of its attitude following such representations? Members will be aware that there has been a suggestion that the Glenthorne property (known by some as the CSIRO land) should be subdivided for housing.

During a grievance debate earlier this year, I disclosed to the House that I was not only the local member for the area in question but also a resident of O'Halloran Hill adjacent to this area. I informed the House that my neighbours and constituents would be horrified if this suggested subdivision were to go ahead. I understand from recent press reports that the Federal member for Kingston, Mr Gordon Bilney, claimed he had received assurances from the Federal Minister for Administrative Services that this land would now be retained as an important open space between the Adelaide Plains and the Noarlunga Basin.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to advise the member for Fisher that I received a letter from the Hon. Stewart West, the Federal Minister for Administrative Services. I will outline to the House what he had to say in his letter, as follows:

I have noted the strong representations received on Glenthorne and the position adopted by the State and I do not propose personally to pursue the issue of housing any further.

I am delighted with that news. It is important to acknowledge the role that the local member, the member for Fisher, has played in this and also the role played by the Federal member, Mr Gordon Bilney. Both members have made strong representations as, indeed, have I. On several occasions I telephoned Stewart West and I have written to him twice, clearly representing the State Government's position in relation to this land.

I am pleased to have received his assurance after the effort that has been put into obtaining this commitment on behalf of not only the people of the local area but also the people of South Australia. The Glenthorne land has long been regarded by the local community as an urban lung. For the subdivision of the area to proceed for housing would, of course, have been totally unacceptable to the local community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members on my left would quieten down, I would give the call to the member for Heysen.

MARINELAND

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning confirm that there have been recent negotiations to relocate the Marineland dolphins to the Coffs Harbour porpoise pool in New South Wales rather than at Sea World on the Gold Coast and, if so, will she explain why? Earlier this year a proposal was put forward to relocate the Marineland dolphins to Coffs Harbour. However, the Minister rejected this proposal and in a joint statement on 15 June with the Chairman of Sea World, Mr Peter Laurance, she announced that Sea World would be the new home for the six Marineland dolphins, and that necessary tests could be completed 'within two or three weeks' to allow for their relocation.

I have now been informed that about three weeks ago new approaches were made to the management of the Coffs Harbour pool. They were made by Mr Lyndsay Best, an officer of the Department of Environment and Planning, who asked that the original proposal to relocate the dolphins there could be revived. This suggests there are now doubts about the plans to send the dolphins to Sea World and I seek the Minister's clarification.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted at the honourable member's interest in this issue. I am personally not aware of any new proposal to relocate the dolphins to Coffs Harbour. As members would know, and as I have explained on a number of occasions, the dolphins are now owned by the receivers of the Tribond company and, as such, Mr John Heard has had the complete responsibility for relocating the dolphins and for overseeing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not see what is so amusing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am afraid the hysteria being generated opposite is quite amazing. I am merely stating the facts about the position in relation to who owns the dolphins and who has the day-to-day responsibility for their feeding, maintenance and well being. I am not sure why members opposite are so hysterical. I am quite prepared to explain at some length my responsibility for the dolphins as Minister for animal welfare and, as I explained in great detail during the Estimates Committee, I am responsible for the well being of all animals in South Australia, which is not an inconsiderable task.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, I will ignore the interjection about the Opposition being animals because I am, after all—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will ignore that. However, if the cap fits, let them wear it. Getting back to the creatures at Marineland, specifically the dolphins, I understand that there is an agreement with Sea World that, when the dolphins have been tested for communicable or contagious disease, they will be relocated to their new home. I am unaware of further negotiations regarding any Coffs Harbour proposal. That was the question I was asked, and I am very happy to answer it.

OAKLANDS ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Has the Minister of Transport given approval for the sale of the Oaklands Road Safety Centre? I have had some representations from residents adjacent to the safety centre with a range of questions relating to a number of rumours, which include a $5 million sale of land, a Cabinet submission giving approval for the sale of the centre, or part thereof, advertising and real estate listings and Government department commercial developments. The residents have sought the Minister's consideration of a consultation process if, at any stage, a sale of the land, or any part thereof, is contemplated.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Hayward for her question and I compliment her, as always, on her fine representation of her constituents. The short answer to the question is, 'No'. I have not given permission to sell the land or any part thereof and nor do I intend to do so. It is quite normal Government practice that all Government assets are valued from time to time, and decisions made as to the worth of keeping them or otherwise. That is a normal and ongoing process of Government.

I was pleasantly surprised that, in the explanation given by the member for Hayward, she quoted a figure of $5 million. My understanding was that the property was not worth anywhere near that amount. Now that she has mentioned the figure it has sparked my interest, and I will investigate the issue further on her behalf.

It is true to say that the facility at Oaklands Park is a much under-utilised facility. Everyone would agree that there is far too much land for the purposes of the Department of Transport. However, there has been absolutely no decision made either to sell the land or to redevelop it for commercial purposes. I understand that that would not be possible in any case, because the property is zoned residential. That is not to suggest that the Government has any interest in developing it as a commercial operation. Even if the Government wished to develop it in that way it would not be possible because of the zoning regulations.

However, I can give a commitment to the member for Hayward and her constituents that if the Government did make a decision that the facility had to go—or that even part of it would have to go—that decision would not be taken without a great deal of prior consultation and, hopefully, agreement on the part of her constituents and the local council, which would also have a significant interest in any development, exchange or sale of any large area of land in the council district. The member for Hayward's constituents can rest assured that there will be no pre-

emptive strikes or anything like that. They are not likely to wake up one morning and find that the Government is developing some kind of commercial operation or, indeed, doing anything else with the land without a great deal of consultation with all of the interested groups that I have named.

DUCK SHOOTING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Does the Minister for Environment and Planning intend to have a review of duck shooting by an interdepartmental committee, comprising at least the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Police Department, the Department of Technical and Further Education and the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, and so broaden the review announced three months ago to involve only the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, or is the Minister—as is being speculated in some quarters—planning to close all Crown lands to duck shooting next season?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry that the honourable member has not read what I have been saying in the media about this. It is no secret that a review is taking place into the whole question of duck shooting, but it has nothing to do with the Department of Technical and Further Education. The review taking place now is being conducted conjointly by the Advisory Committee on Animal Welfare and by the Department of Environment and Planning. I have not got the results of that review because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have announced the review, and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am not getting my feathers ruffled. I do not think I have ever been calmer, and I am certainly not ducking the issue. I can assure the House that the review is taking place now.

HOMESTART LOANS

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction urgently review the HomeStart scheme and the Housing Trust sales program to ensure that prospective low income home buyers are not excluded from buying their own home by the sometimes insurmountable entry barriers imposed by the Minister's deposit requirements and the loan application fees of the lending institutions? In March this year, the Minister responded to a question in this place from me on this subject and indicated that the trust would soon review its sales scheme, particularly with respect to double units, to see whether any improvements could be made to the scheme.

The Minister has since introduced the HomeStart scheme which requires a minimum of 5 per cent deposit with at least $1 000 in money saved by the purchaser. In addition, substantial loan application fees of the order of $600 must also be paid, whereas under the old State Bank scheme the fees for low income earners were much less. In addition, buyers face up-front payments for rates and taxes and land broking fees. These requirements may not be significant barriers to middle income families, but taken together they are of real concern to those on a low income and especially those with families. This is a very regressive arrangement since the entry barriers are a much higher percentage of a low income family's income, and many people in this situation are being disadvantaged as a result.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for Elizabeth for his question, and also for his wholehearted support for the HomeStart program. The honourable member and the House will be aware that this Government has supported home ownership more than any other. There are various schemes—HOME; rental-purchase; re-financing; stamp duty exemptions; and now HomeStart.

However, as with many forms of Government assistance a reasonable balance must be struck, that is, between the level of assistance provided and the amount of incentive left to the person being assisted. In the case of home ownership assistance, the Government believes that it is important that applicants indicate their commitment to buying a home and their determination to succeed with their purchase. That commitment is best indicated by a personal savings contribution towards the deposit.

With HomeStart, the deposit required is 5 per cent of property valuation. Of this amount $1 000 must come from the applicant's own savings. This, I believe, is a more than reasonable demand given the size of loans being provided, the number of years for which finance is being provided, and the opportunity to purchase being provided.

In the member for Elizabeth's electorate, house prices are generally quite low. Under HomeStart, a person buying, say, a $60 000 house will require a deposit of $3 000. This would be met by personal savings of $1 000 and $2 000 from the Federal Government's First Home Owners Scheme. Any surplus from the First Home Owners Scheme grant could be used to meet loan fees. No stamp duty would be payable on most homes in the member's electorate because of the exemptions offered by this Government.

However, the Government is prepared to consider the HomeStart scheme in six to 12 months time to see how trust tenants have fared, and to make adjustments if needed.

STATE OPERA OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DA COSTA SAMARITAN FUND (INCORPORATION OF TRUSTEES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Da Costa Samaritan Fund (Incorporation of Trustees) Act 1953. 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 give effect to a request of the trustees to extend the list of hospitals to which the Act applies. The Da Costa Samaritan Trust was initially established at the turn of the century by way of a bequest of Louisa Da Costa. Its funds were to be applied for the relief of convalescent patients of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In 1953, the Da Costa Samaritan Fund (Incorporation of Trustees) Act was passed. The Act provided the trustees with corporate status, and generally facilitated the management of the trust. In keeping with the original trust deed the Act provides that there shall be not less than three trustees, who are now Mr P.B. Wells, AM,; Mr K.B. Price; and Mrs B.F. Garrett, MBE.

In 1969, amendments were made to the Act to extend the powers of the trust beyond providing benefits to convalescent patients of Royal Adelaide Hospital. By virtue of the amendments the trust could then apply its funds to patients of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and any other hospital as may be proclaimed (such hospital being a public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act). Flinders Medical Centre and Modbury Hospital have since been so proclaimed.

The trust plays an important role in assisting convalescent patients of limited means. Hospital personnel screen the financial situation of patients and make requests for assistance. Applications are also considered from organisations which help convalescent public hospital patients. The trust spends a major proportion of its income on individual patient help, special equipment and projects. Individual assistance includes night or supplementary day nursing, paraplegic supplies, special glasses and shoes, hearing aids, travelling expenses to receive special treatment, nebulisers, oxygen concentrators and rehabilitation equipment for disabled persons. While there are some established schemes, for example for assistance with patient transport or purchase of equipment for disabled persons, the trust does not duplicate, but caters for people in need who, for one reason or another, fall outside the schemes.

The trust has sufficient funds to assist a wider range of patients in the metropolitan and country areas, and has sought to broaden its scope. The Act contains an impediment in that under section 19 (3) only public hospitals within the meaning of the Hospitals Act 1934-1967 can be proclaimed to be hospitals to which the section applies. The provision is anachronistic—not all hospitals that the trustees have in mind are 'public hospitals' within the meaning of the Hospitals Act, nor would it be appropriate to so declare them, as the Hospitals Act has been superseded by the South Australian Health Commission Act, and the Hospitals Act will be repealed in due course.

In order to give effect to the trustees' wish to extend their scope, the amendment therefore deletes reference to the Hospitals Act prerequisite and substitutes a requirement that a hospital must be an incorporated hospital within the meaning of the South Australian Health Commission Act as a prerequisite to the Governor issuing a proclamation. The amendment also provides for the trustees to recommend those hospitals they wish to be proclaimed, thereby ensuring that they retain control of the process. The trustees have indicated that the hospitals they have in mind at this stage (all of which are incorporated under the SAHC Act) include:

Lyell McEwin Health Service,
Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children,
Berri Regional Hospital Inc.,
Mount Gambier Hospital Incorporated,
Port Pirie Regional Health Service Incorporated,
Whyalla Hospital & Health Services Incorporated,
Port Lincoln Health and Hospital Services Inc.

The Government supports the good work of the trust and is anxious to facilitate its operations. The amending Bill is a hybrid Bill and, as a matter of course, will need to be referred to a select committee.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 19 of the principal Act. Section 19 enables the Da Costa Samaritan Fund Trust to apply the balance of its income, after payment of management and other expenses, for the benefit of convalescent patients of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and any other hospital declared by proclamation to be a hospital to which the section applies. Under the current subsection (3) only public hospitals within the meaning of the Hospitals Act 1934-1967, can be proclaimed to be hospitals to which the section applies. This clause deletes subsection (3) and substitutes a new subsection under which only incorporated hospitals within the meaning of the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976 can be so proclaimed. The new subsection also specifies that any such proclamation must be on the recommendation of the trustees.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the marketing of wheat; to repeal the Wheat Marketing Act 1984; 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

The Commonwealth Wheat Marketing Act 1989 was assented to on 15 June 1989. That Act contains provisions to retain the export monopoly of the Australian Wheat Board, but to open up more choice for growers by deregulating the domestic wheat market. The Commonwealth has introduced a range of measures to extend the board's commercial powers and flexibility to ensure that it will be able to compete effectively in a deregulated market.

While the Commonwealth has the legislative power to make laws regarding export and interstate trade in wheat, it does not have powers over intrastate trade. To enable the Australian Wheat Board to trade intrastate, complementary State legislation is required. The Wheat Marketing Bill 1989 provides that complementarity in South Australia.

While the Wheat Marketing Bill 1989 gives the Australian Wheat Board the power to trade intrastate in grain other than wheat to the extent that doing so promotes an objective of the board, barley and oats are expressly excluded. These grains are marketed by the Australian Barley Board. The Wheat Marketing Bill 1989 also makes provision for the continued collection in South Australia of a voluntary research levy. The Bill provides that all moneys collected by this voluntary levy must be expended in South Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. By the definition of 'grain', barley and oats are excluded from the functions and powers conferred on the Australian Wheat Board under the measure.

Clause 4 provides that the Australian Wheat Board is to have the following functions in addition to those conferred on it under the Wheat Marketing Act 1989 of the Commonwealth:

(a) to trade in wheat and wheat products;

(b) to make arrangements for the growing of wheat for the purpose of trading in wheat;
(c) to promote, fund or undertake research into matters related to the marketing of wheat or wheat products;
(d) to trade in grain (other than wheat) and grain products to the extent that trading in such grain or grain products will promote an object of the board under the Commonwealth Act;
(e) to make arrangements for the growing of grain (other than wheat) for the purposes of trading in such grain; and
(f) such other functions as are conferred on the board by a law of the State.

With the qualification that barley and oats are excluded, the clause confers on the board functions in relation to intrastate trade that correspond to its functions under the Commonwealth Act in relation to interstate and export trade.

Clause 5 confers on the board powers in relation to its functions under this measure that correspond to its powers under the Commonwealth Act. Clause 6 authorises the Commonwealth Minister to give directions to the board in relation to its functions and powers under this measure in the same way as is authorised under the Commonwealth Act. Clause 7 provides for delegation by the board.

Clause 8 provides for the application of certain provisions of the Commonwealth Act, namely, those in Divisions 2 and 3 of Part 4 of the Commonwealth Act (relating to purchase of wheat by the board, wheat pools and payments for wheat) and section 74 of that Act (conferring further powers on the board relating to futures contracts and other financial transactions).

Clause 9 corresponds to provisions found in section 20 of the present Wheat Marketing Act 1984. The clause provides that payment by the board in good faith of money payable under the measure to the person appearing to the board to be entitled to the money discharges the board from further liability. The clause also provides that an assignment of money payable by the board in respect of wheat purchased by it is voidable by the board unless it is a registered crop lien, in which case, it is so voidable unless written notice of registration of the lien has been given to the board by the holder of the lien.

Clause 10 corresponds to section 22a of the present Wheat Marketing Act and continues the current scheme for deductions to be made from the price payable for wheat sold in the State and for payment of that money into the Wheat Research Trust Fund under the Rural Industries Research Act 1985 of the Commonwealth. As under the current provisions, money so deducted may be claimed back from the Minister by the person otherwise entitled to it by serving notice in writing on the Minister during March in the season in which the wheat was harvested. Provision is made to allow purchasers, or purchases, of wheat of a class prescribed by regulation to be excluded from the application of those provisions. It is intended that smaller wheat transactions will be exempted by that means. Clause 11 provides for the repeal of the present Wheat Marketing Act 1984 and contains necessary transitional provisions.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 133.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition supports the legislation, but sees the need to propose amendments in due course. If the Minister intends introducing and circulating amendments during the debate, that might shorten the whole procedure, but I am unaware whether the Government intends to make a contribution in the Committee stage.

The Bill was presented in the form of a second reading speech which came down supposedly as a machinery series of amendments. In fact, that was far from the case. We should look briefly at the nature of the committee—the Anaesthetic Mortality Committee. The committee investigates anaesthetic incidents to a greater depth and in a more technical way than the system of courts, medical boards, etc., and the resultant information is translated into general recommendations about procedures, equipment, etc.

Its reports contribute to increased safety in anaesthesia. Its proceedings and reports were absolutely protected under legislation up to 1987. Its effectiveness rests on total confidence of people who volunteer information in confidentiality, non-compellability and non-admissibility.

The committee worked well until 1987, when the old Health Act was repealed and new wordings came in with regard to this committee, and it was placed in the Health Commission Act. The new wording provided for confidentiality, but was silent about compellability and admissibility. The second reading speech implies that this committee has had some concerns about this aspect and has continued to be concerned. These simple machinery amendments are meant to tidy up those concerns.

The committee has not met for two years because of its concern about the points that it has raised. Having reached the stage of the Government bringing down a Bill, the amendments that it has put into that Bill still do not cover the committee's concerns. I do not know what advice the Minister takes in his department, but the advice that I have read which has come from QCs, is that the Government's proposed amendments, the Bill having been brought in after two years of inactivity on the part of the committee, goes no way to satisfying the committee's concerns.

This question of being able to compel evidence to be given is one of real concern to the committee, and the committee cannot function if those provisions are not catered for. I refer to the original Health Act of 1975, clause 146s (2) of which provided:

> Evidence of such information or report shall not be admissible in any action or proceeding before any court, tribunal, board, agency or person except with the approval of the Governor by Order in Council. A witness in such an action or proceeding shall not be compellable without his consent . . .

It continues. Those two expressions 'shall not be admissible in any action' and 'shall not be compellable' were dropped from the wording of the new Health Commission Act. I can see from the amendment that was circulated that the Government perhaps had access to this Queen's Counsel opinion, but it has now done something to firm up the concerns of the committee and it is my advice that most of their concerns are probably satisfied. I did not have the opportunity to read this document before it was tabled, but I will read it in depth and obtain further advice, and perhaps we can look at it when the matter reaches another place.

The quick advice I have received is that it is probably now satisfactory, but it is not good enough for this Parliament to have a committee that does not meet for two years because of inactivity on the part of the Government in getting these legal matters sorted out and when the Government eventually brings the Bill into this House it tries to write it off as a machinery Bill when, in fact, it has some dramatic drafting flaws, in the opinion of QCs.

As members know, we rely entirely on the drafting as it comes in. We assume that the drafting has been done correctly, and it is not good to find that a Bill has been brought in with a set of amendments which do not satisfy what the report that goes with the Bill says they will cover. The Opposition will be supporting that amendment when we reach the Committee stage, but I hope we can learn a lesson from this; that, when Bills come in here and the amendments are drafted, we can get them correct first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health): I cannot let that last comment pass without saying something. Let me make it perfectly clear that the Government has fully consulted about this matter with the people concerned. When this legislation was introduced into this House, we were reliably informed by the people to whom the honourable member refers that they were happy with the drafting. They then, apparently, went off and obtained a further opinion and, in light of that further opinion, have pressed for the amendment which I have had circulated in my name. I am not sure what we do when the experts disagree on these technical legal matters. If I were to follow strictly the advice normally available to Government, I should still maintain that the amendment I am circulating is not necessary, that people are jumping at shadows.

However, it does no damage to the legislation to be further amending it in the way I will canvass in Committee, therefore it seems not unreasonable that I should urge this amendment on the House. Let me make perfectly clear (although I cannot find the exact words in my second reading explanation, but I know I made it clear in that explanation) that, when the legislation was introduced into the Assembly, so far as we were concerned everyone had been fully consulted and at that stage were happy with the drafting. We cannot be held accountable if people want to change their minds at a later date. We are held accountable only if we are so insensitive as not to consider further the advice placed before us.

We are so sensitive that we have considered that advice and agreed, out of an abundance of caution and to keep everyone happy, and because it does no damage to the legislation, that we should urge the further amendment on the Committee at the appropriate time. Other than that, I thank the honourable member for his indication that he and his colleagues will support the legislation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Proposed new clause 2a—'By-laws.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 1, after line 15—Insert new clause as follows:

By-laws

2a. Section 38 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (1) of subsection (1) the following paragraph:

(1a) to prohibit or regulate the smoking of tobacco;.

This is part of a package of two amendments which I believe are a desirable addition to the Bill. The present situation is that, while the consumption of tobacco is regulated quite strictly in a number of areas (such as public transport), there are practical, legal, and symbolic reasons why that should be the case in the hospitals and health institutions of South Australia. I am sure that anyone who has followed the debate would be aware of those reasons.

To give hospital boards the opportunity to ensure that they have a legally reliable and practical basis on which to regulate or prohibit, if they feel it necessary, I believe that this amendment will put that on the correct legal footing and give the hospital boards and Health Commission institutions the appropriate powers to ensure that the consumption of tobacco is regulated on their property in a way which will benefit the public and the patients.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government supports these amendments and urges them on the Committee. They have been a matter of discussion for some time. Indeed, in a friendly way I was lobbied about them in an operating theatre one Thursday evening when I was at the Royal Adelaide Hospital visiting casualty. It may be that the Government would have incorporated such an amendment at a later date, but we are happy to cooperate with the honourable member in shifting that time limit forward. I express the concern that hospitals will be sensitive in the way in which they administer the powers now being made available to them through this amendment, and I have no doubt that that will be the case.

Mr OSWALD: The Opposition has no problems with this amendment, as it is eminently sensible to give hospital boards this sort of jurisdiction. We are moving into the prohibition of cigarette smoking under certain conditions. I recall writing to the Royal Adelaide Hospital a couple of years ago about a situation where a smoking area had been provided in the lobby outside the tuberculosis ward. That was quite ludicrous. People with chest problems were picking up the smoke as it came in from the lobby area near the ward. It is sensible and I am quite happy to support it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I support the amendment and would like to say how pleased I am to see it supported by all Parties. Nine years ago, when I was Minister of Health and trying to achieve this through hospital boards, such support could not have been obtained from the House of Assembly on a bipartisan basis. I well remember my concern that hospitals were not at that stage exercising the example that is so important—and I recall that the worst offenders were psychiatric hospitals. There seemed to be a belief prevalent at that time that one of the most effective ways in which a psychiatric patient's nerves could be soothed by a nurse was through the offering of a cigarette. We have come a long way in nine years, and I am very pleased to see it.

New clause inserted.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'By-laws.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 1, lines 23 to 27—Strike out all the words in this clause and substitute:

Section 57aa of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out paragraph *(j)* of subsection (1) and substituting the following paragraph:

(j) to prohibit disorderly or offensive behaviour within the health centre or the grounds of the health centre and to provide for the removal of persons guilty of disorderly or offensive behaviour;

and

(b) by inserting after paragraph (1) of subsection (1) the following paragraph:

(1a) to prohibit or regulate the smoking of tobacco;

This is the second part of the amendment to complete the process. It is technically in the same vein as the first amendment, so I will not repeat my argument. It simply ensures that it extends across the whole range of Health Commission institutions and instrumentalities, and I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government supports the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Disclosure of confidential information for certain purposes.'

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

Page 2, after line 24—Insert new subsection as follows:

(4a) A person must not, when appearing as a witness in any proceedings before a court, tribunal or board, be asked, and, if asked, is not required to answer, any question directed at obtaining confidential information obtained by that person directly or indirectly as a result of a disclosure made pursuant to this section and any such information volunteered by such a person is not admissible in any proceedings.

In part, I canvassed the gravamen of this amendment in my second reading explanation. It seeks to further clarify the provisions of the Bill. The Government is not convinced that these provisions are necessary. However, we have been advised in the past few days that the anaesthetists have obtained further legal advice which indicates a view that the amendments as drafted are not as watertight as the anaesthetists would wish. Obviously we are all working towards the same end, that is, to restore confidence in the confidentiality of material supplied to the anaesthetic mortality committee so its important work can resume. It is in such a spirit of cooperation I urge this amendment on all members.

Mr OSWALD: The Opposition supports the amendment, but I will make a few comments. The Minister said, first, that he was not convinced that this amendment is necessary; and, secondly, that members of the anaesthetic committee might be jumping at shadows. I guess it comes down to the point I made earlier—and I have some sympathy for the Minister—that, if one receives legal advice, you are locked into it in all good faith until such time as someone else gives you more qualified legal advice. In this case, the Minister keeps coming back to the point that the committee was jumping at shadows and he is not absolutely convinced that the new amendment is necessary, which is really saying he is still happy with the old legal advice.

I am not sure whether the Minister obtained advice from a QC. As a member of Parliament, I have difficulty sometimes when I receive advice, and I tend to listen to advice from many people. When there are several varying opinions, I cast around and take the most senior advice possible. In this case, I read the Government's initial amendments and thought they sounded okay—they read fairly logically—but I am not a lawyer. However, when I read the QC's opinion, I tended towards it because it seemed more logical. I am surprised that the Minister keeps coming back to the point that the original advice is probably quite sound and he is putting up this new amendment only to placate the members of the committee.

I will put on the record a couple of extracts from that QC's opinion, and it is someone whom I am advised specialises in this area of legal/medical opinions. He states:

When this legislation was first enacted in section 146s of the Health Act, subsection (2) included the words:

Evidence of such information or report shall not be admissible in any action or proceeding before any court, tribunal, board, agency or person except with the approval of the Governor by order in council.

As I understand it, [a member from another place] proposed amendment is to include words to the above effect. Certainly I recommend an amendment to that effect, because the law is that evidence illegally obtained is not, for that reason alone, inadmissible. It can be admitted.

Another part of the opinion states:

Clearly, therefore, without an express prohibition such as appeared in the old section 146s, a court may receive such evidence.

When a QC provides an opinion, I can understand the Minister's saying, 'We had better draft up another amendment to make sure we have covered that contingency.' I do not think this Chamber is the place to argue the point over varying opinions. We should perhaps tend to the more senior legal opinion. I do not want to be disrespectful to the drafter of the original legislation because in law—and this is certainly the case in my field—there are always experts who differ in their opinions. I am pleased that the Government is amending the legislation in this way. If that placates the anaesthetic mortality committee and makes it happy, I am also happy. With those words, I support the amendment.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Without wanting to drag this on too much longer, my advice comes from a QC as well, and who are we groundlings to judge between QCs? But there you are—I thank the honourable member for his support.

Mr OSWALD: With that extra advice, I guess I must rethink some of my earlier statements. The point is still relevant that the Government has seen fit to put in this extra amendment. We are pleased from that point of view. The committee has not met for two years. Perhaps it will start meeting again and become an effective committee within the whole area of the health industry.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 547.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill, which has three main purposes. First, it increases community awareness and understanding of multiculturalism. That purpose is reflected in the decision to include the word 'Multicultural' in the title of the legislation which will become the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act.

A further thrust of that role is to ensure that the commission plays an effective part in the advancement of multiculturalism and ethnic affairs through the programs of Government agencies. To give effect to those two goals the Bill enlarges the commission by increasing its membership and allows for separation of the roles of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Deputies will be appointed from the members, whose number will be increased from 11 to 15. The second reading explanation indicates that the increase is to allow additional contributions from perspectives such as economic development, employment and training. No doubt it will also allow further ethnic diversity in the composition of the commission.

Since the legislation was established in 1980 under the ministry of the Hon. Murray Hill there have been considerable changes and advances for the better in the development of our understanding of multiculturalism and the practical implementation of the concept. When reading the original Act I was struck, as I have been in other areas, notably the arts, at the foresight of Murray Hill as Minister of Ethnic Affairs in introducing a piece of legislation which no doubt aroused certain cynicism in some quarters, based on the belief that one could not legislate for attitudes.

The fact is that legislation is an expression of attitudes and, to some extent, a determinant of attitudes, which is why the Opposition welcomes this further reinforcement of the importance of multiculturalism and its acceptance in South Australia. The word is relatively new and there has been considerable debate in the past couple of years about its meaning and its benefits. The word is defined in the Bill and it is worth reading that definition into the record, as follows:

'multiculturalism' means policies and practices that recognise and respond to the ethnic diversity of the South Australian com-

munity and have as their primary objects the creation of conditions under which all groups and members of the community may—

(a) live and work together harmoniously;

(b) fully and effectively participate in, and employ their skills and talents for the benefit of, the economic, social and cultural life of the community;

and

(c) maintain and give expression to their distinctive cultural heritages.

The economic effect of multiculturalism on Australia has been well documented, and it is primarily for economic reasons that migrants have been encouraged to come to Australia. The changing ethnic mix of our migrant population gives us reason to stop and think from time to time, particularly in recent years, with the quite dramatic shift from migrants of European origin to migrants of South-East Asian, Arab and South American origin. That gives rise to debate which, as history has shown, can be quite vehement but invariably, as history has also shown, settles down to a tolerant and practical acceptance of our cultural diversity.

This was superbly expressed in an interview that appeared in a September issue of the University of Adelaide's newsletter *Lumin*. A few weeks ago my attention was drawn to this article in which Mr Andrew Taylor, Chairman, Department of English, Adelaide University, interviewed Mr Dmytro Pavlychko, Head of the Taras Shevchenko Ukranian Language Society and Secretary of the Ukranian Writers Association, who was in Australia as a guest of the Australian-Ukranian Professional and Business Association. Mr Pavlychko paid a tribute to Australia and Australians which is worth of reading into the wider record of *Hansard*, because it is a matter of considerable pride. The last question in the interview by Mr Taylor was:

Finally, is there anything we haven't covered that you would like to talk about?

The reply states:

Multiculturalism. I'm about to leave Australia soon and I'm reflecting on what I've seen. The first thing I should tell you should be about your policy of multiculturalism. It seems to have been accepted in Australia. You understand what it means more than I do. It is the respect that seems to be extended to the languages and the cultures of other people; when I leave Australia that will be my deepest impression. And it's about this experience that I wish to speak, in that land—

that land being the Soviet Union and particularly the Ukraine—

where up until now there has been such a falsely advertised internationalism. Despite the fact that Australia has never put itself forward as a champion of internationalism, I see here exactly the highest humanist principles which belong within a multicultural nation.

I was very touched when I read that, and I felt that it needed wider currency. Earlier in the interview Mr Pavlychko was asked about his championship of the Ukranian language. His answer demonstrates to us what perhaps should be self-evident, but it needs reinforcing strongly, particularly when we see moves which indicate a prejudice against maintaining the language of migrants in their new home country. Mr Pavlychko states:

Language is not only a method of communicating. Language is the life-blood of every nation. It's a system of philosophical imagery, it's metaphorical, illustrative thinking. Where a language disappears, there you have the disappearance also of the national structure and the national spirit. The death of a language is the death of its people.

The way these sentiments are expressed—and I share them—indicates the value of the amending Bill and its provisions, which include enlarging the commission's functions so that it can assist in the development of strategies designed to ensure that multicultural and language policies are incorporated as an integral part of wider social and economic development policies.

In saying that, I do not want in any way to diminish the great importance of English as the official national language of Australia and of the unifying effect of a common language for one nation which is what we are. The unifying effect of English is indisputable. The respect for the English language must be upheld and promoted, as must be respect for the individual national languages of the ethnic groups and the cultures which are not only embodied but also permanently recorded through the medium of language.

The Opposition will have some questions in Committee because, whilst we support the thrust of the Bill, the second reading explanation is somewhat ambiguous in respect of the position of Chairman, which has been changed from a full-time appointment to a part-time appointment. We want to know whether the Government intends to continue the appointment of the existing Chairman on a full-time basis. We note that, whilst the Government has included in the legislation a representative of the United Trades and Labor Council in preference to and at the exclusion of a representative of other groups—there will no doubt be debate about that within the various migrant communities—the size of the commission has been enlarged but no alteration has been made to the size of the quorum of five members.

If a full 15 members are appointed, only one-third of them can make decisions binding on the whole commission. Various questions are to be answered, but generally we support the broad thrust of the Bill and commend the commission, its Chairman and its members for their very effective work over the past nine years. We believe that the commission is one of the effective unifying forces in South Australia, as well as being a coordinating force and advocate for the role and rights of ethnic communities, their languages and their culture.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I support the Bill, which provides for an expansion in the role of the Ethnic Affairs Commission. An expanded role is needed because, since the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission Act was proclaimed in 1980, we have seen an increasing awareness of the vital contribution of migrants and different cultures to our community. It was said by the Minister in introducing these amendments that in the past 40 years immigration has accounted for half Australia's population growth, so that immigrants and their children constitute 40 per cent of Australia's present population.

I am pleased that the proposed amendments we are considering today include a new definition of 'multiculturalism' and an alteration to the title of the commission as well as revising its functions to reflect the new emphasis on multiculturalism. As I understand it, these amendments will help the commission to better promote community understanding and awareness of multiculturalism and how it contributes to the richness of our community and to the greatness of our nation.

I also put on record my appreciation of the role of the Ethnic Affairs Commission in this State, and in particular its Chairman and members in trying to promote a better understanding of the importance of cultural diversity in our State. These amendments deserve bipartisan support, because multiculturalism should be bigger than Party politics. All of us should be grateful that any breaches in bipartisanship have now healed, because we realise that any endorsement of racism can only gouge deep divisons in our community.

We all remember the campaigns of one British MP, Enoch Powell, in the 1960s which helped polarise a nation and which gave hatred, bigotry and ignorance a thin veneer of

respectability. That campaign led to violence, fear, division and turmoil—exactly the things the Ethnic Affairs Commission in this State strives to avoid and overcome. In 1968 in the United States the Governor of Alabama, George Wallace, embarked on a campaign for the Presidency which again sought to galvanise prejudice and hatred into a political force. In 1989, after the bitterness of 1988, multiculturalism must again be given the support of all major Parties.

I support the comments made by the member for Coles. If we cannot eliminate racism, we must leave racism and bigotry where it belongs—on the far-flung reaches of our society in groups that attract only the support of the warped and the disturbed. Like the Minister, I represent part of Salisbury, which has a strong ethnically diverse mix, and every day and week in the Minister's electorate office and in mine we see people from different lands making an outstanding contribution to our community. I think of people from the British Isles who came here in the 1950s and 1960s to build our cars and our defence industry. I think of the Dutch people I know in Salisbury who came here to work in the 1960s in our electronics industries and the Italian people who, over the years, came from Calabria and Campania to work in small manufacturing and to set up small businesses. They work 15 or 16 hours a day to give their children a better chance in life and still have time to contribute to sport and their churches.

I think of the Greek people I know in our community of Salisbury who came to work in our market gardens and other industries and who spend enormous amounts of time toiling under difficult conditions whilst still finding time for the church; they could show us all the meaning of 'family'. I think also of the people who did not choose Australia as their home but were forced to flee tyranny and oppression in Vietnam and Cambodia. I know of young kids at the Karrendi Primary School, Parafield, whose uncles, aunts and grandparents were tortured and killed by Pol Pot. I think of their parents who can teach us the meaning of hard work.

It should be acknowledged that the decision to migrate, is a difficult one. I know from my own experience that the decision to leave family, friends and culture, as well as language in many cases, to build another life is an extremely difficult decision. Often it is a leap into the unknown. There are pitfalls and problems of immigration still not fully recognised as well as opportunities and successes to be gained.

This Parliament is in itself a testimony to multiculturalism. Eleven members of Parliament in this place and another place were born in other nations—in Holland, England (north and south), New Zealand, South Africa and Italy. I hope that will continue. It is very important that we as representatives of our community fully represent it. It is important that we have members of Parliament who come from different cultural backgrounds and were born in different nations. I certainly hope that we will see more. How marvellous it would be if at some stage in the not too distant future we could welcome people of Aboriginal background into this Parliament. What an amazing step forward that would be.

We should remember, in supporting this Bill, that other members of Parliament who do not come from other countries also make a tremendous contribution to multiculturalism. I refer to the former Minister of Ethnic Affairs, the present Attorney-General, Chris Sumner, who went out of his way to learn a new language fluently and who periodically goes back to Italy to refresh it so that he can contribute and learn from a different culture. I think also of the present Minister of Ethnic Affairs who has learnt Spanish and makes a contribution to that community in this State. The member for Hartley has also learnt another language. It is important to recognise that some members of Parliament go out of their way to work closely with our ethnic communities at different levels to ensure that multiculturalism is respected and becomes part of the Australian way of life.

Mario Feleppa of the Legislative Council spends countless hours working with people from the Italian community. He is prepared to travel great distances to help Italian people with problems in different parts of the State, people who do not have the confidence or language capability to approach other members of Parliament. He has helped out in my electorate of Salisbury.

I also know that one of the English born members of Parliament in the other place, the Hon. George Weatherill, spends a lot of time working with ethnic communities, including the Spanish community. I am pleased, too, that the maximum number of members of the commission is being increased from 11 to 15 to allow additional contributions from perspectives such as economic development, employment, training and migration. As both a Government backbencher and a double migrant—someone who was born in one country and raised in another before coming to Australia—I urge support for this Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I thank the members for Briggs and Coles for the contributions they have made this afternoon. We are here debating a very important piece of legislation, indeed, a leading piece of legislation for this country, because we are introducing a number of fundamental developments into the legislative framework for ethnic affairs in South Australia. First, we are building into legislation in Australia, for the first time, a definition of 'multiculturalism' which, in itself, is significant, especially in the light of the very divisive debates that took place in 1988.

Secondly, and more importantly, we are spreading the emphasis of the work of the commission and of the administrative unit supporting the commission, recognising that its charter is now a multicultural charter as well as one of ethnic affairs. People may ask, 'What is the difference?' Some important issues need to be addressed separately within each of those areas.

I am certain that all right thinking Australians would now accept that we are a strong, united, multicultural Australia. Some have suggested that those adjectives are contradictory: they are not. In fact, to work against a multicultural Australia—to strive for some monoculturalism in this country—would not give us the strength and unity that this country needs to develop into the future. Multiculturalism is important and it should be embodied in legislation, as it is in the Bill, which it is hoped will pass through all stages of this Parliament.

Ethnic affairs covers some other areas. As has been pointed out in the debate this afternoon, demographically this country represents people from many diverse origins. I, myself, am a migrant to this country. Many members of our community are migrants from many diverse heritages and traditions. Particular issues affect settlement patterns when migrants arrive. Sadly, there have been examples of discrimination against people from different backgrounds as they have come to this country. There have been important issues of ethnic affairs, namely, the particular needs of communities within the country that have had to be addressed.

We cannot tolerate in the 1980s—and we should never have tolerated—the practices of discrimination and of putting down that have taken place against new settlers in this

country. The fact that we have retained in the title of this legislation the term 'ethnic affairs' is to recognise that there are still issues that need to be addressed within the makeup of our community. For example, areas of discrimination still exist in employment practices. There are still areas of discrimination—they may not be overt, they may be covert or unintentional but, nevertheless, the end product shows that somehow or other a number of people in our community are not being given a fair chance to participate with all their skills. The issue of overseas qualifications is a very telling point in that regard.

This State was the first in the country to establish a unit for overseas qualifications within the appropriate body responsible for ethnic affairs. That unit which was established in 1987, will, through the budget brought down by the Premier recently, be expanded significantly in this financial year, as it should be for the important reasons of social justice and of economic benefit to this country. For too long in the past we have asked those who have settled in this country to be somehow apologetic about the skills they bring to this nation. We have asked them to feel that they should be ashamed of the education or training they have received in their country of origin and to accept our attempts to downplay and devalue the skills they bring. Of course, we know all too well of the great many stories of people who are not able to practise their skills in this country because we would not let them do so. In doing that we committed two grave injustices. First, we committed a grave social injustice to those individuals who are not able to express their talents. Secondly, of course, we did a grave injustice to the economy of this country.

As has been pointed out in the debate earlier this afternoon, most settlers have come to this country for economic reasons—for an economic benefit to themselves certainly, but nevertheless for an economic benefit to this nation. This country has grown strong on migration and yet, everytime we choose not to let people practise their skills to the best of their ability we are doing ourselves a great economic injustice. The upgrading of the Overseas Qualifications Unit in the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the establishment of a board are exciting initiatives that will help us ensure that those grave injustices of the past are not perpetuated in the future.

Among the many important elements that we are building into this legislation is an economic focus. As I have said, it has been correctly identified that the majority of migrants who have come to this country have done so for economic reasons. As a country, we have benefited from that, yet we still do not make maximum use of that fact. If one looks at the countries of origin of many Australians today, one will not find that that necessarily reflects our investment or trade patterns. One example that I often use—but it is by no means the only example—is Italy, which now has the fourth strongest economy in Western Europe. Italy is not a significant player in investment in Australia or in trade with Australia. However, as we well know, many Australians are of either direct Italian birth or descent. We have overlooked great economic opportunities there.

This legislation now builds in a recognition that a multicultural society has not only important social and cultural aspects but also important economic aspects, and we should be looking to pursue and develop that area. Indeed, an example that I have cited recently is my decision to grant admittedly a relatively small amount of money to the Italian Chamber of Commerce and Industry so that it can act as an advisory service for Australian business, particularly South Australian business, and for Italian business wanting to build more links between our two countries.

I am very pleased to see that Dr Paolo Nocella and other members of the chamber have taken up that invitation and are now offering that service, so that we can see the development of more trade and investment between our countries and use the skills and economic opportunities provided by those Australians of Italian origin, in order to achieve a further strengthening of economic ties between our two countries. I am looking forward to seeing that initiative developed by other communities. I have already suggested to a number of communities with whom I have spoken that they, too, should look to develop similar proposals so that we can see more and more of these attempts to open up economic, trade and investment links with other parts of the world, especially where we have significant representation of those communities within Australia.

The social areas, as I have said, are very important indeed, and a great many issues still need to be addressed. I mentioned a few of them a moment ago. I draw the attention of the House to another area that still needs more attention than we as a country are currently giving. We, as a State Government, are certainly looking at what can be done in this area. I refer to the ethnic aged. A number of Australians who were born overseas are now growing older and, for some, as they grow older, there are difficulties associated with living in a country whose language is not the language of their birth. We have a number of people who are, for example, needing support—more than they received in previous years—of members of their own community who speak their own language.

We do not have adequate nursing home support for such situations. Certainly there are some. The Italian and Greek communities have realised the urgency of the issue, and individual members and groups of these communities have been providing such support services. Other communities have sought to do the same, but have not had the numbers or financial strength to be able to do that for the older members of their community as their needs grow. That has been partly addressed by the appointment of a position to the Commissioner for the Aged particularly looking at the needs of the ethnic aged, but more needs to be done, and the role of the Commonwealth Government becomes important. We are committed to pursuing those areas.

There are other social areas as well. Language education in our schools has a number of facets. One is clearly a social facet, and there are economic and other wider cultural facets. I recall, when the Hon. Murray Hill brought the initial legislation before this Parliament, that I, as a member of the Opposition, had the great pleasure of supporting the principles of that legislation. As I did, I noted the significant growth in language services that were available in our education system over the period of the 1970s. That situation is even more exciting now at the end of the 1980s. We now see many more language opportunities available than there were 10 years ago. A good rate of improvement in the 1970s has been followed by further development in the 1980s. We are well on track to seeing the provision of languages for all primary schoolchildren by 1995. Again, we are amongst the leaders in the nation in that regard.

We also have improvements in the provision of languages within the secondary area. I mention particularly not only the individual subjects being offered in individual schools, but the establishment of the South Australian secondary school of languages which provides the opportunity for secondary language study for students who cannot get those studies in their own high schools. Following on a similar Victorian initiative, this has proved very successful.

These are some of the areas in which we have seen exciting developments. Cultural developments again become

very important. A multicultural Australia is a strong Australia in a cultural sense. We know of significant work over the years. The Multicultural Arts Trust, under the chair of Basil Taliangis and members of that trust, has done some very exciting things in promoting multiculturalism in the artistic sense. The Multicultural Artworkers Network has likewise been actively promoting a multicultural artistic Australian ambience.

Some might ask why it should be necessary in the arts to have such bodies. Ever since the start of European settlement, we have had a diverse settlement pattern of people coming from many areas, not from a monocultural area but from a multicultural area. Let us look not only at the English speaking settlers from the United Kingdom, but the Celtic language speaking settlers from the United Kingdom, the German settlers, the Sorbish settlers and the Spanish settlers. The first Spanish settlers in South Australia came to cart ore from Wallaroo. There were also the Italian fishers in the late part of the last century. One can go on and on.

Yet, that did not reflect itself in a number of the cultural expressions of our society. We still remained essentially in a cultural and artistic sense a monocultural society. It has needed some catalysing of the situation, provided by the Multicultural Arts Trust and other organisations supporting multiculturalism in art. We are talking about a dynamic cultural expression, not a static one. We do not want communities in South Australia simply maintaining cultural traditions of the past without change when in their countries of origin these cultures have changed dramatically.

It is important to preserve heritage, but to that must be added a dynamic perspective of culture, and we see that growing in the Australian context. I made the point to a Vietnamese conference focusing on education last year that, if we had true multiculturalism in place in the various countries of the world, we ought to be seeing within Australia, Canada and Indo-China, with respect to those of Vietnamese origin, Vietnamese artistic expressions in Australia which were somehow different from those in Canada and in Vietnam itself because artistic and cultural experiences are functions of a number of aspects in our lives. There are our origins for a start, but also our current experience, and that would be different for our geography for a Vietnamese descendant within Australia from one within Canada and from one who stayed in Vietnam.

We are starting to see that in South Australia, and I am pleased with some of the things which are happening in that regard. It has been a long haul, but I want to pay tribute to Dr André Deszery and the work that he has done to promote an Australian context to multiculturalism in literature, for example, over the years. His pioneering work as a multicultural publisher, long before it was popular with many for this to be so, gave the opportunity for a number of Australians from different backgrounds to write in English and in their languages of origin and to give an artistic expression that was derived partly from their origins and partly from their being Australians today.

We are seeing further examples of that. One of the research projects undertaken at Flinders University in the School of Spanish was by Luis Sanchez, who has written a novel '*Fuegos Fatuos*', based upon the experience of a writer of Spanish origins, now an Australian, and derived from his Australian experience.

One can come up with other examples like the work of Lawrence Chan in art and calligraphy. Lawrence Chan, who is a medical specialist of considerable note in his country of origin, Hong Kong, now lives in Australia. He is a noted neurologist, but he is also a distinguished artist. He has come to Australia and is expressing his art here. He is keen to build artistic bridges between Hong Kong, China and Australia. What one sees in his work are the great origins of the without bones style of Chinese painting—the CAE style of painting—being modified or adapted by his experience within Australia. It has been my practice to send Chinese new year cards to a number of people, and he has provided a particular painting in the without bones style of Chinese art on an Australian theme—a bottlebrush theme. It is a beautiful marriage of diverse traditions.

I have also been pleased to see other examples, many of which are private examples. I had the great honour to see the beautiful calligraphy derived from a Japanese tradition with Chinese influences by Mrs Wake, the wife of the head of Mitsubishi in South Australia. Here, again, is an expression in art that is blending into a multicultural Australia. The aim of this legislation is to give a legislative framework for that kind of starting point to continue. I also appreciate the work of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, its chairman, Michael Schulz, the members and staff of the commission.

The work they have done has been fundamental in achieving the success we have had, as has been the work of my predecessors. The Hon. Chris Sumner is noted internationally for his work in this area, and the tradition I follow by being his successor becomes particularly hard because of his notable achievements. The work that his predecessor, the Hon. Murray Hill, has done also needs to be noted. Fundamental to all of that has been the commitment of the communities of South Australia not to build a divisive community but to build a united multicultural community.

To the heads of all those communities and to their members I give my particular thanks as Minister of Ethnic Affairs for the work they have done. The legislation is quite simple in its explanation and fundamental in its intent: the definition of multiculturalism; the change of name of the Commission to the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission; the establishment of an administrative unit giving proper status to this work within Government, the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs; and the reaching out into wider areas, looking at all areas of Government and into the wider areas of economic development.

We have seen the expansion of the number of members of the commission from 11 to 15, so that we will be able to put other members on that commission. Amongst those we are looking to include are people with significant economic experience in trade or investment within Australia. The member for Coles, particularly, during the debate today asked about the inclusion of a nominee of the UTLC. That carries on from the principal Act, clause 6 (1) *(c)* of which provides:

> A person proposed for nomination as a member of the commission from the UTLC.

That is in the original legislation. Mr Michael Schulz is the full-time Chairman and will continue in that position. In the fullness of time, when a new Chairman needs to be appointed, we are left with the flexibility of determining whether or not the position should continue as a full-time position. However, it is important that it remain a full-time position under Michael Schulz, because the full-time Chairman has an important set of functions which will be added to the important functions to be addressed by a full-time Chief Executive Officer. Once those functions achieve what needs to be achieved, the possibility exists later, within the ambit of the legislation, to see the Chair become a part-time position.

I thank members for their contributions to this debate, and hope that the Bill swiftly passes through this place and the other place, because I believe that all South Australians

deserve this legislation. Many with whom I have spoken are excited by this Government initiative, and are looking forward eagerly to the legislation being proclaimed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Constitution of Commission.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister indicated flexibility in regard to the position of the present Chairman of the commission, which would place the commission on a similar basis to most other commissions and boards. Does the Minister intend to appoint an additional six members to the commission immediately? Does he foresee the number being increased from 11 to 15 or does he see some flexibility in the system perpetually?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is possible. The words are 'not more than 15'. The purpose was to give some flexibility, and it is possible that in the first instance we will not appoint four more but might just appoint three; I am not certain. It depends on several things. One is the mix obtained within the makeup of the entire commission, and the various types of expertise that need to be built in. That depends upon the people who are available and willing to serve on a commission at any one time.

There is merit in trying to keep a position vacant, and we may well try to do that because, at some subsequent time, some person may become available who was not previously available, or the need may arise for someone with particular expertise, and under this provision we will have the flexibility to do that without waiting for the retirement of an existing member. We deliberately made it 'up to' to allow us that degree of flexibility. It is probable that we will not appoint all 15 immediately, but would leave the last one or more positions in abeyance for the time being.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—'Remuneration of members.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I take it that no remuneration is paid to members of the commission, other than the full-time Chairman. Will the Minister clarify that, and say what salary the Minister envisages being paid to the part-time commissioners and deputies?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I assume they will be paid within present hallmarks. The principal Act refers to a deputy and a member. No deputies are in fact appointed, so that area of the Act has not been acted upon.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Does the Minister intend with the amending clause to appoint deputies and, if so, will those deputies be paid on the basis of a meeting fee, regardless of whether they are required?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is not intended to appoint deputies at this stage. One reason for not having deputies is to try to encourage people to attend the commission in their own right and, therefore, to encourage an ongoing interaction of the same group of people. Also, since the commission is almost entirely made up of individuals, not of representatives, it becomes more difficult to consider a deputy kind of situation, so at this stage it is not the intention to proceed on the area of deputies. I will have to take further advice from the OGMB on the existing practice with respect to deputies sitting in, but presumably they receive sitting fees for the meetings they attend rather than an annual quantum which would be available to other members of the commission.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—'Meetings of Commission, etc.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This clause makes no reference to a quorum. Therefore, present section 9 (5) of the original Act stands. If it is proposed to appoint an additional four members, it seems unsatisfactory to leave the quorum number unaltered. Even though it is impossible, given the flexibility that the Minister intends should be exercised, to identify a numerical quorum, surely a formula should be devised for a quorum which ensures that we do not allow a position to arise where, of a total of 15 part-time Commissioners, only five members make decisions which are binding on the commission.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It has not been the advice of the commission and those with experience in the way the commission has operated over the past nine years that there needed to be a change in this, given the attendance practices of the past, and that is the reason no change is proposed. However, I remain indifferent as to whether or not it should be five or more. If this matter is of enough significance, and members wish to move an amendment in another place to increase it to seven, I would certainly be agreeable. We do not have time at the moment to suddenly introduce it, but I will indicate my agreement to my colleague in another place if that is the way members opposite want to proceed. The experience of the commission is that it has not had to rely on quorum provisions to maintain its operations because there has been a commitment by those who have been appointed over the time to see a good attendance at meetings of the commission.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I simply make the observation that it is unusual for the law to rely on experience and practice. We could be smitten with any kind of epidemic that struck down members of the commission, notwithstanding their goodwill and good intentions. I can say here and now that my colleagues in another place will definitely move an amendment to ensure that that situation cannot arise and that the quorum provisions are adjusted to take into account the increased size of the commission.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Functions of commission.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In view of the new functions and objectives of the commission, will the Minister advise the Committee what increases have been made in the 1989-90 budget allocation to the commission to take account of the extensive expansion of the commission's new role and functions and to enable it to discharge those responsibilities effectively?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Putting aside the financial implications of the centralising of the language services, which was separately answered during the Estimates Committee, and dealing only with the impact of this legislation (including the creation of the administrative unit and the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer), the financial implications in this financial year are estimated at about $130 000 with a full financial year effect of $210 000.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—'Delegation.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister explain how this new clause will work and what is the difference between the present arrangements and the proposed arrangements?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am advised that the difference reflects the change from the Public Service Act to the Government Management and Employment Act, and this is required to comply with that change.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 and 15), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Yesterday in this House I was surprised and bitterly disappointed with the attack launched upon Mr Alan Burlock. In my time in this Parliament I have heard many things said and there have been many inferences and imputations against members of Parliament but, when it comes to attacking a person for some cheap, political attempt to gain power, that is the pits—the absolute pits! I said in this place only a fortnight ago that the member for Victoria aspires to be the future Leader of the Liberal Party. There has been a meeting in my electorate in an attempt to unload the Leader of the Opposition straight after the State election. That is fact, and I am glad that the member for Victoria has just entered the Chamber so I can say it to his face and not behind his back.

I remember some time ago the member for Bragg asking a question of the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. Kym Mayes) about some Grand Prix tickets and the bucketing he got thereafter. He said—and it was well known around the corridors—that he was set up by Olsen. I suggest that the member—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I should have said the Leader of the Opposition.

An honourable member: And he never apologised!

Mr HAMILTON: And he never apologised, as I am reminded by my colleague. In my view one of two things occurred yesterday in respect of the member for Victoria; either he was set up by his Leader or else he debased himself in a manner that I never expected to see in this Parliament. It was a gutless and spineless attack on a person whom he knows has absolutely no opportunity to defend himself in this place. I do not mind if someone has a dig at me, because I can respond. I am big enough and ugly enough to respond. However, to have a go at a member of the public is really the pits.

Is it any wonder that the member for Victoria last night, as I am told by my colleagues, backed off at a million miles an hour—spineless, with a yellow streak down his back—when he was confronted on national television. He had to twist, turn and scream all around the place, because he was not prepared. The member for Victoria knows what the question implied. I have known many members opposite, and one thing I will say for the member for Victoria is that he is not a fool. He would have known when he got the question what the implications of it were: they were clear and specific. What relation did the questions have to the marina itself—absolutely zilch. The member for Victoria knows that. It was an outrageous and cowardly attack on a member of the public. The member for Victoria has gone down miles in my estimation. He was a man whom I respected, amongst a number of other members opposite.

I know that the member for Victoria is tough and mean, and there is nothing wrong with being like that in this place: one needs to be tough and mean to get into this Parliament. The member for Victoria attacked a person who cannot defend himself and, as a result, he has gone down a million miles in my estimation. This is the member who, when he becomes Leader of the Opposition or perhaps a future Premier, aspires to attract interstate and overseas developers and business people to South Australia. If I was an interstate or overseas developer or businessman, I would be aware (as people often are through international communications and high technology) of the situation and what the Opposition is trying to do to the State. This attack will be long remembered. The member for Victoria can laugh, but what was said last night and again today in the *Advertiser* will haunt the member for Victoria, because there will be few people in this Parliament apart from some members on his own side who will trust him.

The member for Victoria has shown his willingness to go to any lengths to get cheap political gain in order to discredit the Bannon Government. That is what this is all about. I will call a spade a spade. I do not believe that the member for Victoria was set up—he has too much intelligence for that. Instead, he is part of a concerted campaign by the Liberal Party to discredit the Premier. That is what it is all about—the Premier's popularity in the community.

An honourable member: Sleaze bag tactics.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, sleaze bag tactics. I was reminded, and I have a good memory when I am agitated, of the cartoon in the *Sunday Mail* of 6 November 1988 which I dug out from the Parliamentary Library. The caption is probably one of the most apt that I have seen in a long time. The first part of the cartoon shows the Leader of the Opposition with a big grin all over his face lifting up a rubbish bin lid, and the next scene shows the lid over the top of his head, with muck and stuff sliding down all over him. The caption says 'The lidder of the Opposition'. That aptly describes the sort of tactics that we have come to witness in this Parliament. I believe that this is a sad reflection on the Opposition because, as my Premier pointed out today (and I agree with him), it is a reflection not only on members opposite—it is a reflection on all members of Parliament and the institution of Parliament itself. It is a sad case indeed. However, for the member for Victoria, who is not an unintelligent man and who knew exactly what he was about—

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed. It makes it even more disgusting, as my colleague reminds me. It is not the first time. For the record, I point out that sometime last year there was an attack on the Premier's home with a window being smashed; and then the member for Unley was attacked about Grand Prix tickets; and there is the manner in which the member for Murray-Mallee recently attacked the Minister of Correctional Services in this Parliament. That was unbelievable. That reflection had nothing to do with the debate, yet there was a reflection on the manner in which my colleague conducted his personal life.

There are many stories that members from both sides could relate. I am not going to debase myself or the institution of this Parliament by relating those stories of which many of us are aware. Members on both sides hear many personal anecdotes about colleagues opposite. Certainly, I am not one without sin, and I suggest that many members opposite are in a similar situation. Following the actions of the member for Victoria, I am now ashamed to say that I am from the South-East. Many good people come from the South-East, they are South-East born and bred. The member for Victoria has discredited his electorate and his position in this place, as well as the people he represents.

The member for Victoria perpetrated a shameful act on Mr Burlock and, if he had any semblance of decency, he

should have some desire to atone. I know that the honourable member will not say anything outside this place—he knows of the implications—but at least he could make some announcement in Parliament. I emphasise that this was one of the most gutless, spineless and disgusting acts that I have seen in the 10 years that I have been in this place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity in the grievance debate this evening to speak on two or three matters, the first being one of particular concern not only to members on this side of the House but to all members in this Chamber and Parliament. I refer to problems associated with the domestic pilots dispute. This is a Federal issue, but a number of opportunities have been taken by members on this side of the House to draw to the attention of, in particular, the Premier the concern being expressed by business people who rely heavily on domestic flights in South Australia to ensure that their businesses can be maintained. Regrettably we have had very little response from the Premier or the Government generally and I recognise that the Premier is the Federal President of the ALP. I hope that he would make the appropriate representation to the Prime Minister and to those who can have an input into decision making in this area.

I refer to correspondence I received from the proprietors of Mount Lofty House. I am sure that the majority of members in this place would know of that establishment. Many have had the opportunity to attend functions or have dinner in that excellent venue. The proprietors have done a marvellous job in rebuilding what was a ruin as a result of the Ash Wednesday bushfires. It has now been built up to a world class country estate. I received a letter from the proprietors, Mr and Mrs Sands. It is important that all members of the House be aware of the problems being faced by these people. The letter states:

> We are writing to express our growing concern at the inability of the Federal Government to find a workable solution to the above dispute [the pilots dispute]. As a member of the tourism and hospitality industry we are facing severe financial burdens as the result of this major dispute. Members of our industry are 'hurting' to varying degrees but, as an upmarket accommodation and meeting venue, interstate and international visitors account for 75 per cent of our business and of these 90 per cent would travel to Adelaide by air. Unfortunately, for us in the current situation the majority of our guests fall into Mr Keating's questionable 'only 27 per cent of Australia's population use domestic airlines and that not many tourists travel by air domestically'.
>
> We have had 296 confirmed room nights cancelled as the direct result of the dispute. As a small property of less than 30 rooms this amounts to a loss of significant occupancy and represents in dollar terms a conservative estimate of $120 000. This does not take into account the additional bookings that were never made because of the dispute.
>
> Although a relatively small property we employ 58 people on a full-time and casual basis. The dispute has had a direct impact on the amount of work available. To date we have had to retrench only one employee, our full-time groundsman, but our casual staffing has been cut drastically. In July, a traditionally poor month for our industry, 30 hours housekeeping time a day was rostered; in the past five weeks, five to seven hours a day is common. Mount Lofty House employed one full-time and three part-time gardening staff, the equivalent of two full-time workers; we have cut this back to 12 hours per week and would like to reduce this further but with spring growth the garden demands some maintenance program. For the first time in just under four years of business we have closed our dining room doors. Just one indication of the flow on into other areas of employment that our slump in occupancy has had is the reduction to a third of the usual amount of our monthly account with a local limousine company.
>
> We have not sat back and watched our business fall down around us; we have taken positive action to alleviate the disastrous impact of the dispute on our business. We have had added expense at a time when we can least afford it to try and offset the effect of the drastic drop in our interstate and international market. We have increased our sales staff by one full-time worker and our sales staff are literally walking the streets of Adelaide doorknocking and toting for business at the local level. For the first time in nearly four years of operation we have resorted to the radio and print media advertising directed at the local market.
>
> We are attempting to entice business from Victoria as it is the only State where it is feasible for our market to arrive by road. Our sales staff are undertaking a promotional visit to Melbourne on the 19th of this month and we are having weekly contact with Tourism South Australia's office in Melbourne and the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria. In these and all other current promotions we have cut our room rates by half in order to expand our target market group.
>
> Without doubt there has been long-term damage to our overseas markets. Tourism South Australia has advised that once the dispute has been settled they will undertake an overseas marketing program in conjunction with the Australian Tourism Commission, to rescue Australia's vital tourism industry. As there is, even according to the South Australian Minister of Tourism, 'no immediate end in sight', we are in no position to wait for the benefits of such a program. Our problems are immediate. We are individuals with all our life savings invested in this industry, we have no large financial backing and if the dispute continues this Australian Tourism Award winner is unlikely to survive to gain benefit from any such program.
>
> We urge that every effort be made to pressure the Federal Government to seeking an immediate resolution of the dispute. The Federal Government's claim that their stance has been made in the national interest 'wears thin' as not everyone is paying equally. That it is in the interest of every Australian is no consolation to the small percentage of us that are paying. Any assistance that you can offer in alleviating this situation will be greatly appreciated.

I believe that that letter sets out very clearly the massive problems that are being experienced by people in this position. I reiterate what I said before in calling for the Premier of this State to make every effort and, certainly, to take a greater role than has been the case in the past, to try to alleviate this problem and to assist people who are being so seriously affected by the dispute.

In the couple of minutes that I have left, I want to refer to a matter of a very different nature. I have received correspondence on this from the Director-General of the Department of Environment and Planning, forwarded on behalf of the Minister. I am pleased that the Minister for Environment and Planning is presently in the House. Some little time back I received a letter from a constituent of mine, who states:

> Recently I have heard some remarkably alarming statistics regarding the distribution of the cane toad throughout Australia. Unless there is a larger grant (I think something of the order of 150 000 paltry dollars is currently being spent) to enable Mike Tyler to speed up his research then we face grave environmental problems. Are you aware for instance that it is spreading at about 60 kilometres per year, that it can reach a size of two kilograms in weight, that it is decimating the population of a lot of our small native animals and if it gets into Kakadu National Park it will be curtains for that fragile ecosystem?
>
> Are you also aware that currently South Australia is free from this introduced menace but it will probably be brought down the Darling and therefore Murray River when in flood . . .
>
> I sincerely hope that you will take up this cause in Parliament and see that something is done posthaste.

I wrote to the Minister about the matter, and received the following letter from the Director-General of the Department of Environment and Planning:

> With reference to your letter . . .
>
> The South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service has made contribution of $1 000 per year through CONCOM to support a program of cane toad research in Queensland and the Northern Territory . . .

That is a very paltry sum for South Australia to be spending. My time in this debate is about to run out, so at this stage I simply urge the Minister and the Government to consider giving greater support in this area. I know that Mike Tyler is doing everything he can, and we are very fortunate to have such a knowledgeable person in South Australia. The matter is very serious and I urge the Minister to provide substantially more funding to enable something to be done.

Mr **ROBERTSON (Bright):** I want to take up an argument advanced by my colleague the member for Albert Park some 10 minutes ago. Whilst the member for Albert Park spent 10 minutes pointing out the shortcomings of the Opposition, there was not one peep of interjection from members opposite. The three erstwhile contenders for the leadership on the front bench over there sat silent, mute, throughout the whole thing, shamed into absolute silence. The points made by the member for Albert Park deserve to be taken up further.

I want to spend some time this afternoon looking at the role that the Opposition has played over the marina development at Westcliff and the way that members opposite have set about knocking every initiative that has been taken in this State to bring investment and jobs to South Australia. Going back over the history of the marina development, we see that the Leader of the Opposition fully supported the concept. He was fulsome in his support at the recent Adelaide boat show. When he went down to the site several weeks later he backed away from that, waved his arms around and gesticulated in a general southerly direction, suggesting that perhaps it ought to be moved somewhere else. This was because he could see that the writing was on the wall and that some local people were not particularly amused at the prospect of having a marina there.

Following that we had three weeks of character assassination in this place and in the Adelaide media, culminating yesterday in an implied accusation of murder levelled against one of the developers by the member for Victoria. I note that in this morning's paper we were told that the member for Victoria (chastened by his Leader no doubt) supports not only the project but also the location and that he wants the developer to proceed with the project as soon as possible.

Without going into great detail, if we look at a similar track record in relation to the marina issue, it is quite clear that the Opposition attitude has been continually to knock it. Every time someone wants to bring money and jobs into this State, the idea is to knock it. In relation to Marineland, the Opposition has been willing to put on the public record extracts of evidence given in good faith to the Industries Development Committee and, in the process, debase the institution of Parliament and breach agreements made by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the Liberal Party that that would not happen.

It is quite clear that evidence given to the IDC is confidential and people appear before the committee on that understanding. The Opposition is quite happy to get its hands on the transcript and to leak minutes of evidence to embarrass witnesses. It has also shown that it is not averse to using transcripts of taped telephone conversations between developers and officers of various State Government departments. It has even produced supposed notes of those conversations, when it did not have tapes to back them up, the notes purporting to illustrate the authenticity of the conversations. The Opposition will stoop to any means or measures to ensure that money and investment does not come to this State. It has even shown disturbing signs of racism in its haste to stop anything from outside coming into this State.

We have seen opposition to the concept of a multifunction polis, presumably on the ground that it will form a so-called 'Japanese ghetto'. We have heard the Opposition oppose any semblance of Asian land investment in this country and we have had persistent moves from those opposite to establish a foreign ownership register in South Australia with the specific purpose, I dare say, of excluding Asian money and investment. The Opposition has made every effort to oppose the Zhen Yun proposal and, presumably, its reasons for doing so are other than economic, as well. The Opposition will go to any lengths to knock and denigrate any form of public or private initiative that is taken to bring industry and investment into this State.

Investors must run the gauntlet of abuse and vilification and have their private life minutely examined and plastered across the newspapers. The time has come to put a stop to that. The time has come to put a stop to the smear tactics because the truth is that, by any objective criteria, South Australia is doing very well indeed. I refer members to some of the economic statistics given in this House over the past couple of days. In relation to employment figures, South Australia was the only State in Australia to record a fall in unemployment during the month of September. The seasonally adjusted figures for unemployment dropped from 6.6 per cent in August to 6.2 per cent in September—South Australia was the only State to record that sort of drop. This means that South Australia's unemployment rate has now dropped by two full percentage points in the past 12 months and we now have the second lowest rate in the country.

The September drop was also against the national trend that saw unemployment, in Australia as a whole, grow from 5.5 per cent of the work force in August to 6.1 per cent in September. In South Australia, youth unemployment dropped from 24.5 per cent in September of last year to 18.1 per cent in September of this year—a reduction of 6.4 per cent. In the past 12 months, the unemployment rate has fallen from 8.2 per cent to 6.2 per cent—a reduction of two full percentage points. They are good economic figures and there are more to come. Total employment growth in South Australia in September 1989 was 33 600 people, or 5.3 per cent higher than it was a year ago. They are very good economic figures.

Labour force participation is another key economic indicator. South Australia's participation rate increased by 0.5 per cent to September—up to 62.8 per cent of the work force. The number of persons in the labour force rose by 6 500, or 6.9 per cent. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate placed South Australia in the second best position. Tasmania's seasonally adjusted figure was 9.1 per cent of the work force; Queensland, 7.0 per cent; Western Australia, 6.7 per cent and South Australia, by contrast, had a figure of 6.2 per cent, which compares with Victoria which had the lowest figure of 4.9 per cent. South Australia is showing the way. By every set of economic criteria, South Australia is winning, going ahead and turning the corner.

Let us look at economic indicators and leave unemployment and employment figures. Economic indicators are the indicators of growth. South Australia's gross State product grew by almost 32 per cent in real terms in the decade to last year, and that compares with a national growth in the same league, but South Australia's population growth was somewhat lower. As at June 1987, South Australia's public sector net debt per capita was the second lowest of the six States. The book value of net debt at June 1987 in South Australia was $2 860 per capita, and that is the second lowest of all the States. As regards business investment, in the first three quarters of 1988-89, private new capital expenditure was 116 per cent higher in current dollar terms than during the corresponding period of 1980-81, and in real terms that is a 32 per cent rise. Manufacturing employment rose by 4.2 per cent from 1987-88 to 1988-89.

As regards overseas trade, South Australia is a net exporter of goods. Compared with the rest of the country, South Australian exports totalled $2 441 million during 1988-89, whilst imports totalled $1.8 billion. That was a considerable

balance in our favour. In the five years 1983-84 to 1988-89, total South Australian exports grew by 49 per cent, which is an average of 8.3 per cent per year.

Those are excellent figures, and I suggest that they illustrate that the Opposition flies in the face of reality in knocking this State. I am sick and tired of hearing the bickering and the knocking. It is time to forget the name calling and to concentrate on policies and performance. We should think about what is best for South Australia and South Australians. The Opposition should forget about its political agenda and stop knocking every proposal that is put forward. It should stop trying to smear everyone who might possibly bring jobs and investment to this State. Above all, it should stop the racism and the abuse and let those who want to make a contribution to this State's economy go ahead and make it. Members opposite should get serious about this State's future and consider the future of its people.

Motion carried.

At 5.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, 17 October at 2 p.m.