HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 29 March 1990

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

WASTE RECYCLING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House, recognising the current lack of incentives being provided by the Government to ensure a successful waste recycling industry, calls on the Premier to implement, as a matter of urgency, his pre-election promise to develop a commercial waste recycling industry which will make South Australia 'the major recycling centre of Australia'.

When I gave notice of this motion, I referred to the Premier's election promise as a recycled election promise. I note that that reference has been removed from the wording of the motion, but that is exactly what it is, and I will explain a little later why that is the case. These days, how many times do we hear people talk about the importance of recycling. I suggest that it is discussed by the majority of families on an ongoing basis, and it is a subject of particular importance to our young people. Those of us who have families are very aware of the importance that is placed on the subject of recycling. That has come about as a result of a number of things.

There is general enthusiasm in the community, which should be capitalised on, with regard to the matter and importance of recycling. In addition, members would be aware of the extent of recent media coverage on this subject, particularly some excellent television programs. They have brought about increased enthusiasm on the part of the majority of people in the community and, as I said, it would be a great pity if we were not able to capitalise on that enthusiasm and help make it work. Those of us with families have been encouraged by our children, particularly, to place different recyclable items into various containers. In our house, a number of separate bins have been placed in an appropriate place for containers, bottles, papers, plastics, etc.

Unfortunately, things are not going as well as they should be although we have heard a lot from the Government for some time about the need for an appropriate recycling business in the State. That is not happening, and that is a great pity. Many of the schools in this State have contacted me in recent times expressing concern about the lack of opportunity for recycling to be continued.

I received a copy of a newsletter from one of our leading Adelaide schools recently about plastic recycling which states that unfortunately there is more disappointing news about the school's plastic recycling program. The second scheme in which the school had become involved had to be discontinued, as the recycling company that the school was working with had ceased to operate. The newsletter went on to say that, until recycling is viable for companies, the school will not be collecting any more plastics. A number of items in recent times have referred to the matter of the collection of plastics of a non-rigid nature, mainly plastic bags. Regrettably, it would seem that that whole project has fallen on hard times. We realise that the economics of the soft plastics collection, via the schools, has been very marginal, and the collection of rigid plastic items such as bottles is almost totally uneconomic.

Recently in my own electorate, reference was made in one of the local papers to the work that one of the Lions clubs is doing and has been doing very successfully over a period of time in assisting recycling in that area. However, I was concerned to read recently that the club president had indicated that a decision not to continue the paper collection had been made following a huge increase in the amount brought to the depot. The president went on to say that since other depots closed they have been receiving up to a tonne a day. With the small membership and heavy work commitments they cannot cope with it. That particular Lions club president went on to say how he hated to have to turn people away and to turn paper away but he indicated that the sheer amount of hard work involved and the small amount of money received from newsprint meant that it was no longer possible. He said that the increased amount of paper brought to the depot, which is in Bridgewater, had come from as far away as Summertown (another area in the Hills) and Mitcham, and that surely is a reflection of people's strong desire to recycle newspapers.

I am sure that all members have received a considerable amount of correspondence over a period of time, regarding the need for greater emphasis to be placed on recycling. I would like to refer to one letter that I have received where the writer makes reference to:

> ... well researched factual and hard-hitting documentaries on the destruction of the earth's resources and our gross apathy over fundamental issues, like wastage and littering and the changes which need to be made to redress the imbalance, and on the other [hand] we have overkill of the materials mentioned and methods used by a massive percentage of our population.

He goes on to say:

> This is compounded by the Governments of Australia giving lip service to the problem because, at the time of its showing, community awareness is heightened and the desire is present for change but lack of action and apathy then overshadow the good work done and people revert to their previous patterns. A growth industry is lost and the excessive waste continues.

As I said earlier, it is a great pity that that happens and that the enthusiasm in the community is not taken up. The writer goes on to refer to:

> ... the over-abuse of plastic containers, shopping bags and wrapping along with polystyrene trays and cups—

and he suggests that there is a need for a remedy to overcome some of these problems immediately. He suggests that:

> ... any person with the slightest pang on conscience for the environment will be as disgusted as [he is] over how bone lazy people have become and how the supermarkets, shops, tourist industry, fast food outlets and the plastics manufacturers have jumped on the bandwagon and thrust plastic [down the throats of the consumers].

He went on to refer to the South Australian situation and stated:

> Although Mr Bannon has announced plans for a large recycling depot within five years, unless our habits change, it may as well be 500 years, too much damage would have been done in that time period.

In this debate I will refer to considerable evidence, the hypocrisy of the Government in regard to many of the articles that have been released recently and community concern. However, because of a lack of time today, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision in relation to the remuneration of members of Parliament; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In October 1987 this House approved the principle that State parliamentarians' salaries should be tied to Federal parliamentarians' salaries. At that time there was discussion about whether our salaries should be tied to the salaries of public servants or whether we should follow other States, particularly the Eastern States, and tie State parliamentarians' salaries to a fixed amount below Federal parliamentarians' salaries.

Later, I introduced a Bill along similar lines to the one before us today but members, quite rightly, thought that they did not have enough time to think it through and decide what State parliamentarians' salaries should be.

There is no doubt that society does not accept that, on a ongoing basis, parliamentarians should decide their salaries. As the national economy is decided by our Federal parliamentary colleagues, it seems appropriate, especially since other States have moved in this fashion, that we move to tie our salaries to a fixed amount below the salaries of Federal parliamentarians.

This means that when Federal authorities consider the salaries of Federal parliamentarians they must also consider the effect that will have on the States and the overall economy of the country—and I am sure that those matters will be considered by the Federal authorities. The Senate, which is the States' House, can look at the rights and situations in the States and put a point of view. After I moved my 1987 Bill the share crisis arose and people said that it was not an appropriate time to consider parliamentarians' salaries or anything that looked like giving them an increase. Unfortunately, that is always the case. A point of view has never been put, even by those who have the public ear and eye, that there is an appropriate time to consider increasing parliamentarians' salaries.

The other problem we face is that when the tribunal, which is an independent body, brought down a decision in the past, there were all these forces at work which said, 'Well, it is too much', 'It is at the wrong time' or 'It shouldn't happen.' That also proved that that system was unsatisfactory. In the past, changes in Federal and State Parliaments occurring at different times created public confusion about who was receiving an increase and how much. In fact, the public generally believed that all parliamentarians—State and Federal—were receiving all of the increases if there were increases.

I have chosen to tie our system to the Victorian system, except that Victoria has tied its increase to $500 below the Federal parliamentary salary. The increase I have chosen to include in the Bill is $1 000 below the Federal parliamentary salary which is similar to the proposition I introduced previously. Also, I do not believe it is appropriate to try to tie it in one hit. For that reason, at the commencement of this legislation (if it is passed by Parliament) our salaries will move to 93 per cent of $1 000 below the Federal parliamentary salary; at 1 January next year it will move to 96.6 per cent below that figure; and then on 1 July 1991 it will be 100 per cent of $1 000 below the Federal parliamentary salary. That means that it will be a gradual process. I will not go through how our increases have been fairly small in recent years; if others want to do that, they may. However, there is no doubt that we have fallen behind to some degree.

The common factor was talked about quite a lot earlier when the question of what our salary should be tied to was floated, and no-one came up with a better idea than tying it to the Federal system. I have been asked who I have talked to about this. I have not approached this debate in that way. Since 1987-88 I have bounced ideas off people from most sides of politics inside and outside the House, and I have decided on this approach as the appropriate way to tackle the problem.

The concept of a salaries tribunal sounds good in theory, but it has not worked, and I think we all realise that. Also attached to the Bill will be a schedule of the salaries for Ministers of the Crown or other parliamentary officers—the Committee Chairman and members of the special committees that operate within the House. Again, that is approximately in line with the Victorian system for fixing parliamentary allowances, and I think that is an appropriate way to approach it.

All the other issues that I raised in the 1987 and 1988 debates are available for people to consider. There is no need for me to go through all of them, except to explain the Bill briefly clause by clause. The first clause is just the short title. The second clause provides for the Act to come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 defines 'basic salary' and picks up the staged implementation of bringing our salary to within 100 per cent of $1 000 below the Federal parliamentary salary, and also describes what a Commonwealth parliamentary salary is.

Clause 4 relates to the remuneration of members of Parliament: it explains what the basic salary is and the entitlement of members who hold office. That is really taken from the existing legislation and is available for people to peruse if they wish.

Clause 5 refers to the period for which remuneration is payable, for instance, in the event of a member being defeated at an election. Clause 6 provides the opportunity for the Governor to make regulations in relation to the Act.

I submit to the House that a 3.2 per cent increase at this stage, or whenever the Government proclaims the Bill (and I hope it will not be too far in the future if it is passed) is not a substantial increase. The argument that some will use is, 'What about if the Federal salaries are increased? Will you put more pressure on the Federal people to consider what they are doing because they have to consider what happens to the States at the same time?' I submit the Bill to the House for its approval. I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I indicate that the Government supports this Bill and does so for a number of reasons. Previously when the member for Davenport introduced a private member's Bill relating to salary increases, the Government said that that was the appropriate way to do it but that the time was not right. We agree with the concept that a phasing in over an 18-month period is the appropriate way to go. There has not been an increase in parliamentarians' salaries for some time and we have not yet received or considered the 3 per cent increase that some other people have received following the establishment of the last wage fixing principle some nine months ago. The first increase, which will be approximately 3.1 to 3.2 per cent, is in tune with that, and subsequent increases are in tune with the increases announced under the national wage case decision.

Further, as a Party we had a policy that there should be some linking of parliamentarians' salaries around Australia. When this Bill is finally passed, we will be joining Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria in a similar method of establishing our wages. I now seek leave to continue my remarks later because there are procedural matters that need to be considered to enable this Bill to pass this House.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

UNDERGROUND POWER LINES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House, recognising the need for a far greater priority to be given to the undergrounding of power lines, calls on the Minister of Mines and Energy to detail a comprehensive 20 year plan for the undergrounding of power lines in fire prone areas and, if such a plan has not been prepared, calls on him to instruct ETSA, as a matter of urgency, to prepare a plan for the Minister to bring before the House at the earliest opportunity.

A number of questions have been put before the Government on a number of occasions regarding this subject of undergrounding generally within South Australia. These questions relate to figures supplied by ETSA and other matters of general policy. The figures supplied by ETSA suggest that 92 per cent to 95 per cent of all new lots are now served by underground power. Since 1972, the bulk of subdivision extension work carried out in South Australia has been served by underground mains and services. We recognise that the services for the entire city of Elizabeth were undergrounded 33 years ago and parts of Springfield lines have been successfully undergrounded for some 40 years.

So, the question is, 'Why, despite recommendations of the ETSA commissioned Scott report and the Government commissioned Lewis report, and despite the fact that responsibility for 50 per cent of the recorded damages in the 1983 Ash Wednesday holocaust (which amounted to over $100 million in cash payouts alone, not to mention the human lives that were lost), was at law attributed to overhead powerlines, a serious program of upgrading the old—and, I suggest, lethal—power distribution system in the Mount Lofty Ranges has not been started?'

The House would be aware that recently I tabled a petition of some 2 000 signatures. This was the first stage of the petition which called on the Government to urgently consider the need for undergrounding of powerlines, particularly in fire prone areas of South Australia. The Electricity Trust of South Australia's commissioned Scott report of 1984 demonstrated clearly that ETSA's direct savings within eight years of undergrounding, from the saved cost of overhead lines maintenance, tree-lopping, insurance, car accidents with stobie poles etc., should enable the trust to pay about 50 per cent up-front of the cost of undergrounding.

Unfortunately, the Scott report tried to move the balance of capital cost onto local government through cost formulae, which were taken a stage further by the Lewis report in 1985. These cost formulae, albeit well-meaning, I suggest, were superficial grabs for a solution to ETSA's legal liability for fires caused by overhead lines; to the Government's moral responsibility in terms of a dangerous distribution system; and to emerging environmental and aesthetic concerns. I suggest that these cost formulae have successfully blocked undergrounding for those seven years.

If we look at the comparative costs of overhead versus underground distribution systems, we see that overhead installations cost about 50 per cent of the cost of underground installations. In relation to overhead maintenance, we are looking at about 12 per cent capital cost ongoing per annum, while the latest engineering reports state that the cost of underground maintenance is almost nil. So, if we look at the situation after eight years we see that the cost of the overhead line system (that is, installation plus maintenance) almost equals the cost of the underground line system. If we extend those figures over a 40 year period, we see that the overhead line system, extrapolating rising labour costs as per inflation, plus maintenance, accounts for 12 per cent of capital rising annually with 7 per cent inflation. Overall, that will total about 4 215 per cent of capital over 40 years. The underground line system, which has a conservative design life of 40 years without maintenance, by saving 4 215 per cent overhead maintenance costs, will in this period have paid for itself many times over.

I remind the House that when talking about maintenance we should recognise that the maintenance of overhead powerlines in the Mount Lofty Ranges is 16 times as expensive as on the plains of South Australia. The costs saved, or the profit made—whatever way we like to look at it—suggest that the Government would have the option, if it decided to work towards a genuine undergrounding policy, of reducing tariffs or increasing ETSA's percentage revenue contribution to the State Government—whichever is deemed to be appropriate. A number of issues need to be considered.

I realise that I will not have the time today to refer to many of these issues, but I will refer to them on another occasion. On that occasion, I will discuss the issue of salvage value in relation to the cost of pulling down existing overhead distribution systems. I will refer, at some length, to the cost of trenching that ETSA would put before us, as it has done on a number of occasions. That issue needs to be considered at length. I will also talk about insurance and legal indemnities in relation to this matter.

In conclusion, I refer to an editorial in the *Advertiser* of 22 March. I commend the editor of that newspaper on the editorial headed 'Death to the stobie pole'. I will read this editorial into *Hansard* because I think it says a lot about the situation. It states:

> To drive around the Adelaide hills in an ETSA van these days is almost to invite a lynching. Citizens are ropeable at the continued destruction of trees by the chainsaw vandalism of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Yesterday's agreement to save hundreds of trees at Morialta with an undergrounding program is hardly ETSA's salvation. This is but another precedent for undergrounding all power supplies throughout Adelaide, and for consigning to the history books the unspeakably ugly stobie pole. We pretend to be concerned about attracting tourists and businesses to a unique and gracious city. We pretend to want trees for oxygen, land care, pollution control, shade, birdlife and beauty. We pretend to care about our surroundings and our lifestyle.
>
> Yet ETSA, for all its occasional flourishes of fine rhetoric, seems to remain locked into the destructive thinking of the past—pollarding trees as the easy solution rather than developing the vision for a massive campaign of undergrounding power lines.
>
> To prove it can be done we have water and gas supplies underground. Most telephone links are now underground. New electricity mains go underground. The historic precinct of Port Adelaide has been converted.
>
> All wires must go from the skies that our trees may grow tall.
>
> We should be under no illusions; it will cost money. But if the State Government had the courage to tell us the costs—as energy users, as council ratepayers and as taxpayers—it might be surprised at how willing most of us are to pay for a better environment.

I heartily endorse those comments. I believe that those are the feelings of the majority of people in our community. Certainly, they are very strongly representative of the attitudes of people throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION BILL

The Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purpose mentioned in the Parliamentary Remuneration Bill 1990.

SOLAR ENERGY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I move:

That this House, recognising—

(a) the effects of atmospheric pollution by the burning of fossil fuels;

(b) the importance of reducing global warming by rapid reductions in emissions from power stations and motor vehicles; and

(c) that South Australia is one of the best places in the world to develop solar energy to commercial success,

calls on the Government to—

(a) allocate the necessary resources to identify the state of research and development of solar hydrogen elsewhere in Australia and the world;

(b) publicise information relating to the economic feasibility of proceeding with all possible speed to the solar hydrogen economy; and

(c) identify the progressive steps necessary for industry, commerce and Government to develop a comprehensive program to enable transition to the solar hydrogen economy.

The motion speaks for itself, because it argues (cogently, I believe) why we should be pulling out all stops to move as quickly as possible towards the solar hydrogen economy. In doing so, we must recognise the massive vested interests which will prevent this. Nevertheless, in the interests not only of the environment but also of our economy I believe it is essential that we move with all possible speed towards this end. I will speak briefly, since I want to put the arguments as succinctly as I can, and I hope that the motion can be responded to and voted upon by the end of this session.

The effects on the atmosphere of pollution from the burning of fossil fuels have been very well documented. Members would know that carbon dioxide is released whenever fuels are burnt in air. The extensive use of fossil fuels such as coal and oil for heating, cooking, lighting, electricity and transport has resulted in massive amounts of carbon dioxide being released into the atmosphere.

It is not only carbon dioxide but other gases including nitrous oxide, chlorofluorocarbons, methane and ozone that are having a combined effect, causing devastation of vegetation, devastation of the cities of the world, the eating away of ancient stone in buildings and effects upon human health, particularly of the human respiratory and dietary systems as a result of atmospheric pollution affecting the food chain. These things are well documented and, as the motion states, the House recognises those resulting factors.

The House also recognises the 'importance of reducing global warming by rapid reductions in emissions from power stations and motor vehicles.' An article in *Engineers Australia* of 15 December 1989 documented very well the effect of CO^2 emissions from power stations in Australia. The article states:

> Most of the present annual increase in CO^2 in the atmosphere is attributed to the burning of fossil fuels. In particular, the electricity generation industry worldwide is seen to contribute about 14 per cent to the greenhouse gases.

Australia is a relatively small contributor, and that may be a source of some consolation to us; but when we realise that Australia has one of the highest per capita levels of CO^2 emissions in the world, we must respond by taking positive action. It is no use our saying, 'Let us look to the great industrialised nations and to those nations where there are huge populations, such as India and China, and where there are vast herds of stock which contribute methane.' We must recognise that, person for person, man for man, woman for woman, Australia is one of the highest contributors to CO^2 emissions.

We generate $9 billion of export income from our coal industry, which is a major source of wealth and which indirectly employs about half a million people. I spoke earlier of vested interests resisting the introduction of new energy sources and economies. It is easy to see that the coal and natural gas industries have every reason to resist a transfer of policy emphasis from fossil fuels to new renewable sources of energy.

The greenhouse effect, which is one contributing factor over which there is considerable debate, is forcing us to recognise that our future depends on reducing energy consumption and ensuring that we turn to renewable sources of energy. It is important to recognise that, regardless of the accuracy or otherwise of the multitude of available greenhouse predictions, scientists agree that there is an environmental crisis—there is no disagreement on that basic fact—and that global warming is a major part of it. They also say that we need to act immediately, and I certainly agree that we can act immediately.

We cannot afford to wait until all the greenhouse predictions are put into one basket with agreement from all sides. That will not happen. Our industrial processes depend on energy. Until very recently in human history this had always been obtained from the sun in the form of warmth or from wind or water power. It is only since the industrial revolution, and not long before that, that we have dramatically changed our emphasis, and the effects of that have been dramatic.

The motion states 'that South Australia is one of the best places in the world to develop solar energy to commercial success.' That is a fact, and it is because of our climate. South Australia, as the driest State in the driest continent on earth, has more hours of sunshine than most places in the world, other than some of the southern states of the United States, North Africa and Saudi Arabia. However, unlike North Africa, we have a highly developed and developing technological expertise which has been or is being translated into areas such as computer processing, the aerospace industry and the submarine industry. There is no reason why that expertise should not be directed into the exploration and the development of solar energy.

If we look at solar hydrogen, upon which I propose to concentrate this morning, it is clear that the disciplines required for development of that process relate to mathematics, thermodynamics, meteorology, chemistry and physics rather than to the geological and geophysical sciences which traditionally have been used for the extraction of fossil fuels, but the fact is that we can do it and, if we had the will to do it, we would do it.

I therefore call on the Government to allocate the necessary resources to identify the state of research and development of solar hydrogen elsewhere in Australia and the world. I have already done that publicly and found, to my disgust and amazement, that the Minister of Mines and Energy ridiculed the idea, saying on the one hand that the Government could not afford the funds, which I estimate in the first instance to be the simple sum of $10 000 or $15 000, to send an open-minded scientist around the world to assess the present state of research and development. That is all we need—a basic summary of the available information. The Minister said that he wanted results from investment and research in a year or two—not in a year or 20. If ever I have heard a short-sighted response, that is it because, if we do not act in a year or two, we will be very sorry in a year or 20.

It is quite clear that many nations in the world are already investigating and making considerable progress in the investigation of solar energy. For example, Germany, in particular through the Mercedes Benz and Daimler companies, is investigating the development of solar hydrogen for fuel.

Germany is working in Saudi Arabia in order to pursue this goal and has had considerable success in this area thus far. Those companies are hard-headed companies—they will not pursue a goal that is so far in the distant future that it has no medium-term economic rewards.

In addition, if we work in alphabetical order, Argentina is investigating hydrogen energy systems. Austria is having a special look at air transport. Even in Australia, the Ford company has already conducted small engine tests with hydrogen at the University of Melbourne. A General-Motors vehicle has been tested by the Hydro Electric Commission of Tasmania and in Armidale there is testing for the most suitable hydride to use in vehicles and industry. Professor Malcolm Green of the University of New South Wales indicated, as recently as last month, the economic feasibility of hydrogen as a fuel.

In Canada, the Institute of Hydrogen Systems in Ontario is looking at hydrogen-fuelled cars. In Montreal hydrogen-fuelled commuter railway is under consideration and work is being done throughout the provinces. China is continuing research on hydrogen-fuelled engines and there is an extensive bibliography of Chinese research on hydrogen energy. The list goes on—Germany (which I have mentioned), India, Italy, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Poland, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States, where the Department of Energy has provided funding for many hydrogen projects, as has the Institute of Gas Technology and the Solar Energy Research Institute.

The USSR is testing vehicles using hydrogen and even Yugoslavia—a so-called backward Eastern Bloc country—is involved in hydrogen production. All I am suggesting and urging is that the Government allocate the necessary resources to find out where and how South Australia can benefit from this cumulative research and, having done so, I want the Government to publicise information relating to the economic feasibility of proceeding with all possible speed to the solar hydrogen economy. It is my opinion that the Government is very much dragging its feet, despite the undertaking, given in the Governor's speech opening Parliament, that energy planning was to be the subject of a Green Paper and public discussion. The annual report of the Office of Energy Planning for 1988-89 states, as the Government's goal, the following:

> The Government's overall goal for the energy sector is to ensure that South Australia has access to adequate supplies of energy at competitive prices to meet its future needs. The Government also aims to make maximum effective utilisation of the State's primary energy resources and to optimise economic benefits to the State from energy resources development.

There is not one mention of the environment, of the conservation of energy, or of the benefits of alternative forms of renewable energy—not a single mention—and that is supposed to be the Government's goal.

I conclude by referring to the importance of identifying the progressive steps necessary for industry, commerce and Government to develop a comprehensive program and of indicating the economic feasibility of doing this. I refer to a paper entitled 'Hydrogen: The Ultimate Fuel and Energy Carrier', delivered by Gustav P. Dinga of Concordia College, Moorhead (USA), which was received for publication on 22 February 1989. That paper commenced by stating:

> The private and national research organisations of many countries are establishing a foundation for the hydrogen economy. This research is focused on hydrogen production, storage, transmission, and application to various energy-consuming sectors.

That is what we need to know about. What are the programs and what are the steps? The paper continues:

> It is up to us (teachers, scientists, students, industrialists) to learn about this fuel and apply its use to the world transportation and energy systems.

The fact is, and the conclusion of this paper states:

> When all factors (production costs, utilisation efficiencies, environmental effects, effective cost, conservation and economics) are taken into account in comparing SNG (synthetic natural gas), Syn-Gas (Synthetic gaseline) and hygrogen—

we are now talking about transport fuels as distinct from power generation—

> hydrogen comes on top on all counts. Hydrogen—

and here we are talking about solar hydrogen—

> has the highest utilisation efficiency, is the most compatible fuel with the biosphere, the most cost effective, the most energy conserving, the most resource conserving, the least capital intensive, and the most inflation-fighting fuel.

The research that I have been able to uncover speaks for itself. It is time the Government spoke for the State, for conservation and for cost benefits that will come to South Australia as a result of what I am certain is our capacity to provide solar hydrogen not only to Australia but to the greater part of the world.

Mr HAMILTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIME PREVENTION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

> That this House acknowledges that crime is a phenomenon affecting the entire community and that a concerted community response is necessary to confront crime and effect a long-term increase in neighbourhood security and safety and, accordingly, the House welcomes the $10 million community based crime prevention strategy developed by the Government in cooperation with the South Australian Police Force and indicates its full support for the work of the South Australian Coalition Against Crime.

In speaking to my motion, I believe it is important to note what the Government said in the lead-up to the last State election. I would like to quote in part some of the promises made by the Bannon Government, as follows:

> A future Bannon Labor Government will:
>
> Pursue a crime prevention strategy including the provision of $10 million of new money over five years for prevention programs and local initiatives.
>
> In summary the crime prevention strategy will include:
>
> $10 million to be set aside specifically for crime prevention over the next five years; the formation of a broad-based Coalition Against Crime—comprising Neighbourhood Watch, community leaders, and representatives of local government, business and unions, church and youth organisations—to advise Government on crime prevention issues. The group will be chaired by the Premier.

Indeed, the Government has already proceeded to invite different groups to participate in this Coalition Against Crime, many of the people concerned coming from diverse community groups, including the Safety House Association; the Director of Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, Department for Community Welfare; the Police Commissioner; the Director, Courts Services Department; the Ethnic Affairs Commission's Mr Michael Schultz; Ray Whitrod, Chairperson, Victims of Crime Service; Mr B. Lovegrove, the Police Association; Ms J. Wood, S.A. Council of Churches, Mr D. Henderson, State Manager, Commercial Union Insurance Company, who we all know is involved with the Neighbourhood Watch Program; Justice E.P. Mullighan, Q.C.; Ms Ruby Hammond, Head of Aboriginal Issues, Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody; Judge A. Wilson, S.A. Branch, Crime Prevention Council; the South Australian representative of the South Australian Council on Ageing, Ms C. Barnett, Chairperson, Community and Neighbourhood Houses Association; Ms R. Craddock, Vice-President, Neighbourhood Watch, Medindie; and the Reverend C. Dredge, President, Council of Churches. Many other community representatives are also members of the

coalition, and I refer members to page 556 of *Hansard* (20 March) to see the comprehensive list. One of the disappointing aspects of the manifesto put out by the Premier relates to the following statement:

A future Bannon Labor Government will welcome the participation of the Leader of the Opposition on the Coalition Against Crime.

To this date, despite all the Leader of the Opposition's huffing and puffing and carrying on about crime in this State, the Leader has not as yet—or had not as at 20 March—indicated his willingness to participate in the Coalition Against Crime.

I question the Leader's sincerity in terms of his concerns about law and order and crime in this State when he has not yet responded to the Premier's request for him to be involved in the Coalition Against Crime. Given that the Leader has not responded, I say that he is hypocritical and should either put up or shut up on this issue. If the Leader is as concerned as his Party suggests, he should indicate to the Premier his willingness to serve on the Coalition Against Crime. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1006.)

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I indicate to the House that, as this is a Bill involving appropriation of money from Consolidated Revenue, there is a need for amendment to the Bill to provide for that appropriation. I have had an amendment printed for that purpose and I will move that in Committee. At this stage I urge support for the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

New clause 5a—'Payment of remuneration.'

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

Page 2, after line 29—Insert new clause as follows:

5a. A member of Parliament is entitled to be paid the remuneration fixed by or under this Act and this section is sufficient authority for the payment from the Consolidated Account of the amounts required for that purpose.

New clause inserted.

Clause 6, schedule and title passed.

MAREEBA COMPLEX

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

That this House strongly opposes the concept of stand-alone abortion clinics in South Australia, demands that the Government halts its plans to establish the Pregnancy Advisory Centre at the Mareeba Complex and believes that pregnancy terminations should only be undertaken within the confines of nominated hospitals.

(Continued from 1 March. Page 514.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert:

(a) acknowledges—

(i) that under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act abortions can be lawful if performed in a prescribed hospital before the foetus is capable of being born alive;

(ii) that the 1969 amendment on abortion presumes that a foetus is incapable of being born alive before 28 weeks gestation;

(iii) that the proposal for a pregnancy advisory centre including an abortion clinic at the Mareeba site at Belmore Terrace, Woodville, does not change the law;

(b) believes it was the spirit and intention of the 1969 amendment that legal abortions take place only in the mainstream of medicine, that is, in general hospitals, and that each hospital proposing to provide abortions first be prescribed by regulations tabled in this House; and

(c) recognises that Mareeba is an outpost clinic of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Legalised abortion is strongly supported by many South Australians. Tens of thousands of women in our State have had abortions in the 20 years since the law of abortion was codified and liberalised by the 1969 amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Even before 1969, many doctors were willing to perform abortions. Since the 1969 law, public opinion has more strongly favoured legalised abortion because law often has a leading role in changing public opinion.

If abortions were regarded by the criminal law as unlawful homicides, as the Call to Australia Party advocates, doctors would continue to perform first trimester abortions and no jury of 12 men and women would convict them. In the current climate of opinion, no politician would gain popularity by opposing abortion.

Abortion on demand is now a modern convenience. The easy path for politicians is to avoid the topic and, if cornered, speak in platitudes. Those activists who advocate abortion on demand argue that women who are poor and cannot afford children need abortion. They argue that abortion is a private matter in which the law should not interfere. They argue that women should have absolute control of their fertility, and that, without that control, women will never be as free as men.

These arguments for equality, freedom and opportunity are honourable. Feminists are right to complain about the sexual irresponsibility of men, sexual exploitation, economic disadvantage and hypocrisy. That leaves just one question: what about the foetus? Many people tell me that I am not allowed to ask that question. Even gentle, intelligent supporters of the current abortion law regard the question as treason if asked by someone in the Left, liberal spectrum of politics. They say that to ask the question is to treat women as mere vessels for the baby, but it is plain to me that pregnant women are vessels for their babies; it is just that they are much more than vessels.

What about the foetus? At about five months, a foetus can survive if born. He or she reacts sharply to pain, has sleeping habits and can be comforted by the mother's voice. The mother can already sense the baby's movement. I shall describe how such a well-developed and sentient being is killed in the kind of abortion clinic planned for Mareeba. It is much different from abortion in the first trimester. It is called dilatation and evacuation. The mother is given a general anaesthetic. Her cervix is opened. The doctor then uses metal implements to tear the baby into pieces small enough to be removed. A pile of recognisable limbs, torso and head accumulates in the theatre.

Mr Becker: Is this necessary?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, that description is necessary. Is it any wonder that hospital staff wake at night thinking about it? Is it any wonder that local staff cannot be found for these late abortions? Is it any wonder that the abortion on demand lobby is desperate to censor any film revealing the procedure to the public? Some of the foetus' attributes and abilities at this stage of pregnancy have only been discovered by medical research in the 20 years since the 1969 law. The most important advance was ultrasound which, since 1976, has allowed mothers to see their babies in the womb.

Yet we still have a 20-year-old law that presumes, wrongly, that foetuses are not capable of being born alive until seven months gestation. The Deputy Leader has told us his motion will not change the law. Well, the law is wrong. It ought to be changed, and the Deputy Leader's motion does not help. With advances in chorionic villus sampling, namely, sampling of the placenta, parents are now able to discover the sex of their baby from the 11th week. I am told that some parents who are disappointed by the sex request a late abortion. The Mareeba proposal will grant those parents their wish.

In July last year Cabinet decided to establish a free-standing clinic for late abortions in the former Mareeba Babies' Home, at Belmore Terrace, Woodville. Hundreds of people in the Woodville area were born at Mareeba and many more have had their children saved there. Mareeba is important to Woodville. The Health Commission network must think that the people of Woodville have no memory or ought to dispense with it in the interests of the commission's progressive and ideologically sound initiatives. The commission insists on calling the Mareeba proposal a pregnancy advisory centre. It is undoubtedly that. It is also undoubtedly a late abortion clinic but one would be howled down if one called it an abortion clinic. Orwellian language is a strong point of the network at the Health Commission: a network that has spent much working time and taxpayers' money in lobbying me by phone, fax and mail in the past month.

Woodville is, of course, in the electorate I have the honour to represent. An earlier proposal for an abortion clinic in North Adelaide was quickly withdrawn. I believe North Adelaide is in another electorate, the name of which escapes me just at this moment. Mareeba is an outpost of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is several blocks across the railway and Port Road. The Health Commission sought a clinic away from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because nurses and doctors at that hospital were refusing to perform late abortions except for strict medical reasons. They refused because the foetuses at that stage of pregnancy so closely resemble prematurely born babies. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital found it almost impossible to find volunteer staff for these late but legal abortions. These abortions comprise fewer than 5 per cent of the total.

My opposition to the Mareeba proposal has been focused on that 5 per cent of abortions, but the abortion-on-demand lobby carry on as though I were trying to ban the other 95 per cent. This lobby has consistently lied about my opinions and those of other members. The Mareeba abortion clinic is being pushed through because the Health Commission insists on the State's providing that 5 per cent of abortions that nurses and doctors find so repulsive and unjustified.

In my opinion, merely because these abortions are legal does not mean that the State has to go to extraordinary lengths to ensure that they are offered. Alas, most members on both sides of the House disagree with me.

I oppose an abortion clinic at Mareeba for two reasons. First, it is an attempt to evade the feelings of common humanity that hospital staff have for foetuses of 20 weeks whom they know, from their work in the maternity wards, are on the threshold of human life. The Health Commission is trying to take the question of late abortions outside general hospitals and outside the mainstream of medical ethics. The Health Commission is searching Australia for medical staff who have no ethical objection to late abortions and who are willing to perform abortions full-time. The search, so far, as been unsuccessful. I hope it will continue to be unsuccessful.

The second reason for my opposition is that the Mareeba proposal is an evasion of Parliament's intention in passing the 1969 law. That law says that legal abortions must take place only in hospitals and that hospitals proposing to provide abortions must first be prescribed by regulations tabled in this House. The provision was moved by Labor's Mr Des Corcoran as an amendment to Mr Millhouse's 1969 Bill. *Hansard* of 30 October 1969 records Mr Corcoran as follows:

> I am mainly concerned with what might be termed abortion clinics, which, presumably, would handle no other type of medical case. If these are likely to be established, Parliament should have an opportunity to discuss the matter and move for disallowance. We have the right to criticise a Minister's actions and he has the right to explain his actions. Under the provision as it stands we might disagree vehemently with the Attorney-General's reasons, but, by then, the clinics would have been proclaimed and it would be difficult to get the decision changed.

Hansard records that the Committee of the Whole divided on the amendment, 18 ayes (including the Labor Leader Mr Don Dunstan) and 16 noes (including the member for Fisher, as the member for Davenport then was) and the amendment was thus carried. Five days later Mr Millhouse assured the Parliament as follows:

> I point out to the honourable member for Millicent that, because of his amendment, this must all be done by regulation. Parliament will still have an opportunity to scrutinise the regulations.

Why has this House not had the opportunity to scrutinise regulations prescribing Mareeba as a hospital? The answer is that Mareeba is an outpost of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, so the Health Commission has cleverly evaded the 1969 law.

The Mareeba proposal can piggyback on the prescription 20 years ago of Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a hospital performing abortions. Yet, when Queen Elizabeth Hospital was prescribed, it was not contemplated that this prescription could be used as a cover for a free-standing late abortion clinic. So, the proposal for an abortion clinic at the Mareeba site does not strictly violate the law. It does not change the law. However, the law needs to be changed to plug this Executive evasion of Parliament's intention.

The law of this State is made by Bills for Acts read three times in this House and in another place. The motion moved by the Deputy Leader does not seek to change the law. The Deputy Leader knows that his motion, if passed, will change nothing. He knows it will not stop the Government proceeding with the Mareeba proposal. He has not even arranged for its introduction in another place because, I believe, members of the Liberal Party in that Chamber will not support it.

The Deputy Leader wants the applause of those many people who sincerely oppose abortion or late abortion and who do not understand his machinations. All he has done is throw a baited hook my way in the hope that I can be fished out of the Australian Labor Party. The Australian Labor Party gives its members a conscience vote on the matter of abortion. I am free to speak as I have on this. The Deputy Leader told us in his opening speech that all Liberal Party members had a conscience vote on this matter but—surprise, surprise—all 22 of them had already decided to support this motion.

Mr S.J. Baker: On conscience.

Mr ATKINSON: All 22 of them, without hearing the debate. What about the tender conscience of the member for Davenport who tried 20 years ago to enable free-standing abortion clinics by Executive decision? The Deputy Leader told us he was not interested in the morality of abortion or in changing the law. I am.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In view of the comments of the member for Spence, when I conclude today I will seek leave to continue my remarks later. Obviously, the Opposition opposes his amendment. What we have seen here is a grapple between conscience and Party policies. I am totally disappointed with the contribution of the member for Spence. He has sold his soul and attempted to somehow evade the responsibility that is incumbent on him as a human being and as a member of this Parliament.

We are not talking about baited hooks; we are talking about fundamental issues. The honourable member would seek to muddy the waters and deny that the Mareeba Clinic is the matter that should be debated here today. If the honourable member wishes to put a point of view or a private member's motion before this House on the credibility or moral judgments that have to be made in relation to abortion, that is up to him. The motion before this House takes us one step forward, yet the honourable member seeks to deny its being successful. I am thoroughly disappointed with the member for Spence.

I know the member for Spence holds very strong views. He said that if this motion succeeds it will mean nothing but, on the contrary, I assure him that it will mean everything. If this motion succeeds, and the Government still proceeds with the Mareeba Clinic, it would be in contempt of this House of Parliament.

We know that the Government is in contempt of its own Labor Caucus, and occasionally in contempt of its Labor policy areas for whatever reason. We know that there is contempt within its own Party which moves against it when particular issues arise. We saw that in relation to the uranium issue when the Roxby Downs debate was on and a number of other issues. However, when the Government of the day says to the Parliament, 'You are irrelevant and, whatever the wishes of Parliament, they are irrelevant', that is when parliamentary democracy no longer prevails in this country.

It has been a standing tradition that, if a motion is successful and enjoys the support of this Parliament, it shall be adhered to by the Government of the day. Indeed, the Government of the day may well seek other avenues, but the principle has been put in place. What this amendment does is different from the intent of the original motion—quite deliberately so. I am ashamed of the member for Spence. I heard his debate and I know that many people believe in the things he said in this Parliament today, and that many people hold strong views about the sanctity of life.

However, that is not what the debate was about, because we come back to that same problem that we have always had, that is, getting people to agree as to when abortions should or should not take place. That is what members have done deliberately in this House; they have deliberately directed the debate from an issue which I believe is crucial and important, and every member on this side of the House believes that. When you say that, because people have said, 'I do not believe in Mareeba,' they do not have a conscience, which is exactly what you are saying—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I believe that that is where the honourable member has obviously evaded the truth, because he knows that this issue has been around for a long time. We have had piles of correspondence from various people on this matter. We do not need a debate in the Parliament to finally determine our position, because we have had adequate evidence over a long period of time on this matter. So, when I asked the Party room whether it would support this motion, and there was unanimous support for this from members of both the Upper and Lower Houses, I was telling the truth. Yet, the member for Spence is denying his personal responsibility to this Parliament, to the people he represents and to his own belief.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we are now getting very close to the stage where we should have a look—

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member make his point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: —at Standing Order No. 127 which provides that a member may not make personal reflections on any other member. Mr Speaker, I ask you to consider that point.

The SPEAKER: Is the point of order that the honourable member is doing so, or close to? If it is such that he is, the honourable member should be clear in his statement.

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Speaker, my clear statement to you is that the Deputy Leader is making personal reflections on the honourable member and suggesting that he is not representing his electorate properly. They were approximately the words that he used. I would suggest that—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. I suggest that the member for Spence is quite able to defend himself in this matter and is the judge of how he represents his electorate. Regarding the point made about imputations and personal reflections, I ask the Deputy Leader to be a little more careful in his comments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I certainly will wind up in relation to this, but again I express my disappointment. Clearly, irrespective of how every person in this House feels about the issue of abortion, it is my belief that there was a strong point of view in this House that the Mareeba clinic should not proceed. I do not have any doubt about that. Yet, this motion will obviously deny that proposition. What does the amendment propose? It refers to acknowledging the law. The honourable member says, 'Well, I don't like the law.' Many people in South Australia do not approve of the law. That is their right and those views should be reflected in this Parliament. He has said nothing new. The amendment states:

> *(b)* believes it was the spirit and intention of the 1969 amendment that legal abortions take place only in the mainstream of medicine, that is, in general hospitals, and that each hospital proposing to provide abortions first be prescribed by regulations tabled in this House.

What does that mean? Does it mean anything? He then states that he is really recognising Mareeba as a legal abortion clinic. That is absolutely extraordinary! I believe that the basics of the argument were that abortion clinics would be set up away from the mainstream medical services, yet this motion states that they are really part of mainstream medical service. It states:

> *(c)* recognises that Mareeba is an outpost clinic of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

In fact, it justifies that. What has the honourable member done? He has done nothing. He has just repeated what the law provides. We all know what the law is. We are saying that, in terms of this Government's decisions, it is wrong to have an abortion clinic which is separate from the mainstream services.

I made a number of other comments about my personal belief in this matter, including the need for careful counselling and care so that we see far more women deciding not to abort than to abort. To have this amendment before us today I think is a disgrace to this Parliament, because the honourable member is really denying himself and this Parliament the right to make a decision on what is a prin-

ciple in which I believe most people in this Parliament believe, that is, that there should not be a separate abortion clinic. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE MARINELAND COMPLEX AND RELATED MATTERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That the Premier, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Minister for Environment and Planning have leave to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee on the Redevelopment of the Marineland Complex and Related Matters, if they think fit.

(Continued from 22 March. Page 773.)

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): On behalf of the Government, I indicate we support this motion, first, in as much as it is an invitation to the respective Ministers mentioned within the motion and, secondly, in as much as it is not a precedent for this being a general practice. We do not accept that there is necessarily any obligation that attendance by Ministers before select committees is either bound or not bound by a resolution of this or another place.

As we do not wish to interfere with the operations of the select committee and have indicated that we will cooperate with it, and because some legal questions may arise which could limit participation rights if this motion were not passed, I indicate that we will support it. When a select committee calls for information from a Government or Cabinet, it is normal practice that one Minister and not a series of Ministers be nominated to attend. So, one Minister will speak on behalf of the Government, and I advise the House that, in this instance, I, as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, will take up the opportunity to appear before the select committee and speak on behalf of the Government.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The intent of the motion, as I understand, is to invite various Ministers to attend the select committee. It would be totally improper for just one Minister to represent the Government because at least three Ministers are involved in this issue. They are the Minister of Industry, Trade, and Technology, the Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning, and this applies more to the Environment Minister because of her previous position as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee.

This whole issue lies in the decision that was made by that committee based on information provided to it by the Department of Environment and Planning. It is essential that the select committee has the opportunity to examine the many persons, be they Ministers, public servants or citizens, who have been involved in this issue. The Minister has already tried to circumvent the select committee and has put a tremendous amount of pressure on various areas of the community and politicians by releasing the so-called 'thousand pages'. The amount of money that it cost to put this document together is unreal. In my 20 years in this House that has never been done before, where someone has tried to head off a select committee by putting out 1 000 pages of absolute garbage while all the sensitive stuff, the truthful information, is still hung up in Cabinet.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: When my Party was in Government, I chaired the Public Accounts Committee without fear or favour. I served on it for long enough to learn that if you want to cover up the facts on a sensitive subject you put them in a document to Cabinet because, if it is a Cabinet document, it is not made available to anyone. So much for open Government and freedom of information!

I hope that the truth of this issue comes out because some politicians on the Government side will have to answer to the people in the future. The public of South Australia will never be allowed to forget the fiasco that has occurred over this issue. I hope that the select committee will get to the truth of the matter, although I doubt very much that it will.

Motion carried.

ATHELSTONE WILDFLOWER GARDEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House notes the badly degraded condition of the Athelstone Wildflower Garden in Blackhill Conservation Park, condemns the failure of the Government to fund the National Parks and Wildlife Service sufficiently to enable it to maintain the garden in the condition in which it was received from the Blackhill Native Flora Trust, and calls on the Government to take urgent action to restore the area and maintain it properly for the purposes for which it was acquired.

(Continued from 1 March. Page 517.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): The member for Coles is right, there have been some funding cuts to the Athelstone Wildflower Garden at Blackhill Conservation Park, and some exotic plants have died because of the necessity to reduce the watering regime. It is sad to see the loss of any plants, but this garden was set up originally for native plants and wildflowers which would thrive in the natural environment without the need for artificial assistance.

It seems to me that the garden has added a lot of exotic plants and has necessitated much more care than it would have needed had it been set up purely as it was in the first place—as a wildflower garden. The garden absorbs quite a disproportionate amount of funding. In fairness to other parks in the Adelaide Hills area, some of the funding was redirected to them.

It also should not be forgotten that this Bannon Labor Government has trebled the area of the State devoted to national parks since 1982 and has added three large regional reserves. In addition, the Government has also applied for world heritage listing for the Nullarbor National Park, which is a vast area and unique in the world. The introduction also by this Government of the Native Vegetation Management Act and the Pastoral Act to control further clearance of vegetation has made, and will continue to make, an enormous contribution towards sustainable land management practices in pastoral and marginal lands.

The establishment of local soil conservation boards, under the new Soil Conservation Act, also guarantees the participation of local communities in the management and conservation of our most vital resource—soil. In addition, the Governments, both State and Federal, are introducing Greening Australia and Trees for Life, and the planting of 100 million trees and entry into various heritage agreements have been promised. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That in the opinion of the House, the Government should immediately undertake the development of phase three of Brighton High School.

(Continued from 1 March. Page 518.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): In speaking to this motion, it is important to remind the House, and in particular new members, that just because a person is elected to this place it does not mean that he or she can demand from the Government millions of dollars to be spent willy-nilly in their electorate. I know that the temptation exists for new members to attempt to make a name for themselves in the early stages of a new Parliament—in other words, to make their mark and to let everyone know that they are diligent and on the job.

If we consider the member for Hayward's motion as a kind of tongue-in-cheek attempt to get a line in the local Messenger newspaper, that is well and good. However, if the member is serious in demanding the immediate expenditure by the Government of millions of dollars, he is either a very silly person or perhaps, to be a little kinder, he has no knowledge of the workings of Government, the allocation of funding of capital works or the allocation of priorities across the State that the Government must consider. If the latter is correct, the member for Hayward is the advertising industry's dream. He would quite happily subscribe to the philosophy of 'I want it; I don't care where the money comes from; I don't care how we pay for it; just give it to me now.'

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Like Janine Haines.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the Minister says that it reminds him very much of Janine Haines. That is an accurate observation. It makes one wonder how the member for Hayward manages his weekly budget. However, to bring the motion into the real world of good government, I would like to amend the motion by striking out the words 'immediately undertake'; inserting 'be congratulated on the implementation of phases one and two and should consider'; and, at the end of the motion, add the words 'according to the priorities of the whole area and the Education Department'. The amended motion would then read as follows:

> That, in the opinion of the House, the Government should be congratulated on the implementation of phases one and two and should consider the development of phase three of Brighton High School according to the priorities of the whole area and the Education Department.

First, I thank the member for Hayward for the accolade he gave to the Government when he moved this motion. This accolade related to the successful completion of stages 1 and 2 of the Brighton High School redevelopment, and I fully support his congratulations for those people in the school community who were involved throughout the project—the school council, the staff and officers of the Education Department. I also acknowledge the member for Hayward's praise for Sacon and its officers and endorse his commendation—with all due modesty, since I was the Minister responsible for the work on stages 1 and 2. The member for Hayward went as far as to say that the Government should be unreservedly praised for the facilities it provided. In recognition of the honourable member's discernment on this point, I have included just such a modicum of praise in the first part of my amendment. In view of his previous comments, I am assured that the honourable member will have no difficulty with that.

Unfortunately, although lavish in his praise for the completion of the project, the honourable member tended to skip over the precise details of stages 1 and 2 and played down the scope and nature of those major undertakings. For the benefit of members, I should like to explain just what those developments consisted of. Stage 1 provided a gymnasium, changerooms, canteens and toilets, such facilities being funded through the capital works assistance scheme and a significant amount of school and community funding. Nearly $500 000 was provided through the Government's capital works assistance scheme for the gymnasium project. As the member for Hayward correctly pointed out, stage 2 of the redevelopment cost over $7 million and, in fact, was closer to $7.5 million.

Brighton High School obtained a first class development for that expenditure, and it is important to list to the House exactly what it received: 18 classrooms and associated facilities; four serviced classrooms; a language room; a seminar room; staff toilets; a computer laboratory; two business education areas; a business education seminar area; two deputy principals' offices; six science laboratories and associated facilities; six art areas; a music performance area; two music classrooms and associated facilities; three ensemble rooms; and six practice rooms.

As with all capital works, the project resulted from a need and requests being assessed, gaining area priority, corporate priority and then going through the public works and budget processes. The member for Hayward has misrepresented the status of the stage 3 proposal. He made it sound as though a fully developed plan were ready and waiting for someone simply to press a button that says 'Go'. It is at this point that I think some of the more senior members opposite should take the member for Hayward to one side and explain what the capital works process is all about.

Obviously, he does not know, and I believe that he was sincere in thinking that, just by standing up and making a speech, the Government would be able to churn out something like $8 million or $10 million to satisfy the whims and fancies of the member for Hayward. As most thinking members in this House know, that is not the case. I understand that suggestions for a stage 3 were considered and I am advised that Sacon made some sketch plans of ideas for technical studies facilities and the upgrading of the original main building.

However, I understand that no commitment was ever given to a stage 3 redevelopment, and Sacon did not prepare any documentation nor initiate any design work. As with any school, Brighton High School can request any amount of capital works it deems necessary, and these requests are considered in the context of area and corporate needs, priorities and resources. There is no doubt that Brighton High School has been treated extremely well to date, and I am delighted that many students will benefit from the work done there.

However, there are many other areas of need and Brighton's request must be considered in that context. The member for Hayward's original motion seems to assume that this Parliament can merely snap its fingers and, behold, a major works project is called into being. Make no mistake: a redevelopment such as the honourable member described would be a major project. I have been advised that in February this year Sacon provided a cost indication estimate for a stage 3 redevelopment.

The technical studies and photography facility would cost about $1 025 000, alterations to existing buildings would be about $750 000, and a new home economics building would add a further $200 000. By the time contingencies and professional fees are added, the member for Hayward is asking the Government immediately to commit over $2.25 million. That amount does not include allowances for furniture and equipment. The member for Hayward's request makes a mockery of the procedures and processes that have been put into place to make sure that public money is spent responsibly and effectively, not just by this Government but by Governments of all political persuasions.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Hanson is trying to big note himself to the new member by suggesting that what I am saying is not the case. I give credit to the member for Hanson. When he was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, he made sure that this kind of stupid expenditure—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sorry, Sir. The member for Hanson made sure that the kind of expenditure that is being demanded by the member for Hayward did not take place. I congratulate him on the position that he has taken as the watchdog of Parliament, and I say that sincerely. Does the member for Hanson wear two caps: one when he is trying to impress a new member, and another when he is trying to act out his role as a member of the Public Accounts Committee?

Of course, we would all love to be able to provide wonderful facilities for the students of Brighton High School—not only Brighton High School, but every other high school or primary school that we represent in this place. We would love to be able to give thousands of South Australian students facilities as good as those already existing at Brighton High School, but unfortunately we live in a world of competing needs and finite resources.

The member for Hayward is not being realistic when he demands that a major project go ahead in his electorate, without taking into account the needs of other students and other areas.

Mr Ferguson: He is being very greedy.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Henley Beach says that he is being very greedy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: He is not being that; I think he is just not aware of the way that things should be done. I take the member for Henley Beach to task in saying that the member for Hayward is being greedy. But the member for Hayward is being extremely irresponsible by demanding that the project should go ahead immediately, which, in effect, would bypass all the essential planning and approval procedures of the Education Department, of Sacon and of this Parliament.

I would now like to respond to some of the specific allegations made by the member for Hayward. The gutters, which the member for Hayward mentioned, were removed from the home economics building to solve a problem caused by leaves falling from adjacent gum trees. The gutters filled regularly with leaves, causing overflows in wet weather and rapid deterioration of the gutters. I am advised by Sacon that the building inspector who is responsible for that area is unaware of any instances of water running down the internal walls, as the honourable member described.

The member for Hayward also referred to the support columns in the technical studies area. I understand that the columns have deteriorated through age and weathering. However, I am advised that, although the columns are unsightly, there is no immediate safety problem. To avoid further deterioration and to improve their appearance, the columns need to be repaired, and I understand that this work has been included in the 1990-91 southern area works program.

Both the home economics and technical studies buildings are in need of general repairs, but at present they are not a safety risk, as was suggested. Maintenance work has been scheduled for both buildings in the 1990-91 southern area works program.

White ant problems have been addressed temporarily in the technical studies area on several occasions. Repairs have been made to flooring and wall partitions, and roofing timbers have also been temporarily repaired. Reroofing and replacement of roof timbers have been scheduled for inclusion in the 1990-91 southern area works program.

The member for Hayward alleged that stage 3 was essential; otherwise students would not have access to an adequate curriculum in several subject areas. He may not be aware that Brighton High School is part of a shared curriculum project with Mawson High School, which is situated less than a kilometre away. Mawson was built as a technical high school; it has excellent technical studies facilities and recently upgraded home economics facilities. Senior students from Brighton were offered courses in photography and media studies. They also had access to a comprehensive range of technical subjects including electronics, plastics, metalwork, welding, automotive maintenance and technical design. In fact, about 50 Brighton High School students are taking courses at Mawson High School during this first semester as part of the shared curriculum project. That prompts me to say that the member for Hayward should get his act together and start talking to people in the Education Department about what is being offered to students in that area.

During 1990 the curriculum and resource sharing project between the two schools will be further expanded to provide students with access to a wider range of courses. In addition, Brighton High School is a member of the South West Corner Senior Secondary Project. From information I have been able to ascertain it makes one think that Brighton High School is getting the cream of the education cake and that is. I have found this out, and I represent an area that is a long way away from Brighton High School.

The principals of the secondary schools of the South West Corner are developing structures and programs which will meet the current and future needs of all the students of the South West Corner. It is in that context that the member for Hayward should be thinking about the provision of education services and facilities in his electorate. If the member for Hayward wants a briefing on this matter, I would be only too pleased to guide him in the right direction.

In my own electorate, several high schools are part of the Elizabeth/Munno Para College of Secondary Education. This is a multi-campus high school which offers an enormous range and variety of courses and facilities. It includes the highly successful Elizabeth West Adult Re-entry School. In the context of declining enrolments in schools and changing needs in education, it is becoming more and more difficult for single schools with fewer students to continue to offer the breadth of curriculum required for today's students.

The member for Hayward should temper his demands for massive spending on single projects with an understanding of the broader issues and wider needs of all students in the area. He must understand that not all needs can be met immediately, and some needs can be met in ways other than through massive capital works. He should realise that, where such work is deemed appropriate, priorities have to be set, and he should acknowledge that certain essential processes must be gone through. I ask members to support the amendment.

I think I have put the case that, in regard to Brighton High School, there has been a comprehensive study by the Education Department which was fully supported by the Minister and by the Government. In regard to Brighton High School and other areas that the member for Hayward represents, everything is being done to provide a wide range

of studies that the students can enjoy. Therefore, I again ask the member for Hayward to consider these remarks. This is not an admonishment: he has tried hard and I have put him right. I urge the House to support the amendment.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I am overwhelmed—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Are you going to accept the amendment?

Mr BRINDAL: No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I will not accept the amendment, and I am overwhelmed by the contribution of the honourable member opposite. He certainly did his homework and, in so doing, he seeks to teach me a lesson about one of the schools in my electorate. This House can be grateful for the great time and effort that he put into his contribution. We can all perhaps now be better informed about Brighton High School than about any other school in the State. Unfortunately, I had difficulty concentrating and I would therefore be very grateful to read *Hansard*. While the honourable member was speaking, I was reminded that, when I previously visited Great Britain, I had occasion to come across a little animal called a lemming. A lemming is a small rodent-like creature, notable for two things: its proclivity to breed and the fact that when it has overbred it rushes off cliffs.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, that is a reflection on my colleague and is grossly in contempt of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I find it very difficult when the member concerned does not take offence or umbrage himself. The Chair cannot do that for him. However, I caution the member for Hayward in the use of his language and descriptions of members. There are Standing Orders and the propriety of the House to be considered.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I was in the process of rising to my feet to take a point of order, but you may have noticed, Sir, that one of the Clerks asked me to sign the motion; so—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —I do take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The point of order has been made and dealt with.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise if the House misunderstood me. I was merely saying to the House that, while the honourable member was speaking, my recollection was directed to an animal called a lemming. If the House took it as an aspersion on the honourable member, I apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member is labouring the point, and I ask him to come back to the subject of the debate.

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member opposite gave me a lesson on Brighton High School. I remind him that Brighton High School is a high school in my electorate and, in fact, I knew virtually all he told me about the curriculum offerings of that school, but in so doing the honourable member ignored the substance of my motion. He twisted things, turned them around and directed a lesson to me. He said that as a new member I had a lot to learn. He thought that the Government should snap its fingers and behold it should be so.

I wish to place on record that that is exactly how I think. This side does not have the privilege of sitting on the Treasury benches and, if representing my electorate I stand here and suggest to the Government that something should be so, I believe that the Government should look at the matter, consider it carefully and that hopefully it will be so. If the honourable member thinks that $2.25 million, which I think he said was the all up outrageous figure—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: If the honourable member likes to refer to me as ignorant that is fine but I well recall that in the evolutionary scale of the alphabet H comes well before L. The points I made about the Brighton High School were these. I believe there is a safety problem at that school. I did not and do not have at my disposal the resources of Sacon. My sources are simple sources; they are the council of the Brighton High School, the teachers and students at that school. They consider that there is a problem, although Sacon may know better. However, I note that the honourable member said that this, that, and something else had been temporarily addressed.

One of the points I made in the debate was that the problem of white ants was such that lathes could disappear through rotten floorboards. The honourable member said that the matter had been temporarily addressed. I would ask the Government how often one can temporarily address a white ant problem before it becomes a real problem. Is it temporarily addressed until such time as someone is injured? I also note that the gutters were removed. That was a point in my speech.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member acknowledges that. He did not deny that water came down the wall; he could not find any record of it. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to the following question on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: No. 90; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RANGERS UNIFORMS

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** 21 March.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The current cost of the wardrobe supplied to male National Parks and Wildlife Service officers is $663.75.

The various items of the wardrobe and their cost is as follows:

	$
1 pair moleskins (summer weight)	69.00
2 pair moleskins (winter weight)	138.00
2 long sleeve shirts (Patrol)	82.00
2 short sleeve shirts (Patrol)	82.00
2 knitted polycotton shirts with NPWS logo	50.00
1 woollen 'V' neck sleeveless jumper	23.75
1 jumper	45.00
1 tie	
1 Akubra hat	71.00
3 pairs socks	18.00
1 pair boots (Rossiters)	31.00
1 Bluey jacket	54.00
	$663.75

As the honourable member correctly observed in his question, certain items have been sourced from Fletcher Jones and National Parks and Wildlife Service staff have expressed

considerable satisfaction with the quality of those items. The honourable member's assertion about the cost of chartering an aircraft, however, is not correct. The aircraft is owned by the Department of Environment and Planning and in cases where National Parks and Wildlife Service staff have had to be measured up for garments, the tailor has taken the opportunity to travel on normal programmed flights to more remote locations.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Supplementary Report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 1989.

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Eyre Peninsula College of TAFE, Ceduna Campus.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I wish to inform the House of information I have received regarding the finding and removal of mildly radioactive waste material near Port Pirie. On 22 and 23 March 1990, rubbish which had been dumped outside the fence on the northern side of the tailings dams at Port Pirie was removed in preparation for the construction of a road by BHAS, outside but adjacent to the site of the proposed operations of SX Holdings.

The surface rubbish consisted predominantly of waste from the former scrap metal operation conducted on the site of the former uranium treatment plant. However, beneath the surface, mildly radioactive residues were found. The major component of the active waste comprised granular crushed ore. However several other sources were found, including:

- ceramic tiles from the uranium extraction plant;
- two 200 litre drums containing a yellow solid, believed to be impure ammonium di-uranate, the yellow intermediate product in the production of 'yellow-cake' or uranic oxide, this substance being mildly radioactive; and
- a few drums containing other active residues.

These wastes result from previous operations at this site more than 20 years ago. The wastes, including the drums, have been placed in the chemical residue dams inside the fenced tailings dam area.

Transfer of the waste was supervised by an officer from the Radiation Control Section of the commission. The South Australian Health Commission's Radiation Control Section, in addition to supervising this transfer of the waste to the chemical residue dams, is fully investigating any environmental effects of the material and will be providing me with a full report. At this stage it is not anticipated that there is or has been any danger from this, but we are acting out of an excess of caution.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES OFFICE

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On 1 March the member for Hanson made allegations concerning the activities of the Director of the Industrial Supplies Office, Mr Graham Sutton, and his links with a company called 'Project Services Australia'. I indicated in my answer to the question that the Director of the ISO is not employed by the Government. Therefore, following the airing of the allegations, I requested a report be prepared by Mr Alan Swinstead, the Director of the Engineering Employers Association (EASSA), which hosts the organisation on behalf of the Manufacturing Advisory Council, a body made up of Government, union and employer representatives.

I have now received the report which has the concurrence of members of the management committee of the Manufacturing Advisory Council. The recommendations have also been endorsed by the Manufacturing Advisory Council, which met yesterday. The report indicates that Mr Sutton's name appears on an application for registration of the company Project Services Australia. On two occasions the Director of the Industrial Supplies Office referred clients of the ISO to that company.

The report indicates that the clients involved were seeking advice on financial and advertising matters which are not within the duties envisaged for the Industrial Supplies Office, which is dedicated to a program of promoting South Australian industry capability and import replacement. The report says, however, that matters of financial and advertising advice do not fit comfortably with the duties of an officer of the office and that the actions of the Director in referring potential clients to a company in which he had an interest were inappropriate. In his conclusion, Mr Swinstead says that Mr Sutton's actions:

> . . . whilst perhaps best described as an imprudent error of judgment, did not demonstrate an intention towards a deliberate dishonesty . . .

In response, while he will retain his current position with the ISO, the Director has been reprimanded and has also taken steps so that his name should be removed from the business register, thereby ending his association with Project Services Australia.

Further, the report recommends establishment of a Code of Practice for ISO officers. I note the report says that that was suggested by Mr Sutton himself last year. In the meantime, it has been agreed that no ISO officer will hold any form of other interests which are related in any direct or indirect manner to the work of the ISO.

I can also report to the Parliament that EASSA is currently developing, with the cooperation of a solicitor, a proposal for incorporation for the ISO. This will involve the constitution of an appropriate board of management. One of its first tasks will be a review of appointments to the ISO, including the position of the Director. These initiatives should ensure that clear guidelines are in place for the activities of the ISO and its officers so that they have greater accountability to EASSA, the Manufacturing Advisory Council and the Government.

These initiatives should go a long way to easing any concern which may have resulted from a public airing of this issue. I, and the Government, continue to have a commitment to the ISO's charter and its activities which have already resulted in substantial gains for local industry. I note that since 1985 some $330 million-worth of work has been kept in South Australia through the work of the Direc-

tor and his team in the office's import-replacement activities.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VIDEO GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On Tuesday 21 March the Premier said in response to a question that the House would be advised on the introduction of video gaming machines at the Casino. I wish to advise the House that today in Executive Council the Governor approved a regulation to exempt certain video gaming machines from the definition of poker machines in the Casino Act.

The regulation, which will be placed on the table next Tuesday, sets in train the process for the introduction of video gaming machines into the Casino. A submission will now be made to the Casino Supervisory Authority to vary the Casino licence to allow the machines to be introduced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Following the statement made to last Thursday's public sitting of the NCA in Adelaide by the presiding member, Mr Gerald Dempsey, that over the past year the authority in South Australia had been involved in 'a total of 15 separate operations' and that some of those operations had been concluded and reported on to the South Australian Government, will the Premier reveal how many of those 15 operations have been concluded and do they include operations Hound, Fleece and Cache and an offshoot of Operation Ark relating to whether or not Barry Moyse acted alone in his corruption?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter mentioned by the Leader, of course, is drawn from reports made recently that the NCA has dropped certain operations. I am advised that that is not the case and, in relation to that, I refer to the public hearing—also mentioned a moment ago by the Leader of the Opposition—conducted by Mr Dempsey, in which he made specific reference to such allegations. It is very surprising that, having made a statement about this last Thursday, today we get reports which suggest that nothing has been said on the matter, and that the matter has not been addressed—it was, and very directly. Of course, it is being alleged today, yet this statement was made a week ago. The article states:

> It was recently alleged in the media that some authority investigations have been 'abandoned' or 'axed'. This is completely incorrect. Where a matter has proven not to be appropriate for investigation by the National Crime Authority, it has been disseminated to the relative Police Force. Where an investigation has been completed, a formal report has been delivered under the terms of the National Crime Authority Act.
>
> The confusion in this regard stems, I believe, from the fact that, in July 1989, the National Crime Authority reviewed the priority of the matters currently being investigated by it. It was decided, and this is discussed in more detail below—

there is reference to further elaboration on this matter—

> that one matter take general priority in the authority's investigations in South Australia. Other matters were not abandoned, but were reprioritised, and the degree of resources being invested in them was reviewed and altered.

That is Mr Dempsey's term, and that is the situation. In relation to the suggestion that in some way the terms of reference have been constrained to prevent the NCA from investigating certain things, again, I say quite clearly that at all times the Government has made it clear that, if the NCA believes that it is impeded in proper investigation in some way by a term of reference, that reference will be amended or given afresh. There has been no question of that.

The issue has been raised periodically, and as recently as early this month. In fact, I personally spoke to the Acting Chairman (Mr Leckie) and asked him whether or not he felt that there were constraints in the terms of reference, and he told me that he did not believe so. On that occasion, I said to him, 'If you feel there is any problem, please signal it and we will arrange for any changes to be made.' That was subsequently confirmed clearly in a letter from the Attorney-General. That has been our posture throughout.

The question that the Leader of the Opposition asks, and the way in which this issue has been reported, continues to totally confuse the Government's relationship with the NCA and what it is doing here. It is not for the Government to direct or be involved in investigations and inquiries of the NCA; on the contrary, the very fact that we have the NCA here is to ensure that an independent authority in an unfettered way can conduct its own investigations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —without any interference from the Government. That is the clear principle and that is why we did it. Members opposite urged just such a course. Senator Hill, who occasionally grandstands on this issue, said that the NCA ought to do something in South Australia. Initially, we were advised against that course; we were told that it was not appropriate.

Subsequently, we came to an arrangement whereby the NCA could establish an office, it was given authority and it was getting about its job.

To test the proposition I make and to show that the Opposition's statements and the sort of aura it is trying to create are quite inappropriate, let me put the situation in the reverse: what if the Government actually instructed the NCA on its priorities? What if we told the NCA what to pursue and what not to pursue? What if we told it that we wanted daily evidence of operational details? Who would be the first on their feet criticising and condemning us? It would be the Opposition.

I know that the job of the Opposition is to oppose, but this is carrying it too far. There are occasions on which I would have thought that even an Opposition with some sort of obligation to oppose would accept the situation as being a reasonable one that it should support. If the Government was interfering with the NCA and if its independence was threatened in some way, the Opposition would have every reason to complain about it. However, the reverse is true and, in this instance, I would have thought that we would have the wholehearted support of the Opposition to ensure that this independent and properly constituted authority can carry on its job without Government direction or interference.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They are covering up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader and the Premier will come to order.

WORKLINK PROGRAM

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House

whether any projects will be undertaken in the northern suburbs under the WorkLink program? The Minister would be well aware that the level of youth unemployment in the northern suburbs is unacceptably high. It has been put to me by many non-government agencies in my electorate that these young people and other disadvantaged groups could benefit from this program which, I understand, provides six months paid employment using structured training programs.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member will be pleased to hear that job training opportunities will be boosted in the northern area with two projects awarded grants totalling more than $233 000 under the WorkLink program, which is aimed at particularly disadvantaged unemployed people. One group, the Anglican Community Services at Elizabeth has been granted $104 000 for a food redistribution centre. This project, which will employ eight people, involves the construction of a mud brick building to house the food redistribution centre. It also involves some landscaping and gardening and the erection of a pergola along walls to a hall and offices. Other groups involved in the project are the Elizabeth Food and Health project, the local DCW and the Elizabeth City Council.

The member for Napier will also be pleased to hear that the northern region Aboriginal Neighbourhood House has received a boost with a $129 000 grant under the WorkLink program. The multicultural youth land improvement project involves erecting a shed and barbecue at the house. This project, which will employ 13 people, also involves planting trees and landscaping the neighbourhood house grounds and nearby community reserve, including upgrading playground equipment. An important aspect of the project is to involve Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal youth together on a worthwhile local community project.

Of course, those grants form only part of the WorkLink program to be announced this week. A total of $1.8 million has been approved for 13 projects for 1990 in city and country areas of South Australia. People with disabilities, young people who often find it extremely difficult to obtain employment, and Aborigines will be especially targeted by this program. They deserve to be given a go, and the projects are designed to help build skills, confidence and self-esteem while providing worthwhile community projects. This is another example of how local organisations are responding to the needs of unemployed people in the community with the assistance of the State Government.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. In relation to the list of 56 persons nominated in the original South Australian reference for investigation by the NCA, has there been any increase or reduction in the number of persons under investigation and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot answer that question; I do not know the answer. I will refer it to my colleague the Attorney-General who may be able to assist the honourable member.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS NETWORK

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs report to the House on the success and future of the Volunteer Ethnic Information Network in South Australia? As members know, voluntary organisations are particularly important and appreciated in our community. The Volunteer Ethnic Information Network is increasingly becoming an important service provider to local communities. I understand that committees have been established in metropolitan and some country regions.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and I think there is a very good story to tell about volunteer ethnic information networks. There are many people in our community for whom English is not the first language and for whom it has proved difficult in the past to come to terms fully with all aspects of community life. That has partly been assisted by the provision of much printed information in languages other than English, but even that does not fully resolve the problems that many people face. Therefore, the idea of having a volunteer ethnic information network, whereby specially trained volunteers work with ethnic community groups to assist members of those groups who need further assistance in understanding various aspects of information came about.

As a result of that the Volunteer Ethnic Information Network was established and officers are being located at various information centres and premises of agencies, ethnic clubs and organisations to assist their respective ethnic community members with the provision of information. The commission organised and coordinates training programs for volunteer ethnic information officers. To date, 88 volunteers have been trained through three training programs, each of 10 weeks duration.

The honourable member mentioned the ethnic information advisory committees. I can advise that they have been established in the western region, the northern region and the Port Pirie region. Those committees assist in the selection, placement and support of volunteers undertaking the training program organised by the commission and they identify the principal areas of information needs that are of concern to various ethnic groups or individuals residing in that respective region. They also advise councils on the nature of problems that have been identified. At this stage, seven officers are based in the northern metropolitan region and 11 are to be allocated; in the western metropolitan region 25 officers have been placed and 30 are to be allocated; and in the Port Pirie region 15 are to be allocated.

REMM MYER SITE

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is to the Premier. Will the Government take the Lord Mayor's advice and immediately intervene to help resolve the union problems at the Remm site?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Lord Mayor has advised us to intervene, if he was correctly reported. He has not exactly said how and in what way. The Government views the situation on the—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think the Minister of Transport is being a little unkind to the Lord Mayor. However, let me return seriously to the question. The Government views with very great concern what is occurring on that site. It is absolutely crucial that such a high profile and important project, involving the investment of millions of dollars, be conducted to the highest of standards and to the time scale, and that it be seen as a demonstration of the capacity that exists in this State. There has been an enormous amount of building activity in this city in recent years and most of that has been carried out with tremendous alacrity and to budget. That includes Government and private sector projects.

We have a pretty good reputation but, at the moment, there is no question that all eyes are focused on the Remm Myer project—literally focused on it, because thousands of people are in and around the mall every day. The fact that the site is not operating at the moment is of very great concern, indeed. It also means that the proponents of a number of other projects which are ready to go and in relation to which planning procedures have almost been completed, or there are other events that are setting them up, will have to think fairly carefully if we cannot be seen to be getting on successfully with this project.

By 'We' I do not mean the Government, because it is not a Government project—it is entirely a private sector project—but we as the community of South Australia, and all the workers on the site and those involved in it have a stake in South Australia and in the success of that project. It is not as if the Government is standing idly by and saying, 'Tut, tut, this is a pity.' On the contrary, for the last week my colleague the Minister of Labour and, to a lesser extent, I have been actively involved in attempting to secure some sort of settlement, agreement or resolution. It is not easy to do. It is all very well to thunder that action is needed, but nobody, including those involved in the project, can say precisely what should or could be done about it.

First, the matter is before the Industrial Commission. It is not possible for the Government to direct the commission or to remove matters from the hands of the commission. We could do so, I guess, if we had legislation before the Parliament, but that would be quite inappropriate. Obviously, a speedy decision from the Industrial Commission on the matters before it is a vital factor in the settlement of this dispute.

As regards disputes between contractors and the proponents, again, discussions have been held by both my colleague the Minister of Labour and I in an attempt to see whether some resolution can be obtained. We are certainly not simply standing back; we are in active consultation with the parties.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member interjects that we are not very successful. It is a difficult situation, and grandstanding about it will not solve it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What happened to ASER? We accomplished one of the most successful projects in the history of Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and it has been an enormous commercial asset to this State. This is not a project in which the Government is the constructor or the owner; it is a private sector project. The proponents of the private sector and private enterprise opposite are now crying out—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —that we directly intervene in that commercial process. We are certainly intervening in an attempt to find a solution, and I hope that we will get support in doing that from members of the Opposition as well.

COMPACT FLUORESCENT LAMPS

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Can the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House whether his department has assessed the benefits to be gained from using the very energy efficient compact fluorescent lamps now on the market?

I have read that these globes offer a much longer life and the same light output as conventional lamps and, most importantly, use two-thirds less power. While there is a substantially higher capital cost than conventional lamps, energy advisers in the United States report that the long-term savings through reduced demand for power generation are potentially quite significant.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for giving me notice that he was going to ask this question. At the same time, I need to acknowledge an interest in this area by the members for Henley Beach and for Albert Park, and, indeed, the Minister for Environment and Planning, as well as a number of other members on this side of the House.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I can advise the House that the Government is closely monitoring the emergence of this new lighting technology through its Government Energy Management Program. As the honourable member pointed out, electronic lamps are low energy, compact fluorescent lamps, which can be used to replace the standard incandescent lamps with which we are all familiar. They are available in most of the common wattages used in commercial and domestic settings.

The Office of Energy Planning advises that electronic lamps use only about one-quarter the energy of an equivalent conventional lamp and, in doing so, generate about 80 per cent less heat. The cooler operating temperature of these globes can be used to the advantage, of course, in areas where low-heat loads are important to avoid causing problems for air-conditioning plants, and they have that side benefit. The lamps themselves, of course, if used in sufficient profusion will reduce the amount of electricity that needs to be generated and thereby reduce the amount of gas, oil or coal that needs to be burnt, with the consequent effect on the output of the various greenhouse gases. The lamp has two other advantages: first, a much longer operating life—up to about 8 000 hours, depending on the brand chosen; and, secondly, a lighter weight than a number of other lamps.

The Office of Energy Planning (OEP) believes that at present prices electronic lamps would need to be used upwards of 3 000 hours per annum to be cost effective. For this reason they are particularly suited to the hospitality, health, retail and accommodation industries, as well as some industrial areas. The Government's energy management program has already used these lamps in projects at the Northfield Women's Prison and the Jervois Wing of the State Library. They are being considered for other projects and will continue to be used where it proves cost-effective to do so, Sacon has recently installed them in the foyer of Wakefield House to improve the lighting levels, with no increase in electricity demand.

The OEP believes that at this stage electronic lamps seem to be marginally economic in only a few applications in the home in situations particularly where conventional lamps remain switched on for a long period. However, as with any emerging technology, we can expect the price to the consumer to fall in real terms as sales volumes improve and as manufacturers continue to refine both the design and the methods of manufacture. Officers involved in the Government's energy management program are maintaining close contact with leading manufacturers and are being

continually briefed on new developments and pricing structures and, where possible, will continue to trial the lamps.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. Does the statement by the Managing Director of Scrimber, Mr Graham Coxon, reported in the *Border Watch* of 22 March that pinus radiata is the worst tree from which to make Scimber mean that the project has been seriously flawed from the start, and is this one of the reasons for the continuing delays in bringing Scrimber into production and the massive escalation in cost?

The Scrimber project was originally justified on the basis that it would provide a commercial use for thinnings from the pinus radiata forests in the South-East. The project now will cost at least $50 million compared with an original estimate of about $17 million and it is at least two years behind schedule in coming into production. Mr Coxon's latest statement suggests that one reason for the cost escalation and delay could be difficulties being experienced in adapting pinus radiata to produce Scrimber. I would very much appreciate the Minister's reassurance on this matter.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question because I think it will help resolve a bit of confusion.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked his question; he must wait for the answer.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The number of timbers on which the Scrimber process has been tried is fairly limited. One of the interesting things is that an American timber that we tried, in fact, gave a slightly better result than the pinus radiata. The Scrimber was originally based on pinus radiata and was predicted and, in fact, found to be correct with regard to stress and strain classifications and other matters that industrial people worry about in using building materials. So, the situation for pinus radiata has not changed; it will still be an exceedingly good product. The fact that some other timbers are showing even better strength characteristics, of course, will augur very well for exporting the technology and having plants built under licence in other countries.

MINOR PARTY PREFERENCES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Will the Government consider either amending the State Electoral Act or taking some other appropriate administrative action in order that Party scrutineers observing the counting of votes on election night will be able to insist upon an accurate, even though unofficial, count of minor Party preferences, and will the State Government urge the Federal Government to adopt a similar approach of the counting of minor Party preferences for Federal elections?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess that such a count would have been without prejudice to the official count, which of course usually occurs some days after the poll, once absent and postal votes are to hand. I have to agree with the honourable member that in the circumstances of last Saturday evening, or indeed at the State election, it would have been of great interest to the candidates, journalists and other people to have a rather more accurate picture than they usually get.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Indeed to the broader public, as my colleague reminds me. My understanding is that things would have been rather more clear-cut on Saturday evening but for some very misleading and inefficient scrutineering that occurred in Western Australia. Briefly, I would like to share with the House my experience on Saturday. I went to a polling booth as the scrutineer of Mr Gordon Bilney and I was delighted to find that the member for Fisher was there representing his side of politics. I had strict instructions to try to get as accurate a count of the preferences as I could. At the time I was not sure whether I should be looking at Mrs Fuller's preferences or former Senator Haines' preferences, but nonetheless preferences obviously would have some part to play. I had been warned that the Commonwealth Electoral Officer in Canberra was notoriously uncooperative in these things, if only because there was nothing in the Act which gave him any sort of guidance.

I sought out the returning officer and asked on behalf of all the scrutineers there whether it would be possible to get a count of minor Party preferences, only to be told 'No' and to be given to understand that that gentleman really did not understand all that closely what impact the whole thing had. His only interest was to get a count of the first preference votes and that was it.

In conclusion, let me tell the House what I did: I stationed myself on the left-hand side of one of the poll clerks, and the member for Fisher stationed himself on the right-hand side, so the poor woman whilst counting votes had the Deputy Premier breathing in her left ear and a member of the Opposition breathing in her right ear—she showed a considerable aplomb in the circumstances—so that we could get a reasonable sample of the second preferences of Senator Haines' votes. An extra five minutes or so of work on the part of one of the poll clerks would have been all that was necessary to get a rather more accurate, although informal, count of those votes. I would be quite happy to take up the matter with the Attorney-General, and it may be that it would also be appropriate for both political Parties to take up the matter with their colleagues in Canberra.

MARINO MARINA

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether delays in the planning processes for the Marino Rocks marina indicate that the future of the project is now in doubt? Just before the last State election the Government released a statement which included a timetable for planning processes associated with this project. The timetable included a public display of the supplementary development plan during the period December 1989 and January 1990, a public hearing on the SDP in February 1990, and a public exhibition of the section 63 scheme in February and the first half of March. None of these things has occurred to date giving rise to speculation that the future of the project may now be in doubt.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can only conclude from the continual questioning and presentation of petitions by the honourable member that he is totally opposed to this project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry; a reasonable person would have to reach that conclusion. I would be interested to know whether the honourable member would be willing to put on the public record whether or not he does support this project. However, it has become quite

apparent to me that he is totally opposed to it, and it is interesting that he has tried in the past to be on both sides of the argument so that when he is speaking to one group he supports it, and when he speaks to another group he does not support it. The community will not be fooled by that approach.

Having regard to the planning process, let me assure the House that my department has conducted itself appropriately. The proponents of the development have not provided a final plan for this development. Therefore, until the final plan is provided, some of the things that the honourable member has been saying are nothing short of quite outrageous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would like to share with the House some information that I received from Mr Tony Vaughan on behalf of the Burlock group of companies with respect to a question that the honourable member asked me last week. He states:

The claim by Mr Matthew—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Obviously members opposite do not wish to hear this information, but it is relevant. Mr Vaughan states:

The claim by Mr Matthew that the harbor would become a 'pollution trap' is sheer nonsense. I am amazed to think that anybody would believe (given the obvious demands of the environmental impact assessment which specifically lists '. . . run-off and water quality')—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. The question related to the schedule and timetable of certain things to be done by the Minister. It did not relate to pollution—that was yesterday's question.

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. I ask the Minister to relate her remarks to the timetable.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I will relate my remarks: I believe that these remarks are pertinent to the project. I have been asked about this and I will continue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: With respect to the timetable, this point is relevant—and I will explain why—because it impacts directly on the claims that have been made by the honourable member. Mr Vaughan continues:

. . . that we as proponents would submit for approval by the Government any design which failed to include engineering solutions to stormwater and its associated effects.

Quite obviously, the member is attacking the project. He does not wish to see it proceed. The Government is proceeding properly in terms of its commitments to the community and to the developer, and then the developer has—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The broad community certainly does and, if you will recall—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will address her remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member will recall that the Boating Association has been given an undertaking that he does support the project. Either the honourable member supports it or he does not. I was actually present when the honourable member gave a commitment that he supported the project. If he has changed his position, I would be delighted if he would inform people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is my understanding that the project is going ahead and that in fact the developer has not provided the final plan to the Government. That is the current state of affairs with respect to this project.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Deputy Premier advise what progress is being made for the provision of a multistorey car park at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

An honourable member: It's about time.

Mr HAMILTON: Your crowd did nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: My constituents constantly remind me that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the second largest hospital in South Australia and services all the north-western suburbs of Adelaide. My constituents also advise me that parking spaces have, for many years, been at a premium, resulting in many of my constituents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the question.

Mr HAMILTON: I repeat: my constituents have also advised me that parking spaces have, for many years, been at a premium resulting, in many instances, in constituents being late for appointments at the hospital and/or receiving parking fines because of inadequate parking facilities.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member has pursued this matter for quite some time with his usual thoroughness, and I think I have some reasonably good news for him today. First, it is clear that there is a deficit of car parking spaces in and around the hospital. In fact, I am advised that there is a total of 1 346 car parking spaces at the hospital both on-site and off-site, but excluding the surrounding streets. Of these car parking spaces, 1 166 are provided for staff and 108 for patients and visitors. The areas designated for patients and visitors have two-hour restriction zones to discourage all-day parking. In addition there are 100 to 150 all-day spaces in the surrounding streets.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The hospital recognises the need to provide additional parking for employees, patients and visitors, particularly in the light of these figures. It has commissioned a group of consulting engineers to undertake a feasibility study into the provision of an on-site multistorey car park. I will be delighted to keep the honourable member informed of the programs in respect of this matter.

HOUSE BREAK-INS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Will the Premier say what action he and the Government will take to protect law abiding citizens whose properties are broken into and damaged by vandals and hoodlums? Also, what action will he take to prevent those crimes taking place? Mr Speaker, you will be aware—and so will the Premier—that in recent times there have been press reports about people's properties having been broken into during daylight hours when they have been in their homes. For example, a constituent of mine had been continually harassed by vandals throwing stones. In fact, these vandals had been throwing stones at the homes of elderly widows and others. A person attempted to protect his property and family against this action by accosting one of these villains, and he now finds himself before the court,

and the villian has been let off scot-free. I ask the Premier to have this disgraceful situation rectified.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly share the honourable member's concern about vandalism and breaking and entering. Indeed, this has been one of the Government's top priorities in recent years. In this regard I draw attention to the Government's $10 million crime prevention package and the expansion of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme which actually has had quite a marked effect on lowering the level of break-ins. Incidentally, I speak as someone who has been the victim of such a break-in.

The fact is that in the past year or so we have seen some signs of progress—a reduction in the escalating rate of these crimes. That simply encourages us—as we are doing—to redouble our efforts to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place in the community to try to ensure that the efforts of the police—and remember that police policy has now moved very much to community policing—are reinforced by proper community attitudes. In other words, the fact is that as a community we have responsibilities, and I think this is where the Neighbourhood Watch program has an important role.

I might say, though, that we should be careful that we do not indulge in some sort of vigilante-type approach to this matter. A community which collapses into that kind of anarchy eventually will have major problems. We have avoided those problems in this State, and I believe we will continue to do so.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: An interjection was made concerning victims. I point out that this Government has done more in terms of victims of crime than any other Government in Australia. Indeed, our Attorney-General is recognised as a world authority on this very subject. We have increased greatly the funds of criminal injury compensation, and all of our crime prevention strategies include victims and and rights of victims. The honourable member may well be aware of the recent formation of the Coaltion Against Crime, the first meeting of which has already been held, and a number of studies and activities have been initiated from that.

So, I believe that a comprehensive tackling of this problem and the social attitudes that can produce it will see results. Of course, I am unable to comment on any particular case before the court and it would be inappropriate for me to do so. The law is constantly being updated and amended and, in relation to the rights of victims, the Government is ensuring that we remain at the head of the field in Australia.

FISH MARKETS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Health advise whether regular checks are made of the fish markets and other points of sale of fish to make sure that correct labels are attached to fish for sale? A recent report from the Victorian Department of Health revealed that 31 per cent of all fish was incorrectly labelled in the city of Melbourne. It would be unfortunate if the same practice was occurring in South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As probably the Government's major consumer of fish and chips, I have a particular interest in this matter. The first thing to be said is that the penalties are not inconsiderable; the maximum penalty for any person who misrepresents the nature or quality of food is $2 500.

Since 1987, 72 samples of various fish for retail sale have been analysed for species identification. It was found that 15 of the samples were other than the species known in this State by the name on their label. They were as follows: one blue whiting, two silver whiting, two snapper, two barramundi and eight butterfish or mulloway. Part of the problem is that the names of 'whiting', 'snapper' and 'barramundi' can relate to different species of fish overseas or interstate and, when imported or sold under those names, have misled customers.

Historically, in South Australia hake has been sold as butterfish or mulloway, particularly cooked in fish and chip shops. I am told that the analyst is unable to identify species of cooked fish. Where incorrectly labelled fish has been found, the matter has been satisfactorily corrected by negotiation with the vendor, manufacturer, or importer. In April 1989, the fish—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The answer is that they are sold for different prices. So, people need to know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If identification is irrelevant, I assume that there should be no difference in price. In April 1989 the fish industry was circulated with advice from the commission's food unit that prosecution would ensue if misrepresentation were detected. This included the practice of selling hake as butterfish or mulloway. The industry was further advised that for the sake of uniformity the DPIE publication 'Recommended marketing names for fish' would be applied as a guide in this State. Observations in the marketplace since that time have indicated an improvement, particularly with respect to the labelling of whiting and butterfish.

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Can the Minister of family and Community Services assure the House that the current inability of officers within the Department for Community Welfare to meet the demand for services and to provide a high quality of practice will not lead to the imposition of work bans by social workers and clerical staff as was the case for four weeks in February and March 1987?

On Tuesday of this week the ABC *7.30 Report* highlighted deficiencies in the delivery of services by the department. For some time, departmental officers throughout the State have found it increasingly impossible to meet the demand for services. For example, at the Elizabeth office alone some 40 cases remain unallocated, and many of these cases have not been attended to for over six months. Also, at various offices social and welfare workers are failing to check on a regular basis the welfare of children placed under the care of the Minister, with some children being neglected in this sense for periods of up to a year.

Meanwhile, high rates of burnout and staff turnover are compromising service delivery, as is the Government's failure to implement, as promised, the recommendations contained in the 1988 Cooper report which investigated the department's practices and procedures in dealing with the care of children of under-age parents.

In early 1987, similar grievances by departmental social workers and clerical staff about inadequate staffing ceilings and general work pressures led to the imposition of work bans for some four weeks in the metropolitan area and I am advised that there is no speculation that such bans may be imposed yet again to highlight the inability of staff to meet their statutory obligations, let alone the needs of their clients.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The *7.30 Report* of 27 March 1990 was the greatest dog's breakfast of a presentation from that source that I have ever run into. The journalist had been wandering around the town for some time trying to find sufficient information in order to put something together. Clearly, that search was unsuccessful, but the report went on nonetheless. A number of approaches were made to people in the non-government sector, many of whom said they were happy with the way in which the DCW was going. However, the departure of a disaffected staff member triggered a beat-up of bits and pieces of stories. I will say no more about that report because it went into certain details of particular cases.

But I can say that almost every recommendation of the Cooper report has been implemented. There is a service quality unit, we have increased the training of every worker and there are improved standard procedures. There are some problems with resources in some of the offices and that matter is currently being addressed by the redeployment of resources into the areas of greatest need. That has not necessarily met with a great deal of applause in some of those areas that will be providing the resources to the areas of greatest need, but we believe that this sort of prioritisation is essential and it will occur.

PARKING FOR THE DISABLED

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education, representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Will the Minister consider the imposition of heavier fines and/or the introduction of a television education campaign to ensure that disabled people have rightful access to designated parking areas in public car parks? Disabled constituents have reported to me that often they cannot gain access to areas set aside for the disabled to park in shopping centres and in streets because able-bodied people are continually parking their vehicles in these designated areas.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly recognise the commitment of the member for Price to the rights of the disabled over the time that he has been in this Parliament. I share his concern, having seen the parking spaces set aside for the disabled at the Salisbury railway station persistently used by able-bodied people. I will be happy to refer his question to my colleage in another place and bring back a reply.

STATE ENERGY NEEDS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. How is the 'full public debate on planning for the long-term provision of the State's energy needs', referred to in the Governor's speech at the opening of Parliament, being conducted and who is responsible for coordinating the debate?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Energy Planning Executive is the organisation responsible for this area and most of the work will be done by the Office of Energy Planning. The State energy plan has been put into draft form by that office. I am considering it and I expect that it will eventually go out as a Green Paper.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware of a survey which was conducted at a national level by the Australian Business Advisory Service of Arthur Anderson and Co., which included 97 South Australian small businesses with annual turnovers ranging from $1 million to $50 million and in which it was stated that 'a significant percentage of respondents complained of inadequately trained staff, lack of motivation and general shortages of skilled staff'? If so, is the Minister aware of any consultation to ascertain the type of training and trained staff needed to overcome these problems?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government is very conscious of the lack of training which takes place, particularly among smaller employers. It is strongly supporting the Commonwealth Government's initiative of the training guarantee, which will encourage firms throughout Australia to take up their responsibilities along with the Government to provide adequate training. Also, the Government has been very active in the training area in support of industry which will provide significant resources to small businesses were they to avail themselves of the opportunities provided. I should like to give a couple of examples for the House and for the member for Stuart.

The State Government is actively supporting the establishment of industry training councils, 16 of which already exist, and others are in the process of establishment. These are essentially industry-owned organisations, and the Government is anxious that these organisations should provide the major focus for advice to their own industries and to Government on the support and activities which are required. Those industry training councils already established cover the retail, building, nursery and horticulture, automotive, food and beverage and road transport areas; and clearly these are areas in which small businesses are already heavily represented. However, it is fair to say that the Government would like to see a much stronger role and activity from small business in those industry training councils.

In the area of apprenticeship training, it is often difficult for many small businesses to employ apprentices or trainees in their own right, but the widespread network of group training schemes provides ample opportunities for small businesses, for at least a period, to have both apprentices and trainees. Currently there are 960 apprentices and trainees employed by the group training schemes, and many are in the area of small business. There is scope for a dramatic increase in these numbers, if only those group training schemes can find greater numbers of host employers. This is an excellent opportunity particularly for small business to acquire skilled staff and to make a contribution to the development of these people.

The State Government actively supports the large and effective TAFE network in South Australia, and the business and commercial studies program, obviously essentially important to small business training in South Australia, is the largest program run through TAFE. Over 16 per cent of student hours occur in this program, and that is in a system where there are more than 100 000 students.

As well as these activities, the State Government, in cooperation with industry and the Commonwealth Government, has put in hand a vigorous program of establishing industry skill centres where short courses of immediate relevance to industry are conducted. Already eight of these are in existence and more are currently in the pipeline. Again, we are a little concerned that small business is not prominent in support for or involvement in these centres.

The Government is putting enormous efforts into improving the quantity and quality of training available in South Australia, and many employers and trade unions are actively supporting the Government in that role. However,

a large segment of employers are still not taking up the challenge at this stage, and we are certainly keen for small businesses to take up their responsibility in joining us in providing for the training needs of South Australia.

ENERGY FORUM

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Is Ms Ellie Fricker coordinating the State Energy Forum; if so, how was she chosen; how much is she being paid; for how long is it intended to employ her in this role; who are the other members of the forum; and which organisations do they represent?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think that the honourable member forgot to ask for their middle names and on what dates they were born. I understand that Ms Ellie Fricker has been asked by that organisation to convene some meetings, and she is currently doing so. I heard the number of those meetings, which I think is five or six, but I would rather not be held to that. I guess it is an indication of the fairness of the Energy Forum that it involves people, such as Ms Fricker, who on a number of occasions have attacked both the Government in which the honourable member was Minister of Mines and Energy and this Government, and that it has asked Ms Fricker to run meetings in areas where she has some degree of interest.

We can probably say that when the honourable member retires and starts looking for that sort of job we will consider him along with the Ellie Frickers of this world. The Energy Forum has its own budget and makes its own decisions as to who it appoints to these functions and clearly, as Minister, I am not going to appoint an Energy Forum to give me advice and then tell it whom it can and cannot hire to gather the information to provide me with that advice.

TECHNOLOGY PARK ADELAIDE

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology report to the House on the success of Technology Park? In the March issue of the publication *Developing South Australia*, the Leader of the Opposition is the author of an article entitled 'A Liberal Vision for the Development of South Australia'. In part of this article the Leader states:

> Even the benefits of that cornerstone of Labor's development strategy, Technology Park Adelaide, have been seriously questioned in a detailed study by Associate Professor Healey released recently by the Centre of South Australian Economic Studies. Tens of millions of State dollars have been spent but the return is far from clear.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I noted the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in the March issue of *Developing South Australia* and, indeed, they reflect comments he also made in an earlier press release and in a speech he made earlier in the year.

I hope that he has since taken the opportunity to apprise himself of more facts about the Technology Development Corporation and would now feel that his statements were somewhat intemperate. The reality is that he chose to base his statements on a simple reading of a chapter in the book referred to by Associate Professor Derek Healey who is a noted economist and one for whom I have a lot of respect, but all of those statements I do not necessarily have to accept.

I suggest that he has not drawn the correct conclusions from a number of the things that he has found in his analysis. Indeed, some of the very tables and statistics he includes in his own chapter in that book give rise to quite different conclusions from those he has drawn. That is the nature of economic analysis—that there are variable opinions about the facts that one determines.

The chapter is perhaps disparaging about the Technology Park Adelaide experience but does not actually produce evidence of failure as it alleges. Most of the variables which could be measured actually indicate a conspicuous success. For example, the high rates of growth of significant economic variables for Technology Park Adelaide companies are recognised in a table, but their importance is minimised in the consequent text. All the companies at Technology Park Adelaide, and this will apply at Science Park in the south as well, are commercially oriented. Their rents are not subsidised. They compete in the marketplace in the same way as do other technology companies not located at Technology Park Adelaide or at the Science Park.

The author identifies an amount of $2.3 million that he believes has been paid in support to companies at Technology Park. The reality is that companies in South Australia and elsewhere wishing to come to South Australia are eligible to apply for assistance under the South Australian Development Fund, and companies at Technology Park have indeed taken advantage of that, as have other companies.

It is interesting to note that when they do apply for funds they do so on a commercially oriented basis, not a subsidised basis. The criteria that apply to those companies are no different from those which apply to companies anywhere else in South Australia. Even if the figure he quotes is, in fact, correct—and that has not been totally substantiated in his article—that $2.3 million results in 800 jobs having been created. In other words, that apparent subsidy for 800 jobs works out at $3 000 per job, a very effective means of positive technologically directed job creation within this State.

The point is that the companies at Technology Park are not receiving subsidies; they are receiving catalytic seed funding to assist their development. Their rents are commercially based and their activities commercially oriented. The funds allocated from the State Government in terms of purchasing the site and constructing the buildings there are mentioned in the Government's financial contribution of $17 million (the Leader mentions tens of millions, referring to a figure way in excess of $20 million or $30 million—he has that capacity for exaggeration). That $17 million has been used to build the infrastructure, to promote South Australia internationally and also to provide assets that help industry throughout the State, such as the Teaching Company Scheme, the Adelaide Innovation Centre and the Adelaide Microelectronic Centre.

The net asset balance of the corporation is $7 million based on a conservative valuation of its land holdings, and the buildings have all been constucted on the basis of proper commercial orientation. They have short-term subsidies appearing in their accounts but are based on a long-term commercial pay-back operation. I would argue that the amount of money that has been put into Technology Park should be seen against the fact that those self same companies will have been responsible for sales of $140 million

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —and that would seem to justify well and truly the community's faith in Technology Park and the Technology Development Corporation.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WESTCLIFF MARINA

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, I was offended by the inference of the Minister for Environment and Planning when she alleged today that I was peddling nonsense stories about the Westcliff Marina silting up, and that I am for or against the project depending upon my audience. The Minister is aware that in talking about the marina silting up I was quoting a Government report prepared by the Department of Mines and Energy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: I was not expressing my own opinion. Unlike the situation represented by the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: —my true position on the marina project is on public record. I am in favour of a southern marina. I have clearly stated at public rallies, during radio interviews and in press releases that I am in favour of a marina development provided that the site is appropriate, that proper planning controls are in place and that the community is consulted.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION BILL

Read a third time and passed.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: 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.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the member for Murray-Mallee, who is obviously determined to waste the time of the House. I am pleased to be able to read it.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order and ask that the Minister be invited to retract the statement she has made imputing improper motives to me in saying that I am wasting the time of the House.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member took offence, I ask the Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not believe that anything I have said is unparliamentary and, therefore, I do not think it appropriate that it should be withdrawn. This Bill amends the provisions of the existing Act with respect to allotments of land to which irrigation waters may be supplied. Within the district of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, an allotment of land that is of an area of less than .2 of a hectare is not entitled to a supply of water for irrigation purposes. This land is provided with a domestic water supply and the landowner is charged for the supply accordingly.

In recent times, there has been a proliferation of allotments approved for residential use in the Renmark district that are each of an area of up to .4 of a hectare. As these residential allotments are larger in area than .2 of a hectare, the owners are currently entitled to a supply of water for irrigation purposes from the Renmark Irrigation Trust. It is not desirable that owners of residential allotments should have the same rights and privileges with respect to a supply of irrigation water as those persons whose livelihood depends on such a supply. This Bill increases the minimum area of an allotment of land to which a supply of irrigation water may be provided, to .5 of a hectare. The owners of the residential allotments will continue to be provided with a domestic water supply by the Renmark Irrigation Trust, but will lose any entitlement to a supply of irrigation water.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act which is an interpretation section. The amendment strikes out the definition of 'rateable land' and substitutes a new definition that differs from the current definition by excluding land that is, in one block, less than .5 of a hectare unless the block forms part of a single holding that exceeds .5 of a hectare. 'Single holding' is defined as any continuous area of land, or any two or more parcels of land that are separated only by roads, track or channels, situated within the district and occupied and used by the same person as a single vineyard, orchard or garden.

Clause 4 amends section 78 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (1) and substituting a new subsection (1) dealing with the trust's entries into the trust's assessment-book of an assessment set out in the form shown in the third schedule.

Clause 5 repeals section 83 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. This deals with the power of the trust to rectify the assessment-book in respect of any land that has ceased to be rateable land by reason of subdivision, amendment of the principal Act, or otherwise, or on the discovery of any error or omission in the assessment-book.

Clause 6 amends section 92 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2) and substituting a new subsection (2) to bring section 92 into conformity with the new definition of 'rateable land'.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Valuation of Land Act 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: 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.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: More than his valium. I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but I could not help making that remark: it did seem quite appropriate.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 127 is the particular Standing Order to which I refer. Since the Minister has not only satisfied—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member take his seat.

Mr LEWIS: She drew attention to the remark again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will take his seat. I think that the honourable member is being a little petty in this. We have business before the House which we are trying to finish. I do not think there was anything that serious in anything the Minister said. I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to reconsider his point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Valuation of Land Act 1971 came into operation on 1 June 1972 and, although it has been amended a number of times, minor amendments are now needed to take into account changing administrative requirements. Minor amendments are proposed for definitions contained in section 5. The definitions of 'annual value' and 'capital value' have been simplified and the term 'rating or taxing authority' removed from this section and all places it appears in the Act.

Following public complaints that in certain areas of the State private sector valuers are not available, it is proposed to amend the Act to enable those landowners, or owners who can demonstrate genuine hardship, to request valuations of land from the Valuer-General. Where appropriate, the Valuer-General may recover fees for that service as set by the Minister.

The term 'valuation list' has been removed from the Act. This acknowledges that valuation information is now kept on computer and print-outs provided as required. Registered owners or their agents may view valuation information relating to their property free of charge, but members of the general public will purchase copies of the roll on conditions and at a price determined by the Minister.

This Government acknowledged that heritage buildings should be valued with their heritage status as a factor, and in 1985 amended the Valuation of Land Act accordingly. However, some buildings deemed to be of heritage value to the City of Adelaide are not included on the State Heritage List and are not covered by the provisions of section 22b. It is proposed to further amend the section to allow the Minister to prescribe such buildings as forming part of the State heritage for purposes of valuation.

Administratively the Act will be simplified. All prescribed forms will be deleted, penalties will be brought into line with current values and the Minister will be able to fix appropriate fees for services.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 4 of the principal Act, a transitional provision that was inserted in 1981 and has been exhausted.

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act, an interpretation provision. The clause deletes paragraph *(b)* of the definition of 'annual value' of land which provides that, if the value of the land has been enhanced by trees (other than fruit trees) planted on the land or preserved on the land for shelter or ornament, the annual value must be determined as if the value of the land had not been so enhanced. A simplified definition of 'capital value' is substituted and the definition of 'rating or taxing authority' is struck out. An updated definition of 'the rating or taxing authority' including reference to the Local Government Act 1934 is substituted.

Clause 4 amends section 11 of the principal Act to remove the reference in subsection (2) to 'rating or taxing authority'.

Clause 5 amends section 17 of the principal Act to remove references to 'rating or taxing authority' and to insert a new subsection (2) that gives the Valuer-General the power to value land or cause land to be valued, at the request of any person. If the Valuer-General is satisfied that there is no licensed valuer with the appropriate expertise available to value the land, the costs of obtaining the services of a licensed valuer to value the land would, in the circumstances of the case, result in genuine hardship or there are other special reasons why the Valuer-General should accede to the request.

Clause 6 repeals section 20 of the principal Act which requires the Valuer-General to keep a valuation list and make it available for public inspection free of charge between office hours.

Clause 7 amends section 21 of the principal Act by providing for fees for the provision of copies of the valuation roll to be those approved by the Minister instead of those prescribed by regulation and by substituting 'Minister of Water Resources' for 'Minister of Works' as a person to whom a copy of the valuation roll must be provided.

Clause 8 amends section 22b of the principal Act to require a valuing authority that values land for the purpose of levying rates, taxes or imposts to take into account, in valuing land that forms part of the State heritage, the fact that the land forms part of the State heritage but to disregard any potential use of the land that is inconsistent with its preservation as part of the State heritage. New subsection (4) makes it clear that the fact that land becomes part of the State heritage does not invalidate pre-existing valuations. New paragraph *(c)* of subsection (6) provides that, for the purposes of the Act, land forms part of the State heritage if the land is, by virtue of the regulations, to be treated as forming part of the State heritage.

Clause 9 amends section 23 of the principal Act to provide that, where particulars of a valuation under the Act are included in an account for rates, land tax or some other impost, the account will be taken to constitute the notice of valuation required under the section to be given to the owner of land by the Valuer-General.

Clause 10 amends section 25a of the principal Act to provide for allowances that members of regional panels of licensed valuers are entitled to receive to be allowances at rates for the time being approved by the Minister instead of allowances prescribed by regulation.

Clause 11 amends section 25b of the principal Act to provide for the fee payable on an application for review of a valuation to be the appropriate fee fixed by the Minister instead of the fee prescribed by regulation.

Clause 12 amends section 25d of the principal Act to remove the reference to 'rating or taxing authority'.

Clause 13 amends section 28 of the principal Act to remove the requirement for returns under the section to be in the prescribed form. New subsection (2) specifies the matters in relation to which the Valuer-General may ask questions. Clause 14 amends section 29 of the principal Act to remove the following requirements: that where land is compulsorily acquired under any Act the person by whom the land is so acquired must give the Valuer-General notice in writing of the acquisition within 30 days of the acquisition and that where land is subdivided or re-subdivided, the person on whose application the subdivision or re-subdivision took place must forthwith give notice of the

subdivision or re-subdivision in the prescribed form and supply to the Valuer-General such other plans or documents relating to the subdivision or re-subdivision as may be prescribed.

Clause 15 amends section 32 of the principal Act to provide that the fee for a certified copy or extract from any entry in a valuation roll will be the appropriate fee approved by the Minister instead of the fee prescribed by regulation. The amendment also inserts new subsections (3) and (4) to empower the Valuer-General to publish information as to land values in such forms as the Valuer-General thinks appropriate and make publications containing such information available for purchase at prices approved by the Minister. The Valuer-General must, at the request of the owner of land, permit the owner to inspect, free of charge, entries in the valuation roll relating to that land.

Clause 16 converts the penalty references in sections 22a (6) and 22b (5) to the equivalent divisional reference, updates maximum penalties in sections 26 (2), 27 (2) and 28 (4) from $50 to a division 7 fine ($2 000) and inserts a maximum penalty of a division 7 fine ($2 000) for non-compliance with section 29 (1).

Clause 17 is a saving provision that ensures that the definitions of 'annual value' and 'capital value' inserted by this Bill do not affect the validity of determinations of annual value and capital value made by reference to the earlier definitions.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMES (CONFISCATION OF PROFITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 696.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the Bill in principle; however, in Committee we will move an amendment. We note and support the extension of the expiry date of the Act. We recognise that the Industrial Relations Advisory Council has significant benefits for the Minister and, consequently, the Government. Advice from employers and employees indicates that it is an excellent council and communication of information from the Government to the respective bodies is well documented.

Both groups that are involved enjoy the privilege of early access to legislation. They also enjoy the privilege of being able to argue with the Minister and the Director about specific changes that they believe should to occur in any relevant legislation that the Government may put before the House. As I said, it is seen to be an effective council.

I note that the membership of the council is to be increased from 10 to 14, membership comprising the Minister, the Director of the Department of Labour, six representatives from the union movement nominated by the LTC and six members from the employer associations. There is no doubt that several significant employer organisations in the community felt that they would like to have a significant contribution to this council. We accept that the Government has noted this and is prepared to do something about it.

The Bill also amends the schedule of Acts that can be brought before the advisory council. In the Committee stage I intend to move an amendment in that regard. On that issue, I would like to take the opportunity to cite two submissions from peer groups, namely, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Engineering Employers Association. The Chamber of Commerce and industry stated:

> The chamber has no objection to the extention of this Act, nor to the expanded number of members of the council. We do however have some concerns about the deletion of workers compensation from IRAC's scrutiny, as WorkCover board members have statutory responsibilities as directors which may give rise to different priorities from those of non-director employer representatives, or indeed union representatives. A similar concern exists in relation to the long service leave, the tripartite body also being a 'board' under the relevant Act.
>
> Whilst occupational health and safety falls into a different category, as it is overseen by a commission, both the Occupational Health and Safety Commission and the LSL board have only a small number of representatives. It may therefore be preferable that an expanded IRAC retain the right to scrutinise the legislation in these two areas.

That is the concern of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The second letter is from the Engineering Employers Associaton. It states:

> There are a couple of matters arising in the schedules list of enactments which are worth attention:
>
> *(a)* The deletion of the Workers Compensation Act 1971.

In fact, that should read 'Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 1986'. It continues:

> The Engineering Employers Association has advised the Government of its opposition to this proposal for the following reasons:
>
> (i) No mechanism would exist for consultation between the three parties affected;
>
> (ii) The only forum would be the WorkCover board which (a) can only act within the duties of individual directorship obligations and *(b)* can only act within the terms the Parliament prescribes. Clearly, employer interests go to the very foundation of parliamentary interests.

Both of these organisations represent points of view that have been put to me by 20 separate employer organisations and, as I said, by a couple of members of the union movement. It seems to me that employer associations are concerned about the reduction in the ability to discuss a wide range of industrial matters that was previously available to them. In the Committee stage I will ask the Minister to consider seriously the amendment I will put before the Committee. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Minister would be disappointed if I did not have something to say about IRAC, bearing in mind the changes that are proposed in this Bill. He would be well aware that I am quite relaxed about any Government making its own arrangements as far as industrial relations are concerned, but the Opposition would probably choose a different mechanism for consulting with all parties concerned. We do not believe that we need the statutory authority of the Parliament for people to sit around a table and express a point of view.

I would like to reflect a little on IRAC and the way in which it has worked over a period of time. When the Minister or his predecessor have reached substantive agreement within this group, it has been trumpeted from the treetops that IRAC has approved of a measure, as though this were some sort of an imprimatur for the amendments to the legislation. I point out to the Minister that he is less forthcoming when there has been considerable dispute within IRAC and the numbers have been used to bulldoze through a particular measure.

On this side of the House we believe that it is important to have consultation mechanisms and we would certainly consult unions, employers and people who are affected. The danger with such arrangements is that quite often the larger groups may not understand or appreciate the problems caused in smaller areas of employment. A number of areas of small business have been affected quite dramatically in recent years. We are now seeing workers compensation costs going through the roof, and land tax and rates have gone through the roof.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, this does have something to do with this Bill, because IRAC has not in any way, in legislative form, recognised the battle that is going on among small businesses. If we are to have a consultation mechanism, it should be in an appropriate forum so that the aspirations, demands, problems and challenges facing the whole of the business sector can be aired and constructive measures taken. Nothing has come out of IRAC except legislation—and sometimes of a very indifferent form—over the past seven years since the body was first established.

I do not believe that that is a very propitious way in which to use this body. I also do not believe that by locking in employer groups we will necessarily get the best results. When I was shadow Minister of Labour I would hear about things that were canvassed in IRAC from union people who would telephone me before the legislation came before the House. I would get telephone calls from members of the union movement and be told confidential information from IRAC meetings. It is obvious that, whilst the employers seemed to play the game and were responsible as far as confidentiality was concerned, the union side had not kept quiet. Thus there was a one way track in terms of responsibility. I do not believe that IRAC has worked in a way which is of benefit to South Australian businesses, otherwise we would have seen many changes taking place in a legislative and non-legislative form to assist actively the small business people of this State.

With those few words I support the remarks of my colleague the member for Bragg who has said that there is general support for this initiative from the major groups. This is in keeping with the Minister's desire to keep the big groups happy. I do not know whether he has made much attempt to keep the small groups happy. However, there is general agreement on matter and I would be the last one to say that we should reject the amendments before us.

I do not believe that IRAC is a huge or even a minor success in industrial relations in this State, but the Opposition deems that the Minister is capable and should be allowed to make his own consultative mechanisms, of which IRAC happens to be just one.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I thank members opposite for their support. I am pleased that the member for Mitcham does not play in my football team, because he would be kicking the ball the wrong way all the time.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Membership of the council.'

Mr INGERSON: Given the increase of membership from 10 to 14, one of the concerns of many organisations is who will be the lucky one. Can the Minister say what associations he might be looking at? The same thing applies from the employees' point of view.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I have advised the member for Bragg that I will consider nominations from all employer organisations that are invited to submit them, just as I will consider nominations to the Minister from the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Amendment of the schedule.'

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 2—Leave out this clause and insert new clause as follows:

Substitution of the schedule

6. The schedule to the principal Act is repealed and the following schedule is substituted:

THE SCHEDULE

Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968
Dangerous Substances Act 1979
Employees Registry Offices Act 1915
Explosives Act 1936
Holidays Act 1910
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972
Industrial Relations Advisory Council Act 1983
Lifts and Cranes Act 1985
Long Service Leave Act 1987
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act 1987
Manufacturing Industries Protection Act 1937
Motor Fuel Distribution Act 1973
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986
Shearers Accommodation Act 1977
Shop Trading Hours Act 1977
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

The provision amends the schedule of Acts previously covered by the principal Act, one of which has been transferred to another portfolio area. I have moved this amendment because the employer associations were concerned that the right to have a wide and broad discussion about industrial relations Acts and any subsidiary Acts relating to the industrial area was being removed from the Statutory Advisory Committee. They have requested that the Acts to be deleted by the Government amendment be reinstated. I ask the Minister to seriously consider reinstating these Acts by accepting this amendment.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I indicate general support for the amendment of the member for Bragg.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition is happy that the Government has accepted this amendment and I am quite sure that the industry, particularly the employers' organisation, will appreciate that the Government has seen fit to reinstate all of these Acts. I am quite sure that the committee will now continue to function as it has in the past.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 March. Page 543.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the Bill. In discussion with the industry directly concerned, it was acknowledged that penalties had increased significantly and that they should do so, provided that they moved pretty much in line with those provided in the Dangerous Substances Act; and, in fact, these penalties do that. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I thank the member for Bragg for his support.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I rise to make a few comments, the first of which relates to the micro-conduct of the recent Federal election and its implications for South Australia and, indeed, for the electors anywhere in this great democracy of Australia. The member for Walsh asked a question of the Deputy Premier this afternoon that impinged upon the role of scrutineers, their rights and, I suppose, their obligations to the people who put them there—the candidates who authorised their presence in the boxes. There is a general expectation of scrutineers that they are part of the electoral process, that they ensure that the procedures are adhered to correctly and that the candidates' interests are well served. I say that because what happened last Saturday in many booths showed a flagrant disregard for the rightful role of scrutineers as it has extended over many years.

I have been a scrutineer at every election that I can remember, both Federal and State (in fact, in three States), since the mid-1970s. In each instance I have always had the cooperation of the returning officer at the booth and all the officials appointed to perform their important task on the day. That was not the case last Saturday. I was scrutineering at the Para Vista booth, having turned up with three other scrutineers from my side of politics and two scrutineers from the Liberal Party. We got on quite affably as, indeed, did the Deputy Premier and the member for Fisher at their booth. In every instance in which I have previously been involved there has never been any argument between the opposing sides, because the role of a scrutineer is to scrutinise the ballot and the procedure by which the ballot is counted.

We approached the returning officer in that booth and suggested that we were very much interested in the procedure that would be used but, at the end of the day, we wanted to take a very close look at the validity of the votes. As the Deputy Premier suggested here today, as scrutineers, we are very interested in the way in which the preferences go. At the booth I attended I was told, first, that we would have no right to test the validity of the votes. Then I was told that we would have the right to test the validity of the votes, once they had all been tallied and the numbers correctly checked. I was then told that it would depend upon how quickly the ballot could be counted. Once the ballot was counted, I was told that the returning officer wanted to go home early—or earlier than would be the case if scrutineers were to be allowed to observe the counting and check the validity of the votes.

I made it quite clear that I believed that there were invalid votes in some piles. It was made clear to me—this is something that needs to be checked very closely, and I will be doing that—that I had no legal right at all to check the validity of the votes in any of those bundles. That is the first time that I have been lied to by an officer in charge of a booth; it is the first time that I have had contradictory instructions; and it is the first time that we have not met with cooperation which, when all is said and done, as was agreed by all sides, would have taken only five minutes.

The ensuing arguments took very much longer than would have been the case had we had what we requested. It is not just a case of petulance on my part: a great many people across Australia were waiting to know the results in extremely tight seats. I have information that a similar instance occurred in a large number of booths and, in fact, that central instructions were sent out to the effect that scrutineers would not be accorded the same courtesies as they had received in the past.

I was very disappointed with the way in which ballots were counted at the Para Vista booth. The counters there, particularly after I had spoken to the returning officer in this booth, counted the ballots from the rear, so that it was impossible to see any candidate's name or preferences and, for that matter, the validity of the votes. Other votes were counted in such a way that it was not possible to see the last two or three candidates' names. I think that it was a disgrace and I will be making that comment to the Federal Electoral Commission. I must say that at the last Federal election it was very different. When I was a scrutineer at the Stirling East booth the returning officer asked me how the preferences were counted, and that story still causes amusement when I raise it. However, as to this particular episode, all of us who get involved in politics will tolerate so much bureacracy from the Electoral Commission, but on this occasion it went to the extreme.

I now wish to turn to a couple of very important matters of local interest in my electorate. The first relates to the proposed Pooraka Neighbourhood Watch scheme. It is a fact that household burglary, car theft and vandalism are problems in many suburbs which do not attract the attention of the media on the front page or the television stations, but they certainly attract the attention of many of my electors. Housebreaking, car theft and vandalism are annoying crimes which, in many instances, involve the theft of items on which a value cannot be placed for insurance purposes, especially items of a personal nature. However, it is good to see that this Government is addressing this problem.

The Pooraka Neighbourhood Watch scheme, which has been in the pipeline for 12 months, was formally applied for six or seven months ago. I hope that the Government can find in the budgetary process this year some means of cutting down the two-year wait that we have to go through to get these schemes in place. I do not for a moment think and would not argue here that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme is the only thing that is a deterrent to crime, but it is an important community ingredient in a general crime-fighting strategy.

The other item that I wish to talk about is the state of Montague Road between Bridge Road and Main North Road. I hope that the Minister of Transport, who has responsibility for main roads, and any of his colleagues who are involved in the budgetary process and in determining where the Highways Department will spend its money, will take on board the problems that many of my electors experience.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): At about the time of the last State election an argument was erupting in the press between Wal Fyfe, Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives, and Kym Beasley, Leader of the Government in that House. Wal Fyfe claimed that the Government was using its powers to truncate debate on important Bills in Parliament, and Minister Beasley disputed that.

With that in mind, I was elected to and entered this House, being proud to do so. I believe that the institution of Parliament is the central pillar in Australian democracy. As a representative body, Parliament reflects the wishes and

aspirations of the electorate. As a legislative body, it not only makes law but also reviews the actions and initiatives of the Government of the day by acting as a check and power on the Executive. That, I believe, is essential to the functioning of a democracy: that and the judiciary—the balance between all of them.

So, it is with much regret that, albeit after only a few weeks, I rise in this grievance debate to record my disappointment with some of the processes of this House. There could be a very long list, but today I should like to highlight just a few: first, Question Time; secondly, the increasing practice of making ministerial announcements outside this House; thirdly, the declining sitting time of this place; and, fourthly, the condition of this building.

In the Westminster system, Question Time has long been regarded as perhaps the most important part of the parliamentary day. It is one of the few opportunities that members without portfolio, and, indeed, all members of the Opposition, have to question the performance of the Government, thus fulfilling the principle that the Executive is answerable to Parliament. When we take groups through this Parliament, we point to the Bar and say that it is the highest authority within this State because people can be called to answer before it. Governments have virtually been made and broken in Question Time. I highlight the significant inroads that the Fraser Opposition made over the loans affair in causing the demise of the Whitlam Government and the subsequent general election.

I understand that in the Canadian Lower House 40 questions are regularly asked in the 45 minutes of Question Time, and in Westminister 70 questions are commonly asked in an hour. In this place, sadly, there is no similar analogy. I believe that the number of questions asked in this Parliament's hour of Question Time each day is declining. We see long questions, long explanations and often even longer replies by Ministers. Ministers in this place will stand up and talk and talk and talk merely, I believe, to fill out the time. While the Speaker rules so, that may be the prerogative of Ministers in this place, but I believe that it debases Question Time and reduces the opportunity which every member of this Parliament should have to put questions. Rather than have an hour for Question Time, I believe that this House should consider extending that time so that the Government is truly accountable to this Parliament. The Premier serves the Parliament, as do all the Ministers, and the Premier is answerable to the Parliament, as are all the Ministers, his own members and members of the Opposition.

The second point I made was government outside the Parliament. The ever-growing influence of the media on politics, together with the recent proliferation of press officers, of which this Government affords an excellent example, and of media units which I believe it also has, has had a significant effect in reducing the authority of this House. The use of press officers quickly convinced Ministers that the press was a better medium from which to control the flow of information; thus, we see ministerial announcements, which by convention belong in this House, more frequently being delivered to pre-planned press conferences. Consequently, the press gets to ask those questions of the Minister which should be the province of this House.

While he has not been the first to do it, no better example is afforded than by the Treasurer who, it has been suggested even by the press, effectively legislates through press releases by making Government decisions retrospective from the time of announcement. I believe that all members can recall the last election and the several glaring examples in which he did that.

I allude now to the time which is allowed for the debate of Bills. One of the most important Bills brought before this House in this session, on the Government's own admission, was the Marine Environment Protection Bill. That Bill caused a late-night sitting, about which other colleagues and I heard several members grumble. I do not think that the time allowed for that debate was adequate. It was a most important Bill and we should have been given time to debate it carefully. Instead, we had to sit very late to get it through the House.

If this place is to be a Parliament of the people, the representatives of the people in this place have a right to be heard. If we have no right to be heard, we should tell the electors that they are wasting their time electing us. We should tell them to cast votes to elect an Executive Government and to let that Executive Government get on with the business of governing and forget about the mockery of this place. If that is the way that the Government wants to govern, let it govern in that way.

I consider that the people are being duped if we go through this process which we call Parliament and the Ministers who sit opposite hold this place in contempt. Either they believe in the institution or they do not. Let them treat this place with the respect that it deserves or let them tell the people that they do not respect it at all.

Perhaps no better example of what I believe is a disregard for this institution can be seen in the very fabric of this building. This Chamber recently celebrated its centenary and the other Chamber its jubilee yet, if one walks around the corridors, one will notice that the carpets are worn out and in some places have been removed to prevent people tripping over them, paint is peeling off the walls and there is a general structural malaise. Not only that, the space allowed for the permanent officers of this House and for the members is little better than barely adequate.

If this institution is a place of the people, this Government can and should look to it to represent what it is: a place of the people. There should be no finer building in this State than the Parliament of South Australia. Another malaise of the building is the reception areas and general accommodation areas for the public. Mr Speaker, as you know the public has as much right in this House as has every member. Yet, when the public come into this House there are few places where they can go and little room.

On most sitting days the Gallery is crowded to the point where people have to wait outside before they can get in. It is excellent that people show that interest but I believe that, if more people want to come in, perhaps there is some way of accommodating that. It is their place and they have a right to hear what goes on; and, even more, they have a right to see what does not go on in here.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Perhaps we could have closed circuit television similar to Queensland.

Mr BRINDAL: Perhaps we could. I conclude my remarks with a plea to all members in this place. If we value the standard of Parliament and if we are to improve it, we will only do so if members on both sides of the House do not sit idly by while an arrogant Executive—

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

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Since the Federal election on Saturday I have not heard anyone from the opposite side of the House mention anything about it. Therefore, I think it is appropriate at this stage that I make a number of observations, particularly when we consider that every political pundit and journalist around the country said that, if ever there was an election that the Labor Party would lose, it

was be this one. We have seen from the results—and we have had to wait a few days for them—the return of the Hawke Government for a record fourth term. People were saying that this was an election that the Labor Party would lose and that the Liberal Party would be elected, but it is obvious that the Liberal Party was not good enough.

Right from the outset of the campaign a Federal Liberal Party frontbencher, I think it was Senator Austin Lewis, came out and lambasted the Opposition Leader, Mr Peacock, who responded within about half an hour and sacked him. It is always a good way to start a Federal or State election campaign by sacking one of your Party's frontbenchers! Shortly after that we saw the great debate which was won, hands down, by the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke. That is not only my opinion and that of other members on this side of the House—independent surveys run by television stations, newspapers and so on agreed.

The overwhelming opinion of the people was that Bob Hawke won the great debate which, therefore, set him off on the right track for the ensuing four weeks of the campaign. It was interesting to note the attitude of the press in respect of the great debate. If Peacock had clearly won it, the press would have come out the next day and said it was a clear win for Mr Peacock. However, because Mr Hawke won the debate, the press played it down and said it was not worth it, it should not have taken place, conditions were too restrictive, and so on. Needless to say the public of Australia noticed that the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, clearly won the debate and set us off on the right track.

I noticed that, in all of the *Advertiser* editorials from the beginning of the campaign until the election, not one was supportive of the Federal Government. Members on this side of the House are fairly used to that; nothing has changed. I also noticed that the other daily publication in Adelaide—the *News*, and I presume it is owned by the same corporation—did its normal trick in the last week of the campaign and put its editorial on the front page of the paper imploring everyone to vote for the Liberal Party. The election result shows how much notice people take of that newspaper.

Members on this side have some experience with the *News* because in 1979 we successfully took the *News* to the Press Council of Australia not only accusing it of bias during the 1979 election campaign but also proving it. It is not unusual to note that the *News* has not changed its position since that time. If one takes the point that the ALP should have lost the recent Federal election, what happened to the Liberals? I cannot help it if the Liberals have no frontbench, no leadership, no policies and no direction. One can apply that to both the Federal Liberal Party and the State Liberal Party. How can people possibly vote for a Party which is in such disarray and lacks leadership and policies?

Mr Groom: Who is their Leader?

Mr McKEE: I am not sure but I will try to deal with that in a moment. People may not know this, but during a Federal election the ALP really has two conservative parties running against it: the Liberal Party and the National Party. However, from the outset of the recent campaign they set about attacking each other, standing candidates against each other and knocking each other off in Queensland and New South Wales. It really is some coalition! They cannot even get their act together as a coalition. I do not know whether they ever will, but that is their problem. For the next few weeks we will see stories in the media about the Liberals turning on each other while they point the bone and search for the guilty to determine what went wrong.

Mr Groom: What did go wrong?

Mr McKEE: I just dealt with that. I do not know whether the honourable member was in the Chamber, but I said it was as a result of the lack of leadership, policies and direction.

Mr Holloway: Bring back John Howard!

Mr McKEE: That is the point I was about to raise. The Liberal Party now has to find itself a Leader. Will it recycle poor old Johnny Howard? Looking at the Liberal Party over the past 10 years, it might try to recycle him once more. However, there are some Liberals who think they cannot do that any more; instead they will put up a fellow called Dr Hewson. Dr Hewson has already been told to prepare himself for the leadership and to sell his two restaurants in Sydney, his Lamborghini and his Porsche.

An honourable member: His Ferrari?

Mr McKEE: No, they let him keep the Ferrari.

An honourable member: The Rolls went, too.

Mr McKEE: That's right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McKEE: I apologise, Sir. My colleague was counting how many cars Dr Hewson actually owns. That is quite important, because I wonder whether the ordinary worker will take too much notice of a fellow who owns all those cars. What do we do with Dr Hewson? Obviously, he could go into the used car industry. The Liberals got poor old Fred Chaney out of the Senate and said, 'You run for the Lower House because we will set you up for the leadership when we win Government'. Of course, the Liberals did not win.

They shifted poor old Fred Chaney, one of their better operators in the Senate, to the Lower House and what will they do with him? They will not give him a guernsey—he will not be the Leader or the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: They've got John Olsen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McKEE: I forgot about that. They are recruiting from this State and John Olsen, I am sure, will take a leadership role in the Opposition. In respect of my comments about Dr Hewson and his obvious wealth, I am concerned that the ordinary working people will suffer and would have suffered under a Liberal Party victory. On Sunday morning I was out in my electorate straight after the poll talking to people at the Gilles Plains Primary School campus where there are community health workers and a child-care health centre, which is funded by the State and Federal Labor Governments.

The first thing I said when the result of the election was unclear was that those people who avail themselves of that service and the dedicated workers who work in it had better hope that we win, because the first thing that would get knocked off if the Liberals did get in would be such community welfare and social welfare services that have been provided by both the State Government and the Federal Labor Government.

The big to-do in South Australia concerned my colleague Mr Bilney, who was going to get knocked off by an attack from both the conservatives and their candidate and the former Leader of the Democrats, Janine Haines. What a surprise she got. I just wonder whether it was a deliberate move on her part to retire gracefully from politics. I remember when I was in the Party office watching these sorts of activities that she made an announcement that she would move down from the Senate and run in the seat of Hindmarsh, which was where she was born and raised, and she thought she could knock off John Scott.

Something changed there. She thought that with interest rates, unemployment and all those sorts of blow-up problems that she and the Liberals had been putting out, she would tackle Gordon Bilney. What a surprise she got. Certainly, I have to doff my cap to Mr Bilney as the giant

killer in last Saturday's election. Not only did he decimate the Democrats but he decimated their leadership, and the Democrats are now going through the same process as the Liberals—looking for someone to blame and seeing what sort of leadership they can find.

The other good point about the Federal election in respect of this State was in the Federal electorate of Adelaide. My State seat of Gilles is fully contained in the Adelaide electorate. We saw a difference in the types of campaigning. Mr Pratt thinks that the voters are stupid, and he behaved accordingly in the way that he promoted himself in that electorate. Dr Bob Catley, on the other hand, went directly to the Labor Party supporters, the ordinary working people in the community and knocked on their doors, presenting himself to them personally along with the policies of the Labor Party.

He did not have a bunch of showgirls in miniskirts down at the Buckingham Arms Hotel on the Thursday night before polling day saying, 'Vote for me.' It is that sort of campaigning that the people can see through clearly. The people of Adelaide showed that at the ballot box, and we no longer have Mr Pratt. I thought the other surprising result involved the Leader of the National Party, Mr Blunt.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 3 April at 2 p.m.