

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 April 1991

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

### COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGE

Notice of Motion, Other Business, No. 1: Hon. B.C. Eastick to move:

That in the opinion of this House the Standing Orders Committee should consider amendments for ultimate inclusion in the Standing Orders of the House to provide for a committee of privilege.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** This motion was drawn up at a time when there was no activity in relation to privilege of the Parliament in general. It is a fact that that is now proceeding with a joint select committee. I believe that the deliberations of that select committee, when handed down, will give a better indication of what this House needs to do in respect of its own Standing Orders. That being the case, it is not my intention that this motion should be debated any further; nor should it be voted on in a positive sense.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a little confusion.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am quite happy for it to be read and discharged.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member is not proceeding with the notice of motion, he should not have spoken to it. However, as I understand it, he is not proceeding with it we will not continue with the matter any further.

### RURAL INTEREST RATES

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

That this House asks the Premier as Federal President of the Australian Labor Party and the Minister of Agriculture to do all in their power to convince the Federal Government to provide sufficient finance for interest rate relief subsidies of at least 5 per cent through the Rural Finance and Development Division of the Department of Agriculture to help the rural sector recover and stabilise.

In speaking to this motion, I believe it has been grossly irresponsible of the Government to have waited month after month without taking any specific action to assist the rural sector out of the present crisis at the earliest opportunity. I say that because we would recall, way back in September last year, that it was clear that this State was heading for a rural crisis, and the Liberal Party challenged the Government to take action.

The Government issued many statements. One statement referred to increasing the amount of rural assistance that could be borrowed from \$100 000 to \$150 000. Other statements referred to additional assistance through budget sheets and the like and that the State Government would communicate with the Federal Government through the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy. However, when it all comes down to the actual question of whether real assistance is being provided, in the main the answer is very little, if any. In the very short time available, I wish to highlight an aspect of interest rate subsidy that was put forward by the Liberal Party as part of its policy prior to the last State election. It continues to be part of our rural policy, and it states:

A Liberal Government will review all methods of funding by the State to farmers affected by natural disaster.

We recognised then that many of the problems on Eyre Peninsula were caused by the failure of the then system to trigger assistance at an early stage. We said that many farmers on Eyre Peninsula were non-viable because, at that time, it was nearly three years since the drought had commenced. It was only after three years of drought and following community pressure that the State Government reacted and endeavoured to help those people. That is a very similar scenario to what we have at present.

It is now six or seven months since the trigger was pulled for the provision of rural assistance to the farming sector, but nothing has occurred. Our policy further stated:

We believe that, with the early triggering of financial assistance, many farmers with cash flow problems from drought or natural disasters could avoid serious financial predicaments. We believe the banks and commercial lending organisations are in the best position to assess and help farmers . . .

As a result, the long-term aim of a Liberal Government was to ensure that only commercial lenders would lend capital to farmers; because they are specifically set up to do so. Where assistance was needed for drought or natural disaster cash flow problems, it was to be requested initially by a joint approach to the Rural Assistance Branch (now called the Rural Finance and Development Division) by the bank and the farmer, followed by an assessment of viability and the need for assistance to be carried out by the Rural Assistance Branch and the bank. Loans and additional loans required would be lent by the bank or commercial institution on the security they held or obtained from the farmer. Other approved debts could be included in the loan. Small business operators in rural communities affected by these natural disasters could also qualify for assistance.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** This is the Liberal Party's policy before the last State election—a policy that 18 months ago stated clearly what one of the key answers would be to any crisis, yet we have seen this Government stagger from month to month without doing anything. I am amazed that the member for Hartley is questioning my reading into *Hansard* for public consumption aspects of this policy, because so often he is the one who interjects and asks what is our policy. Well, we have a policy and it is a pity that your Government has not had one, because you are to be held responsible—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder will direct his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr MEIER:** The Government is responsible for so many of the problems that currently exist. As I said, Liberal policy before the last State election indicated that small business operators in rural communities affected by these natural disasters could also qualify for assistance. The interest rate charged was to be fixed by the bank or commercial lending organisation for the term of the loan. The next point is very important: the State would subsidise the difference between the two interest rates for the period of the loan. There we see the key to the policy. The document covers a variety of areas, basically all the factors that are currently besetting our rural economy which is a disaster and the likes of which we have not seen in the past.

Yesterday, when I asked of the Premier what approach had been made under Rural Assistance B, the Premier, besides attacking its wheat subsidies (which had nothing to do with my question), referred briefly to the fact that he was seeking an 80/20 subsidy from the Federal Government. In other words, 80 per cent funding was to come from Federal Government and 20 per cent from State sources. Are the Premier and his Government aware of the legislation as it relates to section B rural assistance, because subclause 10 (ii) of the schedule provides:

Subsidies paid under this subclause shall not exceed 50 per cent of the interest payable on and associated costs of such loans, and the State shall bear half the costs of the subsidies out of its own funds.

It is quite clearly specified that the maximum amount of subsidy the State can expect to get from the Federal Government under Rural Assistance B is 50 per cent. The State makes the payments, the State bears half the costs of the payments, the Commonwealth bears the other half, and the maximum amount that can be paid to any farmer is half the interest servicing cost, plus other associated costs or fees.

In simple terms, if a farmer is currently paying 16 per cent, that interest rate could be subsidised by 8 per cent to 8 per cent, and the Commonwealth could pick up 4 per cent and the State could pick up 4 per cent of the subsidy. Given that the Premier said that an 80/20 relationship was being sought, in other words 80 per cent of the funds coming from the Federal Government and 20 per cent coming from the State Government, I wonder whether it is known that under the terms and conditions of Schedule B of the rural assistance provisions, that is not possible. It does not surprise me that the inference was made that they think the Commonwealth is unlikely to take up that offer. The Commonwealth would not be allowed to take up the offer: it would be legislatively barred from doing that.

This motion is a responsible course of action. It is a way that we should be looking at very succinctly and with all hope; it is only one aspect of a passage that is needed, but it is an important part that the State Government can play with for a month after its contribution has virtually been nothing. I have been advised that I have taken more than my time, but I hope to have the opportunity later to continue this debate. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### WHEAT PRICES

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That this House supports the Minister of Agriculture in his endeavour to obtain Federal Government support for a minimum price for wheat for the 1991-92 wheat crop of \$135 per tonne and further this House calls on the Premier to make the strongest possible representations to the Prime Minister to support the application of \$135 per tonne for wheat grown in the 1991-92 season.

All members of the House are aware of the difficult situation facing people in rural Australia and particularly in South Australia. The wheat industry is one of the most significant earners of overseas income for this State and nation and all members are aware that it is essential that this year's wheat crop is sown that will meet all our contractual arrangements and fill new and existing orders.

Therefore, it is essential that the Commonwealth Government gives an indication of a reasonable price so that organisations providing finance can be involved in ensuring that a wheat crop is sown in the forthcoming season. In some instances financial institutions are hesitant and unsure. They want confidence, and this motion aims to bring to the attention of this Parliament the difficult situation that many wheat producers are facing in this State and nation, through no fault of their own. This situation has been caused by circumstances far beyond their control, resulting from the irrational policies of the EEC, the farm support legislation in the US and the economic policies now in place in this country.

To put it mildly, there is great concern and uncertainty throughout rural Australia. People are concerned about whether they will continue to have a roof over their head

and whether they will have the ability to carry on with their livelihood. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the Australian Government has an involvement. It is no good members claiming that we do not have the money, because Australia will be in a worse financial situation if Governments do not give support.

There is nothing wrong with the Government from time to time being involved in the marketplace, because other Governments are doing it. I do not support the full steam ahead approach of complete deregulation and complete removal of all support and tariffs in Australia because it will have a severe and detrimental effect upon industry and employment.

**Mr Hamilton:** Not radio stations?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** I do not see anything wrong with the Government giving support because, unless some support is provided, less and less employment will be available. We will not have a motor car industry or wheat or barley growers in Australia. What will we do with all these people? Will we clobber the cities with them? Will we have a situation where people will not have sufficient income to maintain a reasonable standard of living? If we want any evidence to prove what I am saying is correct, in the first edition of the *Australian Farm Journal* the appointment of a new US Secretary of Agriculture is discussed under the heading 'US Farm Policy Remains Despite New Appointments'. Although the US Administration may favour less support, American politicians are not going to let down their constituencies and it is purely a matter of domestic policy in that country. Therefore, it should be a matter of domestic politics in this country to support our growers.

The Canadian Government has just established an insurance package to guarantee incomes. Those are the sorts of policies that we should be putting in place in Australia—giving some guarantees—because the Australian farming community is not only efficient but also has provided great benefits to the nation as a whole. Therefore, this motion to support the Minister in his endeavours to secure a floor price for wheat so that farmers are in a position to maintain their sowing programs is not only essential but in the long-term interests of all South Australians and Australians. I have a lot more to say, but time is of the essence. Therefore, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### MICRO-ECONOMIC REFORM

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I move:

That this House notes the initiatives being taken by the New South Wales Government, which are supported by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Carr, in advocating micro-economic reform and privatisation; and calls on the Government to adopt the same policies which would result in lower State charges, particularly for electricity and transport, more accessible Government services and lower food costs.

This motion clearly sets out for us the direction in which we need to go. It is indicated to us by the bipartisan approach that has now been taken in New South Wales. We should note the initiatives being taken by the New South Wales Government, which are publicly supported by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in that State, in advocating micro-economic reform and privatisation. This House should call on the Government to adopt the same policies that would result in lower State charges, more particularly for electricity and transport, and make Government services more accessible. Overall, it would lower food costs.

Such policies would be counter-inflationary, they would bring down inflation and be of great assistance to consumers everywhere. Government charges, wherever they occur, either upfront or through the back door into the hip-pocket, are inflationary in one way or another. They ought not to be made by a Government such as this to cover itself for its own ineptitude, incompetence and lack of consideration of its responsibilities in administering the affairs of its departments and agencies and, indeed, the economy in which it has intervened. Costs of that kind need to be addressed, particularly by getting rid of unnecessary Government enterprises and unnecessary Government intervention in our lives and businesses. I do not need to take any more time of the House. The motion is straightforward. If this Government and this House cannot support this motion, God help us, because no-one else will.

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### RURAL SECTOR FINANCE

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I move:

That this House—

(a) calls on all financial institutions providing finance to the rural community, including small businesses, not to proceed with any forced sales or evictions until the Commonwealth Government's rural package is announced;

(b) calls on the South Australian Government to closely monitor and examine each case where farmers are forced to sell their properties with a view to ensuring that they have been fairly treated and that all avenues have been explored to allow them to remain on their properties;

and

(c) calls on the Government to initiate discussions with the financial institutions to ensure that they take a reasonable approach to the plight of the rural sector in this State.

I think everyone recognises that the rural sector, including small business in the rural areas, is going through one of its most difficult and traumatic times. During the time that I have had the privilege of being a member of this place, this is the most difficult, the most unsettling and the most economically devastating time in most rural areas of this State and the nation. Those organisations which have had the privilege of lending money in this country have a responsibility to ensure that commonsense prevails and that people who are in the most difficult situations are treated fairly. One has only to look at the support mechanisms available throughout the other large exporting nations, such as the United States of America, the EEC and Canada, to see that there is an urgent need to assist these people in their difficult times.

In many cases the financial institutions provided money to rural producers when things were good. They were very happy to lend them money; in many cases there was competition between the banks and others to see who could provide the most funds; they were buying business. That was good when things were going well, but now there is a problem: in some cases they do not want to accept their full social responsibilities. As well as their responsibilities to shareholders, they have a social responsibility to the rest of the nation.

There are financial institutions in this State providing funds to rural producers on the condition that they sell their properties. That is not a particularly enlightened way of ensuring that people do the best they can. It is not something that will put confidence back into the marketplace, and it is certainly a course of action which will further depress the rural land values in South Australia.

One of the things concerning me is that if there are forced sales, if people are forced to put their properties on the market during this particularly depressed period, the value of those properties will be further eroded and in the long term the financial institutions will lose millions of dollars, people will be evicted from their farms and lose their lifestyles, and at the end of the day experienced producers will leave the industry. If we are not very careful we will create a situation where there will be large numbers of absentee landlords owning large tracts of agricultural land across Australia, which in itself is a bad thing. I am certainly not in favour of that action.

So, there is a very urgent need for financial responsibility on the part of the financial institutions. The banks have had a windfall with the excessively high interest rates which have been applying in this country for far too long. I believe that some of that windfall must be put back into the community to try to stabilise what is a most difficult situation. At the end of the day, if the banks force sales across this State, they will lose millions of dollars. They have to recognise that factor very clearly. They have to recognise their best option—the best option for the farming community and the small business community in rural Australia and for the nation as a whole—which is to allow those people to sensibly trade out of their operations and enter into schemes of arrangement, which will in many cases mean writing off large amounts of interest. There is no other course of action open to those institutions. I know that they do not want to talk about this publicly, but that is an option, an option which in my view they cannot avoid, because there is tremendous hardship, uncertainty and concern out there. One has only to look at how the downturn has applied across the State.

I could cite at length figures, statistics and quotations from around Australia and the world. I hope that everyone in this place recognises the urgent need for a responsible course of action to be taken by all financial institutions, including those that are owned and operated by the Government. This crisis has demonstrated the need for Governments in this country to look very closely at the Canadian Federal Government's plan to establish a permanent farm income insurance program. That scheme should be investigated very quickly to see whether it can be applied to Australia. When we consider the sort of subsidies that apply in the United States and the EEC, a measure of this nature should be examined.

People on farms in my electorate and across Australia are not sure whether they will have adequate resources to sow a crop in the forthcoming year. That is a very bad situation. There is an urgent need to ensure that sufficient funds are available to provide money for this year's crop. When one considers that the American Congress is looking at proposals to subsidise its wheat growing industry by up to \$1 billion this financial year, one can see the problems that Australia is facing.

I hope that my few brief comments this morning have clearly shown that there is an urgent need to resolve this difficult situation. It is not satisfactory for financial institutions to continually send out letters that are less than helpful and lack understanding and compassion. They should be talking to people sensibly and going through their options with a view to keeping the majority of them on their farms. Some of the letters I have seen (and I am aware of others) are certainly not helpful. The banks ought to sit down and work out realistic options so that people are able to meet their commitments. At the end of the day that will be to the benefit of not only the farming community but also the financial institutions. These letters telling people to sell their

farms are not only unnecessary but also very unwise as the banks will not recoup their money.

In one case a bank forced the sale of a farm and lost almost \$500 000. That certainly has a depressing effect on the economy in rural areas. If we are not careful we will devastate small country towns and businesses. We will then lose services and see a complete disruption of society in those areas. I hope that the Government will do everything possible to put into place the suggestions that I have put forward. I would like to make a longer contribution as I could give many examples but, as time is of the essence, I will conclude by commending the motion to the House.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

### BALTIC STATES

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to—

- (a) take steps to convey to the USSR Government that they should de-occupy the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania;
  - (b) make foreign aid assistance direct to the people and governments of the Baltic States;
  - (c) inform the USSR Government that it intends to raise the independence of the Baltic States in international forums;
- and
- (d) restrict foreign aid disbursements to the USSR Government if the USSR continues to refuse to enter into negotiations for independence and continues to encourage armed crises in the Baltic States.

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, three independent nations in Europe, lost their freedom in the Second World War as a result of aggression by Stalin and Hitler. Before the war, all three of the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were full members of the League of Nations and had signed non-aggression treaties with the Soviet Union. Yet all three countries were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union during the Second World War as a result of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939 which divided Eastern Europe into Nazi and Soviet spheres of influence.

Stalin waited until the world's horrified gaze was fixed on the spectacle of Hitler's tanks rolling into Paris before he finally ordered his Red Army to invade, occupy and annex the Baltic States. A wave of terror followed the June 1940 Soviet invasion. Tens of thousands suspected opponents of Soviet rule—including not only members of political parties, but also members of non-political organisations like the Church, the Red Cross, the scouting movement, and even stamp-collectors' clubs—faced arrest, torture and death as 'enemies of the people'.

In the first year of Soviet occupation, over 100 000 Baltic people were deported to Soviet slave labour camps in the Arctic and Siberia where many of them perished. The figures of deaths due to murder, deportation, illegal conscription, forcible evacuation and acts of war by the occupying forces during 1940-41, were as follows: 60 000 for Estonia, 35 000 for Latvia and 34 000 for Lithuania. If these figures are accurate, Estonia can be said to have lost about 4 per cent of its pre-war population, and the other two Baltic States about 1.5 per cent to 2 per cent each. It should be remembered that, had Hitler's invasion of the USSR not intervened, the Soviet deportation figures would, in all likelihood, have been considerably higher.

Following the Nazi occupation of the Baltic States during 1941-44, the Soviets again invaded the Baltic States and reconsolidated their control through killings, repression and

new mass deportations. Between 1944 and 1949, some 600 000 Baltic people, out of a population of just a little over 4 million, were deported to Siberia. The Soviet policy of genocide and terror was a major factor in so many Baltic refugees fleeing to the safety of countries in the free world, including Australia. There is scarcely a family of Estonian, Latvian or Lithuanian descent in South Australia that has not been scarred by the deaths of close relatives at the hands of the Soviets. For decades after the Second World War, the Soviets pursued a conscious policy of forced 'Russification' aimed at suppressing the religious, cultural, and historical heritage of the Baltic people. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has been unable to force the acceptance of an alien life of totalitarian domination.

Today, in the face of the overwhelming physical might of the Soviet Red Army and the organs of Soviet repression, the Baltic peoples have stood up for their inalienable right to freedom and self-determination. On 9 February this year, residents of Lithuania participated in a referendum, deemed illegal by Moscow, in which they were asked whether or not they supported a democratic and independent status for their country. Some 90.47 per cent of those who took part voted 'Yes'. Similar referenda were held in Latvia and Estonia on 3 March. Some 73.58 per cent of voters in Latvia and 77.83 per cent of voters in Estonia supported democracy and independence for their countries.

The three-quarters 'Yes' vote in Estonia and Latvia is of particular significance, especially given the large Russian-speaking minorities which have settled in these two countries since the war. Ethnic Russians presently make up over 30 per cent of the population of Estonia and over 40 per cent of the population of Latvia. The referenda results indicate that a surprisingly large proportion of Russians in these countries support independence from the Soviet Union.

By continuing the illegal occupation of the Baltic States under the provisions of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the Soviet Union is clearly violating international law, particularly the right to self-determination as set forth in the United Nations Charter and in subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly. Resolution 1541 of the General Assembly, dealing with self-determination, stipulates that the decision to incorporate into another state 'should be the result of the freely expressed wishes of the territories' peoples acting with full knowledge of the change in status, their wishes having been expressed through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage.'

Under international law, Soviet rule in the Baltic States has no legitimacy whatsoever. The only way it has maintained its power there since the war has been through genocide and terror. To suggest that the Kremlin has any right to interfere in the internal affairs of these sovereign nations is tantamount to saying that the protocols of the Nazi-Soviet Pact have some sort of validity 50 years after the war.

Until a year ago, there was a commonly heard argument that the West should not be too precipitate in supporting the Baltic States' struggle to reclaim their rightful independence. It was feared that, in light of the dramatic changes across Eastern Europe and the apparent momentum of liberal reforms in the USSR, a hardline Baltic policy on the part of the West might weaken Gorbachev's political standing in the Communist Party and might endanger the very reform process the West hoped would eventually succeed. That argument, if it ever had any justification earlier in the Gorbachev era, has been well and truly overtaken by recent events and by Gorbachev's dramatic repudiation of his own 'Glasnost' policies.

Liberal-minded reformers have either been sacked or have resigned from the Gorbachev administration. Gorbachev has slammed down the lid on the possibility of any further moves towards democracy in the USSR with his appointment last year of Communist hardliner Marshal Boris K. Pugo as Interior Minister, and General Gromov, who commanded the Soviet forces in Afghanistan, as Pugo's deputy. The current head of the KGB is Vladimir A. Kryuchkov, a man who played key roles in suppressing the 1956 Hungarian Uprising and the 1981 Soviet-backed crackdown on Poland's Solidarity trade union.

Gorbachev, along with his hardline appointees Pugo, Gromov and Kryuchkov, must bear the blame for escalating tensions in the Baltic States earlier this year by ordering Soviet forces to occupy press buildings and to menace the civilian populations there. These crude measures, reminiscent of a Soviet era we had hoped had gone forever, resulted in the deaths of 14 civilians in Lithuania on Sunday 13 January and four more in Latvia on Sunday 20 January.

Gorbachev, despite his Nobel Peace Prize, has spurned the language of reason and persuasion: instead he has chosen the language of the mailed fist. He has chosen not the path to parliamentary democracy but the road to Tiananmen Square.

Similar resolutions to the four proposals contained in this motion were passed unanimously at a Baltic freedom rally held on the steps of Parliament House, North Terrace, on 9 March 1991 in support of the recent independence votes in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

My resolution calls not for redress of the crimes committed by the Soviets against the Baltic populations but simply for recognition by the world community of the Baltic States' inalienable right to recover their rightful independence and to join the fraternity of free nations.

To this end, the Australian Government should take immediate steps for the deoccupation of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, and to remove the Soviet army from Baltic soil so that then, and only then, the world can talk about sovereignty. George Bush told Hussein recently, 'Remove your troops from Kuwait.' This is what Australia and the Western nations should ask the Soviets to do.

As well they should include establishing Australian information centres in Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius (capitals of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania respectively) which could serve as the foundation upon which to build formal diplomatic missions in the future. Baltic diplomats and Government officials for their part should be received by the Australian Government in a manner befitting the representatives of sovereign countries.

As the President of Lithuania put it on 19 January in his appeal to members of the Australian Parliament:

If Australia can help confront tyranny in the Persian Gulf, where it has sent three warships, then surely Australia can confront tyranny in the Baltics, where Lithuania requests only one ambassador.

If the Soviets remain intransigent in the area of occupation, the Australian Government should, I believe, make foreign aid assistance direct to the people and Governments of the Baltic States, and inform the USSR Government that it intends to raise the independence of the Baltic States in international forums. I urge members to support this motion.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Ethnic Affairs):** The Government will be supporting the motion of the member for Bragg. I do not wish to speak at great length on this matter, because we have a time limitation and my colleague the member for Spence also wishes to contribute to the debate. In indicating our support for this motion, I

point out that it is based on the premise that the inclusion of the Baltic States within the Soviet Union was the result of a fraud. It was the result of a gross misrepresentation and a falsification of history. To talk about the Federation of the Soviet Union being a federation of equals is to perpetuate that fraud.

What is now provided in events of recent times, is the opportunity to erase the problems caused by that fraud, or at least to try to mitigate them to some extent by giving the rightful opportunities for independence to the three Baltic States. They have themselves attested to that by the plebiscites that have taken place on 9 February in Lithuania and on 3 March in Estonia and Latvia, in each case significant majorities being achieved for independence for those Baltic States. In the case of Latvia and Estonia, as has been mentioned, the figures were particularly significant given the large minorities that exist in both republics, particularly the Russian minorities.

The situation is quite clearly that the peoples of those three Baltic States, regardless of their origins, overwhelmingly support the need to be free of the false federation that has formed the Soviet Union. One point that needs to be recognised is that recent criticisms by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union about activities in the Baltic States are themselves the most cynical representation of events. They represent a cynical misinterpretation of facts of history. To hear Gorbachev make the statement that he believes in order in the Baltic States, criticising the Governments of the Baltic States for their not maintaining order, and to hear his criticism of the plebiscites that have taken place in the Baltic States, instead favouring the referendum that the Soviet Union conducted just recently, in both cases, is to deny actual facts. Either he is being cynical in the extreme or he has no real knowledge of what is taking place within those republics.

How can the leader of a national Government or of a federated Government say that he is protecting order when his own soldiers storm the Parliament building of one of those republics? How can that same leader say that he is supporting the maintenance of order when there are dead bodies to show for the actions of his own troops in those republics? Likewise, how can the leader of that Government, which itself takes pride in victories at elections in the past of 99.9 per cent voting one way, with only .1 per cent allegedly voting the other way, claim that it is the master of democratic elections, against the plebiscites conducted by the national Parliaments in each of those republics? How can they claim that the referendum that took place, conducted by the Soviet Union, was in fact a fair referendum with honest questions, when 15 of the republics in the Soviet Union boycotted it, when the questions were obscurely worded as to give results that are effectively meaningless, against the popularly supported referenda that were conducted on 9 February and 3 March—referenda that did not have obscure questions but simple, straightforward questions asking whether or not those republics should be independent?

There can be no doubt that the price that has been paid by the peoples of those three republics has been enormous—in human terms, given those who have died, either from deportation or oppression within the republics, those who have been forced to leave their homeland and those who have suffered while staying within their homeland. Also, the cost has been enormous in economic terms. Those three republics that had the opportunity to be economically viable in their own right, which have had significant economic resources and manufacturing bases in decades gone by, have

seen that effectively plundered by their forced inclusion in a false federation.

However, history cannot retrace its steps in terms of totally eradicating the price that has been paid by the peoples of those republics. However, what it can do is make sure that from this point on no more of that happens, and that would be tribute enough to the long-standing struggle of the people of those republics both within the republics and in countries overseas.

It is worth noting that those Australians of Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian origin have maintained a ceaseless representation of the cause of the nation from which they came and, by consequence, of the cause of freedom. They are to be congratulated that even at times when it appeared they would not be accepted, and I am sad to say when an Australian Federal Government indicated that it would not accept their point of view, nevertheless they never wavered. I hope that that dedication to the cause of freedom to those republics will be picked up as soon as possible. This motion offers an opportunity to provide some support for that, and I commend it to the House.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The question of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia is one of decolonisation. A Lithuanian has rather less in common with a Russian than a Papuan has with an Australian. I will not recapitulate the history of the Baltic States, which has been outlined by the Minister and the member for Bragg, but I want to make one remark about the history of Lithuania. It has been a common insult to Australia's Lithuanian community from members of the Communist Party of Australia and their fellow travellers that somehow Lithuanian Australians were collaborators, collectively, with Nazi Germany. That is a straightforward lie. The last independent Government of Lithuania took strong measures against the local Lithuanian Nazi Party and collaborators; indeed, so strong was its actions against Nazism in the Baltic States that Hitler's Germany imposed a trade embargo and sanctions on independent Lithuania.

The politics of the Baltic States is rather more complicated than the summary by the member for Bragg would indicate. Anatol Lieven has written a scholarly article for the UK journal *Encounter* outlining those complexities. The problem of history for the Baltic States is that there are some regions in the Baltic States where migration from Russia and Poland has resulted in a majority of Russian and Polish inhabitants. I think some Australians would assume from their viewing of the television coverage of demonstration and counter demonstration in the Baltic States that those Russian and Polish communities are opposed to independence. The truth is that most Russians and Poles living in the Baltic States support independence for the Baltic States, because they realise that the Baltic States have an excellent economic record, they are far wealthier than those regions of the Soviet Union which surround them and, because of that wealth, there is much migration from those regions into the Baltic States.

The fact is that the Russian and Polish minorities in the Baltic States do not want to share that wealth with their fellow nationalities who may migrate in large numbers to the Baltic States if the union continues. So, those Russian and Polish minorities, by and large, support independence. The issues in Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia are not the only questions of decolonisation in the Soviet Union today: there is Moldavia, Byelorussian, the Ukraine (especially West Ukraine), Georgia, Armenia and the Azerbaijan.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** As the Minister says, there is also the question of the annexation of Karelia, originally part of

Finland, by the Soviet Union. I believe the way forward for the Australian Government—and, let us face it, the Australian Government cannot have much influence on the outcome—is to encourage an evolving federation—indeed, a confederation—and to trade and deal directly with the republics of the Soviet Union. I support the motion, despite some infelicities of the English language.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I thank the Minister and the member for Spence for their support for the motion. I note the sincerity of both members.

Motion carried.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report be extended until the first day of the next session, and that the committee have power to act during the recess.

Motion carried.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 7 March. Page 3387.)

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I do not wish to appear alarmist or facetious, but there is a distinct smell of smoke in the House.

**The SPEAKER:** I have had the matter investigated; welding work is being carried out on the roof near the air-conditioning plant, and smoke and fumes are being picked up by the intakes. Everything is safe, so the member for Napier can sit safely in his seat.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** This debate has occupied the time and thoughts of members in this House during private members' time and, I suspect, in their personal correspondence over many months. In closing the debate, I wish to thank all members from both sides of the House who have contributed, and I mention the members for Playford, Spence, Stuart, Henley Beach, Albert Park, Napier, Adelaide and Coles, and the Minister. In saying that, I hope I have not forgotten anyone. I believe that the record will show that the contributions were many and varied. Many of the speakers in this House made valuable contributions to this debate. I acknowledge that opinions differ on this matter. It is not easy for me to sit here and hear the member for Albert Park and the member for Napier impugn my motives, but I accept that they have an opinion and that they are entitled to it. I disagree.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Playford did indeed continue in a similar vein, but I can say that the members for Albert Park and Napier were worth listening to, while the comments made by the member for Playford are best forgotten. I want to make a couple of brief points.

One of the main contributors in the debate was my colleague the member for Adelaide, the shadow Minister. His contribution was outstanding and threw much light on the debate. I refer the House to the Furler report, which has been quoted both for and against introducing this Bill. As the member for Adelaide succinctly explained to the House, the Furler report called for pregnancy termination advisory clinics, but it did so clearly within the context of

the hospital system. I wish to read this into *Hansard* and I quote from the member for Adelaide and the Furler report. The Furler report states:

The constraints of existing legislation still apply, whereby termination of pregnancy can only be performed in approved hospitals. Rather than an impediment the working party believed that the hospital environment can provide some protection to both women clients and service providers at a time when irresponsible acts of violence and infringements on personal privacy are being perpetrated by some extremist groups . . . Furthermore the working party believed that by locating an important primary health care service which blends personal care with prevention, health education and promotion, the community health service role of hospitals, and concomitantly their responsiveness to community needs might be improved . . . The working party felt it most appropriate to build on services and goodwill where they already exist.

In respect of recommendation No. 6 the report continues:

Pregnancy Advisory Centres be established at the Queen Victoria Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre and the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The member for Adelaide said:

The Furler report called for four such centres, each to be established under the umbrella of a major metropolitan hospital . . . The Government has no intention of meeting the requirement of this recommendation.

Similarly and in an equal vein, I commend the speech of the member for Spence. Although I have been a member of this place for only five minutes in comparison to some other members, I can say in all honesty that that is one of the finest contributions I have heard on any matter in this place. The member for Spence's contribution was clear, simple, logical and well argued, and I applaud the honourable member's sentiments. I seriously challenge all members in this House to take particular note of his comments in making up their mind about this debate. It was a fine and worthwhile contribution and I can pay the member for Spence no better compliment than to say that I wish I had said part of what he had said, and I mean that sincerely.

The Minister in his summation spoke for the Executive Government and did as we expected him to do: he hoo-haed the measure and saw all sorts of Machiavellian plots in its introduction. He tried to pour all sorts of scorn and derision not only on me but on the member for Spence and the member for Adelaide, in particular.

Somehow the Minister feels that this measure is designed to embarrass the Government. If the measure does embarrass the Government, I can assure the House that it is not I who embarrasses it—it is the Government which embarrasses itself. The Minister said that day surgery was important, and he implied that the only way we could have day surgery is by taking it out of hospitals and putting it into pregnancy advisory clinics. That is patently wrong, and I would have thought better than to have such remarks coming from the Minister.

I commend to him the remarks of the member for Henley Beach, who said clearly that day surgery was an acceptable practice and that most abortions nowadays are performed by day surgery within hospitals. Those two contributions are at complete variance. On the one side we have the Minister saying that the only way we can perform these techniques is outside of our teaching hospitals and within pregnancy termination clinics, yet we have the member for Henley Beach already saying that most of these things happen on a day surgery basis within our major teaching hospitals. Again, I commend the remarks of the member for Spence, who spoke clearly of the underlying principles in the 1969 debate. He pointed out that this legislation was under attack from three sources, and it is worth quoting him specifically as follows:

One of these is medical science . . . The second challenge is from medical staff . . . The third direction of the challenge to the 1969 consensus comes from the Health Commission.

In respect of the Health Commission, he stated:

The Health Commission is trying to undermine the third principle, that of parliamentary control.

I seek no longer to delay the House, for I fear that I will not change one mind on either side of the House, and probably at this stage of the debate that is as it should be. However, I would make two comments in conclusion. First, members on the other side of the House have accused members on this side of not exercising a conscience vote on this issue.

Whether or not they place much trust in my word, I can give the House my word that every member on this side has a right to exercise the conscience vote on this issue. That is a matter of fact and this afternoon it will be a matter for the public record. I do not know how members opposite know so much about the Party of which I am so proud to be a member, but I can tell them this: it is a basic and inalienable right of members on this side of the House to exercise their conscience. I can no more control them than I can walk across Spencer Gulf. Because the Party opposite may have a more disciplined form of approach to activities in this Chamber, it does not mean that they can project the same Machiavellian intentions on this side of the House.

The member for Spence in his closing remarks spoke of this Bill as an historic curiosity. It may well become an historic curiosity when, as he said, the RU486 pill comes and people have some measure of control over their own fertility and capacity to determine whether or not they should be pregnant. I for one, and I am sure members opposite, will applaud that. This is not an easy issue: it is a vexed issue and it is one that, no matter what any of us say and no matter what positions we hold in this House, involves a decision that none of us particularly like having to make or arrive at lightly or easily. Nevertheless, we are charged with that responsibility. We cannot escape our gender or the responsibility that we bear for representing people in this place. I will be glad in a sense when this becomes an historic debate, because I do not like having to make these sorts of decisions.

I do not resilie from it, but it is not something that gives me great joy. In conclusion, I point out that the most important thing in this debate is the integrity of Parliament. Since 1969, it has been Parliament's right to scrutinise the approval of abortion facilities in South Australia. With respect to Mareeba, as every member who has spoken for this Bill has pointed out, this is the first time that the right of Parliament to scrutinise the establishment of clinics has been denied.

The member for Coles pointed out that this is a most serious, important matter and one of high moral weight. It is a matter not for the Health Commission but for Parliament. This Government, without the consultation of this House, took away that right by piggybacking Mareeba as an adjunct of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. If members opposite believe that is permissible for the Executive Government, be it the present front bench or ours in two or three years time, what is to stop any Government coming in here and saying it will put a pregnancy advisory clinic on top of Ayers Rock and link it to the Adelaide Hospital, because the principle is the same? I will delay the House no longer because other members have business to get through. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report be extended until the first day of the next session and that the committee have power to act during the recess.

Motion carried.

## ENERGY SECTOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House notes the Green Paper on the Future Directions for the Energy Sector in South Australia and condemns the Government for—

- (a) failing to recognise its responsibility to identify options which enable reductions of atmospheric carbon emissions in compliance with the Commonwealth Government commitment to the international community;
- (b) failing to address the future energy needs of the multi-function polis;
- (c) failing to supply factual information about the environmental, social and economic benefits of demand management techniques;
- (d) the lack of factual information about the part which alternative and renewable energy forms can play in future energy supply;
- (e) the lack of direction and initiatives relevant to energy conservation and fuel substitution;
- (f) the lack of factual historical information about the recent attempts which have been made by the Government and its agencies in demand forecasting; and
- (g) failing to outline the basic optional strategies for funding research and development needed to support the discovery of technologies for viable alternative energy sources.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 3639.)

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** The motion moved by the member for Murray-Mallee attacks the Government's discussion paper on energy. As I indicated when this motion was last before the House, the Opposition does not seem to understand the purpose of a discussion paper. We are at a crucial stage in the development of South Australia and it is imperative that the right decisions are made on a number of key issues. None of those decisions is more important for the future than the choice we make on energy. It is not only important that the right decisions are made. If the decisions are to be effective, the public must support them and understand their consequences. This can happen only if they are involved in the debate, and the energy green paper provides the vehicle for that to happen.

The green paper is a concise summary of the key energy issues that face us. It aims to stimulate discussion on these issues and is directed at a broad audience—the people of South Australia. For those who wish to become better informed on specific aspects of energy policy, the green paper contains references to the vast array of detailed information on energy that has been accumulated in this State over the past two decades. I believe that the green paper strikes the right balance between stimulating discussion and providing information, while not overloading the public with detailed information that is peripheral to the debate.

The member for Murray-Mallee's criticisms of the green paper were tedious and pedantic and, in many cases, just plain nonsense. It was opposition for the sake of opposition and it will be seen as such by the South Australian public. I should like to address the seven specific points of criticism made by the member for Murray-Mallee. As is typical of so much Opposition debate in this Chamber, he had plenty of criticism but no policies or constructive suggestions of his own.

The first issue raised by the honourable member was his claim that the Government has failed to incorporate in the green paper options that will enable carbon dioxide targets recently set by the Commonwealth and State Governments to be complied with. The green paper makes perfectly clear that, while there are numerous options on both the supply and demand side for reducing carbon dioxide emissions, there is great uncertainty about the economic impact of achieving the so-called Toronto target. I repeat that it is the Toronto target, not the Montreal target, to which the honourable member referred in his speech. The Commonwealth's approach to that has been stated, as follows:

While recognising the need to restrict emissions and to aim for a 20 per cent reduction, the Government will not proceed with measures that have net adverse impacts nationally or on Australia's trade competitiveness in the absence of similar action by major greenhouse gas-producing countries.

That is why the recently adopted targets are dependent on not adversely affecting the economic competitiveness of the nation or State. That is why the Industry Commission has launched an inquiry into the costs and benefits of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The State Government has a climate change committee, which will be finalising its report on greenhouse gas limitation strategies in the near future, and this will provide an important guide to the Government's future actions.

I make these points to emphasise that the achievement of the Toronto target in a manner that does not damage the Australian economy is still in the process of resolution. Page 39 of the green paper makes clear that currently achievable measures can substantially reduce carbon dioxide emissions below those forecast for the year 2005 but they will not take us all the way to the Toronto target. That will require quite dramatic changes in the patterns of energy supply and use in Australia, which is one of the reasons that we need to generate public discussion on energy issues, in the first place.

The Electricity Trust has a 'least cost' approach to planning that conforms with the Commonwealth Government's commitment to targets for reductions in greenhouse gases. The Electricity Trust is continuing to identify supply and demand options for reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The capital value of ETSA's generation equipment is over \$1 billion and, of course, much of this generating equipment has a considerable life span. Under normal planning processes, the Electricity Trust does not anticipate installing any base load plant before 1998. Therefore, there are very few opportunities to utilise new technology for electricity generation unless base load plant is retired earlier than is necessary. This could only occur at considerable cost penalties. The economic opportunities for improving the efficiency of existing generation plant are very limited since most opportunities have already been utilised, as one would expect of an efficient utility such as ETSA. One option that may be utilised in future is cogeneration.

The second criticism of the member for Murray-Mallee was his claim that the Government was not addressing the energy demand implications of the multifunction polis. He seemed to imply that the MFP will result in a substantial increase in the State's energy needs, which should be factored into demand forecasts. He implied that the MFP will increase Adelaide's population by 100 000 people, but the reality is that, while the MFP may well be a site at which 100 000 people live and work, it will not result in an increase in the Adelaide population by that amount. In any case, there will be opportunities for increased efficiency of energy use at the site, offsetting the demand impacts of population increases.



Let me also say that the increased energy demand associated with the MFP was considered in ETSA's most recent long-term energy forecasts. Indications were that the number of people likely to be attracted from outside the State and the expected relatively low energy intensive industrial development were unlikely to alter significantly total State demand.

The third issue raised by the member for Murray-Mallee was the claim that the Government has failed to supply factual information about demand management techniques, and that is simply not true. A substantial proportion of the paper is given over to a discussion of the role of demand management in the future development of the South Australian energy sector. The information contained in these sections is factual and more than enough information is available to provide a basis for comments to be made by the community. As I pointed out previously, the green paper refers to a number of other publications providing further details on many of the issues outlined in the paper. These publications are all available for perusal at the Energy Information Centre and the Office of Energy Planning.

Again, I make the point that it was necessary to restrict the level of detail that could be incorporated in the green paper. With respect to many energy demand management techniques (such as enhancing energy efficiency in housing), the key issue does not concern the benefits to be derived from those techniques. They have been well documented over many years. The real issue concerns the policy measures that the Government should take to increase consumer acceptance of these techniques and how the costs of implementing such measures should be spread through the community. The member for Murray-Mallee does not seem to grasp that proper energy management requires communication as well as technical skills.

I turn now to the fourth claim by the member for Murray-Mallee, which is that the Government has failed to provide factual information regarding alternative and renewable energy forms. This is also not correct. The green paper contains a description of the major alternative and renewable energy forms, together with a broad outline of the comparative economics of such energy forms, at least for the purposes of supplying electricity. To be precise, that is on pages 32 to 37 of the green paper. This information is backed up by the publications listed in the bibliography.

The green paper acknowledges that, based on traditional economic analyses, these alternatives currently have poor economic viability in comparison with conventional energy forms. However, such analyses ignore the costs to society associated with depletion of natural resources or with the emissions of by-products of energy conversion processes. Again, that is a fundamental issue which needs to be addressed by the whole community and another reason for the green paper. In the final analysis, on the question of alternative and renewable energy forms, the answer must involve value judgments, because all the economic and technical data in the world will not help us predict the future with certainty.

I have had an opportunity to address four of the specific criticisms made by the member for Murray-Mallee. If time permitted I would cover the remaining points and comment about what was said—and not said—by the member for Murray-Mallee. At this stage, in view of the time, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House deplores and condemns the cavalier way in which the Minister for Environment and Planning has abused the privileges she enjoys in this building by booking facilities in this building (ostensibly for her own use) and when arranging for people who are not members of Parliament to take over control and occupancy of those facilities, to the exclusion and abuse of other members' rights of access.

(Continued from 6 December. Page 2459.)

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## COASTAL DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That the regulations under the Planning Act 1982 relating to coastal development and commission powers, made on 14 February and laid on the table of this House on 19 February 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 11 March. Page 3642.)

**The SPEAKER:** As these regulations were disallowed in another place yesterday, the motion cannot be further proceeded with.

## PRAWN COLOURING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr M.J. Evans:

That the regulations under the Food Act 1985 relating to prawn colouring, made on 20 September and laid on the table of this House on 10 October 1990, be disallowed.

(Continued from 8 March. Page 2254.)

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** This matter was also the subject of some debate in another place yesterday, and a good deal of the material that was prepared and used during that debate is something to which I should perhaps direct honourable members. This matter has been before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which endeavoured, as closely as possible, to get at the truth. Despite the report of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and some degree of public debate surrounding its investigation, there is still community concern about the impact of various additives. I think there should continue to be community concern about certain forms of additives, although I make the point that in this case we are dealing with one specific additive which has a particular purpose.

We are dealing with this matter not because the additive is something that has recently been used to affect the colour of prawns (because that has been happening in this State for, I understand, 20 or 30 years) but because it was suddenly discovered that the regulatory mechanism to enable this to occur was not in place and that a regulation needed to be brought down. The Government therefore prepared the regulation. As I say, it was gazetted, it was subject to consideration by the Subordinate Legislation Committee and that committee, consisting of members on both sides of this Chamber, decided that it would not recommend a disallowance. Despite that, there is continuing concern.

I have endeavoured to obtain the widest possible advice on this matter. A number of experts around this country and around the world have been contacted, and at this stage we have received two responses, at least one of which I know was read into *Hansard* in another place last evening.

The evidence is not all in. However, the circumstances in which we find ourselves is that we are very reluctant to disturb a practice which does not seem to have strong epidemiological evidence against it, and at the same time is obviously seen by the industry concerned as giving it a needed marketing advantage, given the nature of the product in this State and the demands of the market.

There is no course open to us but to support the Subordinate Legislation Committee and to oppose the motion. Nevertheless, at the same time I am continuing to seek evidence, and I am prepared for that to be a public process. I give members this commitment: if further evidence indicates that this colouring process presents a significant risk to the community, particularly to youngsters, the Government itself will withdraw the regulation, which of course is the other mechanism that is always open. At this stage the evidence is certainly not in, and I can only urge members to support a process which, *de facto*, has been in existence for 20 or 30 years.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I am very conscious of the time, but I would like to place on record that I have consulted, particularly within the prawn industry, every person who has eaten a prawn and who has eaten some of the colouring or the shell that has been coloured. How much of that colouring has permeated through the meat is another thing. The interesting thing about this—and it has already been related to the House—is that the very same material that is used for the colouring of prawns is used in numerous other foodstuffs, most of which we all consume many times a day. It is used in custards and all other foodstuffs that require colouring. If we are going to ban its use with prawns, we will have to remove all colourings in other foods.

There is a wider spectrum to be looked at when we talk about the particular additive that is used in this industry. As a large part of the prawn industry is within my electorate, I have consulted with that industry. Many people in the industry believe that there has to be a phasing out, but in conjunction with a market education process. Perhaps if an entrepreneurial prawn producer could market additive-free prawns and it was advantageous to him, needless to say that is the way it will go.

In the absence of conclusive evidence that the additive causes damage, and certainly in the knowledge that many other foodstuffs (for example, custard) contain the same additive there is an inconsistency. I oppose the member for Elizabeth's motion because of the matters that have been outlined by other members. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### SEACLIFF HOCKEY AND TENNIS COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to commit itself to a hockey and tennis complex at Seacliff and calls on the Government to intervene immediately to prevent the loss of \$230 000 Federal funding and \$30 000 Local Government funding together with land and buildings, all of which have already been committed toward the complex,

which Mr DeLaine has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

urges the State Government to intervene to ensure that the \$230 000 in Federal funding to the Seacliff Tennis Club and the Happy Valley Hockey Club is used for a southern region hockey/tennis sports complex.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 3645.)

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I will be brief as I realise that time is of the essence today. There is absolutely no way that I can support the amendment, as it completely changes the original intent and risks the loss of \$30 000 in local government funding along with facilities which comprise an oval and two storey clubrooms. There is no doubt that a need exists for more money to go into sport in the southern region. There is also no doubt that a need exists for a larger complex, but that is needed as well as the complex at Seacliff to which my motion refers. I urge members to support the original motion put before the House. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### AIF 50th BATTALION COLOURS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House calls on the Government to negotiate with the Army Office in Canberra and the Commander 6th Military District, Hobart for the return of St Peter's Cathedral, Adelaide of the Colours of the 50th Battalion AIF (1916-19) which were originally ceremonially laid-up in St Peter's Cathedral in 1937 but were transferred to St David's Cathedral, Hobart in 1973 on the authority of the Army Office at the time.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 3873.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I make clear to the House that the Government accepts this motion. I looked forward to giving a good treatise today on the exploits of the 50th Battalion. However, it is sad that I cannot talk about a pilgrimage that I made 12 years ago to some of the great battlefields on which the 50th Battalion fought, as the Whip has made clear that I have only a few minutes. I am a little disappointed that the member for Hayward took so much time to dig himself out the hole that he has been digging for the past six months or so. If anyone wishes to know about the exploits of the 50th Battalion, I will be more than happy to discuss it with them privately.

Motion carried.

#### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House examine the economic, environmental, social and cultural impact of the proposed multifunction polis and examine and make public all commitments so far entered into by the Government, all costs to be incurred by the Government and the specific timetable proposed for development of the projects,

which Mr De Laine has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting the words:

welcomes the opportunities created by having Adelaide nominated as the site for the multifunction polis and notes the approval of the Commonwealth Government for the next stage of the project involving a detailed environmental assessment of the Gillman site, an estimate of the infrastructure costs of the project and the methods of financing them, an investigation of potential business opportunities, an assessment of the impact on the social fabric of Adelaide and South Australia, and a collaborative community consultation program between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments and further, this House supports the work of the management group chaired by Mr Ross Adler and looks forward to the publication of its report.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 2944.)

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** My motion is about accountability and the responsibility of Parliament to scrutinise a matter of enormous importance to this State involving literally billions of dollars. The amendment moved by the member for Price is along quite a different tack and

one with which I do not necessarily disagree with. As the motion and the amendment approach the issue from substantially different viewpoints, the issue should be dealt with in much greater detail and I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House calls on the Government to restrict the hours of student free STA travel to those hours which cover legitimate school activities of an educational sporting and cultural nature.

(Continued from 7 March. Page 3384.)

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I move:

Leave out all words after 'House' and insert 'is of the opinion that the Minister of Transport should keep the operation of the free travel for children scheme under constant review and that a report on the equity, social justice implications, cost and effectiveness of the scheme should be presented to the House prior to the consideration of the 1991-92 estimates.'

This issue needs further and more detailed consideration than it has received to date. I move my amendment as the scheme will require further review and amendment in the future, and that should be based on the full possession of the facts and the best possible information that the House can obtain. I am sure that the Government will keep the scheme under review, but by adopting a resolution in these terms the House will be in a position to receive that report from the Minister at the appropriate time. I commend my amendment to the House.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I accept the amendment, but indicate that, if a report is not presented to the House by the date specified, it would be my intention to reinstate the original motion.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House congratulates the Government and the Attorney-General for the ongoing implementation of crime prevention strategies, including the broad-based 'Coalition Against Crime' and data mapping projects and further, this House congratulates the Government for involving non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in its fight against crime,

which Mr Oswald has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting the words:

applauds the contribution of non-government representatives, business, union, community groups, local government and the media, in the implementation of crime prevention strategies, but acknowledges that it is not a substitute for the proper policing of the community and that they must work with the police in order to do this effectively, and calls on the Government to consider subsidising the Neighbourhood Watch Association dollar for dollar so that the organisation can better play the part expected of it.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1190.)

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I move a further amendment:

Leave out all words after 'House' and insert:

- (a) Supports the Government and the police in the ongoing implementation of community crime prevention strategies including the broad-based 'Coalition Against Crime' and crime data mapping projects;

- (b) Supports the involvement of non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in the fight against crime;
- (c) Acknowledges the importance of Neighbourhood Watch as an example of a community-based crime prevention initiative, and the need for continuing support of it;
- (d) Recognises that the corner stone of effective crime prevention must be the traditional criminal justice system including adequate support for the police.

I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### ROYAL SOUTH AUSTRALIAN DEAF SOCIETY INCORPORATED

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Royal South Australian Deaf Society Incorporated for the 100 years of service it has given to the deaf community.

In moving this motion, I recognise the importance of the motion to the society, its members and those who rely upon the society for support and, quite often, help. If I could speak in sign language, I would do that now, but I cannot and I openly admit that fact. I know that over the years the society has had many volunteers and much community support but, in the early days, those who were born profoundly deaf virtually found it impossible to learn to speak. So, quite often they were referred to as deaf and dumb. I am glad that, in more recent years, the word 'dumb' has not been used in the connotations of past years.

The goals and the history of the society will be referred to in more detail by the next two speakers. It was not my idea to move this motion today—it was suggested by others, but the motion is moved today for two reasons: first, to congratulate the society; secondly, to highlight the need for community support for the society in its goals and to carry out its service to its members.

I have learnt a lot in my 12 years on the board, and I have also gained much experience but, more particularly, much respect for the individuals who staff the society, the members of the board (who may not be hearing impaired) and, in particular, those members of the society whose deafness is a handicap in communication. I recognise much of the work that Mr John Holden carried out as President of the society, he is now Vice Patron. Mr Murray Coleman, as President in recent times, has done much to have this centenary recognised in this State. Unfortunately, because of his very recent death, he is no longer with us, and I know that he would have longed to be around as the society's centenary is recognised at this time.

I also acknowledge the effort, work and capacity of Mr Bruce Muller, the society's current President. He is profoundly deaf and is a magnificent board member and representative of his group. With Mrs Girke and Mr Lewis, he serves on the committee on behalf of the deaf community. Their contribution and capacity has to be experienced to understand how dedicated to the society they are.

In saying that, I ask members to think how a deaf person would operate if elected to this Parliament. The Right Honourable Jack Ashley, the member for Stoke-on-Trent, South, and Privy Councillor, who was awarded the Companion of Honour and Doctor of Letters, left school at the age of 14, became head of his union before becoming a member of Parliament, and then acquired deafness. That is not quite as big a handicap as being born profoundly deaf. His record is there for people to read. I do not believe that any member of this Parliament could have achieved any greater goal than that man, yet he operates in the Parliament with the

aid of modern technology—with visual aides and translations—even though he is profoundly deaf.

We need to consider that aspect for the future if this is to be a Parliament in which all sections of society can be represented and to which all people have the opportunity of election. Much could be said in asking members to support this motion, but the House can be assured, particularly those members who allowed this motion to take precedence and this debate to proceed at 12.45 p.m., that the society is grateful for accommodating this matter. I ask members to support the motion.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I am very pleased to support the motion and I congratulate the honourable member for moving it. The Royal South Australian Deaf Society Incorporated is a valuable member of the disabilities services field, particularly in the area of sensory loss. In over 100 years of service, the society has provided important skills to South Australians who have a severe hearing loss which have enabled these people to communicate with others. Of course, there are the same cultural and individual differences in the deaf community as there are in the wider community, and I guess in some way these differences are reflected in the current debate over the different hand signing languages, for example, Auslan and English signing.

In any event, signing is a means of communication which enables very sophisticated concepts to be conveyed. There are many who would claim that signing may be more ancient a means of communication than is vocalised language. Be that as it may, the society has been an integral part of the planning process for new services for people with a sensory loss and has shown a commitment to collaborating with other disability services. For example, the society has recently been a valuable member for developing, in an advisory group, a service model for people who have a dual sensory loss, that is, those who are deaf and blind.

It has taken the initiative further in convening the inaugural Deaf Blind National Conference in Adelaide on 30 April and 1 May of this year. The aim of the conference is to bring together consumers and service providers to develop new skills and exchange information and ideas in order to plan for the future, and we wish it well. Obviously, agencies with 100 years of experience must look to the future as they do to the past and, of course, the society is doing this. The society should receive as much encouragement as possible from the wider community to continue maximum consumer participation in developing new services and in taking the services to the community. In that respect, the support of this Parliament will be an important ingredient. I commend the motion to the House.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** As we know, 1991 marks the centenary of the Royal South Australian Deaf Society Incorporated whose mission, as stated in the centenary information, is to 'enable deaf and hearing impaired people fuller access to, and participation in, community life'. These are laudable aims indeed. The information goes on to list a number of ways of achieving this, but in particular I draw attention to the following objective whereby the society will:

... advocate on behalf of deaf persons and provide interpreting support to enable deaf persons to advocate on their own behalf to improve their quality of life.

The member for Davenport has already given an example of the British member of Parliament who has extended his capabilities although hearing impaired. The Royal South Australian Deaf Society's facilitating self-advocacy in these matters is doing the best thing possible.

Highlights of the society's centenary year have included this interpreted session of State Parliament; a Lord Mayor's reception; national deafness conferences, which the Minister has mentioned; the aims of the society to fund a young South Australian deaf person to attend the World Federation of the Deaf meeting in Japan; on 1 September 1991, recognition of World Deafness day; and the 100th AGM of the society in October.

The first known deaf person in South Australia, Henry Hallett, arrived aboard the *Africane* in 1836. The society has previously been a subject before the House: on 26 June 1872, William Townsend, the member for Sturt, submitted a motion to the House of Assembly for an asylum—as it was called in those days—to be established. It was then opened on 1 October 1874. On 24 August 1890, the first church service for the deaf was held in the Rechabite Hall, Grote Street, Adelaide. Another highlight of this centenary year was a memorial service for the first church service.

I attended a mass at St Laurence's Church in North Adelaide several years ago where the priest announced that the mass would be accompanied by sign language. Although it took a little longer, I am quite sure the assembled congregation would have agreed with me that it was the most emotive church service I had ever attended. On 17 April 1891, a public meeting was called in the arbitration room, Waymouth Street, to establish a mission for the religious and social welfare of the South Australian adult deaf and it is the centenary of this meeting that we celebrate this year.

Since its inception the society has relied on deaf and hearing volunteers to manage it, and to ensure the development of services designed to meet specific needs and we congratulate those volunteers. The four main areas of service provided by the Royal South Australian Deaf Society encompass community services, housing services, aged services and community education. As we in this House know only too well, such services do not come cheaply. I note in the list of donors and sponsors for the society many generous and well-known private and corporate donors from around the South Australian community.

As the Minister noted, the Royal South Australian Deaf Society does not only glory in its exemplary past but also looks to the future. In its future provisions, one of the community service initiatives it is seeking to provide is that of regional resource centres. This would seek to extend into the country and metropolitan areas the message of the Royal South Australian Deaf Society providing those services I have mentioned. In particular, the areas looked at in the country to extend these services would be Mount Gambier, Whyalla and the Riverland. The extension into regional resource centres in the city and metropolitan areas would be Elizabeth and Noarlunga. The Royal South Australian Deaf Society Incorporated provides a magnificent service for deaf and hearing impaired people, and its plans to extend even further into the community at large are to be applauded, as also is its fine contribution to South Australia in the past. I am pleased to support this motion.

Motion carried.

#### PETITION: PSYCHOLOGISTS AND REGULATION OF PSYCHOLOGY

A petition signed by 16 residents of South Australia requesting that the House delay consideration of measures for the registration of psychologists and regulation of psychology until definitions relating to hypnosis are clarified was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

### PETITION: GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS GROUNDS

A petition signed by 783 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the sports grounds of the former Glengowrie High School as a community sports venue was presented by Mr Oswald. Petition received.

### QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 243, 575 and 587; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

#### SECURING THE FUTURE

243. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Premier: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'appoint an Adelaide-based Chinese specialist from the private sector to build the State's commercial contacts in mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, and work with South Australian companies to develop trade and investment opportunities', if the specialist has been appointed, what is the name of that person and what salary or fee is he or she being paid; if the appointment has not been made, why not and when will it be?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Applications to fill the position of Business Development Manager China/Hong Kong within the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology were called by public advertisement in the *Weekend Australian* on 18/19 November 1989. A number of offers were made to potential appointees but a suitable appointment was not finalised.

As indicated in my response to the Prime Minister's Industry Statement, the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology is reviewing its international business operations. It appears that the most effective way to service the Chinese market is to use the State's existing representation in Hong Kong in combination with a designated representative for this area in the Adelaide office of the department. These arrangements will be finalised in the next financial year.

#### MFP-ADELAIDE UPDATE

575. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Premier:

1. When did the publication *MFP-Adelaide Update* commence?
2. How many copies have been produced for each issue?
3. What is the total cost of production and distribution for each issue?
4. For how long is publication proposed to continue?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The replies are as follows:

1. *MFP-Adelaide Update*, a public information newsletter put out by the MFP-Adelaide project team, commenced with Issue No. 1 for December 1990—January 1991.

2. 20 000 copies are produced for each two-monthly issue; there have so far been two issues and a third is under preparation.

3. The costs for the first issue were as follows:

Masthead and design concept, layout, artwork and associated costs .....	\$4 965
Printing 20 000 copies .....	\$8 065
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13 030</b>

The costs for the second issue were as follows:

Layout, artwork and preparation .....	\$3 480
Printing 20 000 copies .....	\$6 167
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9 647</b>

Distribution was carried out as follows:

The bulk of copies are distributed through local outlets, selected local councils, Government Departments, the State Information Centre, libraries, Federal and State politicians, the media, flight deck lounges, the Chamber of Commerce, various exhibitions and displays, and hand-outs from the project team office. Copies are also distributed through Austrade and South Australia House in London.

Mailing List (3 000) .....	\$1 240
One distribution through Messenger Press (5 000) .....	\$200

4. The current issue of *MFP-Adelaide Update* is being prepared to coincide with the release of the management board's final report. The newsletter has proved to be a cost-effective and widely read communication. With budgetary considerations in mind, it was designed and prepared as an information vehicle, by which to explain the concept of this important national project and all that it entails, to local, State and national communities. It is one of the avenues of public information and consultation which the project team is charged with carrying out. The newsletter is in demand and will continue to be produced for as long as it is needed and as long as it remains an effective means of communication.

#### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

587. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Premier: How is it proposed to supply the multifunction polis with drinking water, where will the water supply be taken from and what is the estimated cost of supplying it?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The villages of the MFP core site will be initially connected to the electricity and water supply mains adjacent to the site. While these mains have ample capacity to supply the new villages, consumption within the villages will be substantially reduced by reprocessing and reuse of village wastewater and stormwater. The independent format of the MFP villages will allow various schemes for water harvesting and reuse to be tested. Similarly regeneration using methane gas from the Adelaide tip will be considered for electricity supply.

Technology tested and proven on the MFP villages will be available for incorporation into the existing Adelaide urban area which will result in a long-term reduction in water consumption. Gillman and Dry Creek forest areas will be irrigated with treated effluent drawn from the Bolivar sewage treatment works and/or from small treatment plants within the villages. This will lead to a reduction in sewage effluent being passed to the St Vincent Gulf marine environment.

The estimated cost of external water service connection from existing E&WS mains to the MFP core site boundary are as follows:

Area	1991	Year
	\$	
Gillman .....	1 100 000	1994
Dry Creek .....	900 000	2003

Due to the urban consolidation nature of the development,

this is a significantly lower figure than would be required to connect an equivalent fringe metropolitan development.

### GRAND PRIX

In reply to Mr MATTHEW (Bright) 12 March.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Project Director, Adelaide Entertainment Centre, has advised that the Grand Prix Board and the Entertainment Centre have no intention of becoming an agent for point of sale equipment. The possibility of an agency arrangement was raised by an overseas supplier during discussions over the supply of equipment but this was not pursued by the board.

There is no evidence to indicate that a special 'below cost' deal is being done for an overseas company to get its equipment onto the Australian market. The indicative price provided by suppliers is consistent with indicative prices supplied in the USA at industry trade shows. The price variation represents a substantial difference in approach to system design. The less expensive system comprises simplified very durable special purpose equipment supported by sophisticated management software.

The brief for establishment and management of the Entertainment Centre requires a national standard centre to be established at minimum cost and the management to operate the centre on a commercial basis and achieve the best possible return on the outlays of public funds.

While the purchase of point of sale equipment has not yet been completed, it would appear that USA sourced equipment is substantially less expensive than local Australian products. The overseas equipment is specifically purpose designed for this type of centre which must cope with very high transaction rates and sales volumes in limited trading intervals.

The Entertainment Centre will have a major logistical task of serving up to 12 000 patrons in a 20 minute interval. It is therefore imperative that the most efficient purpose designed equipment and management software be used to minimise transaction time and provide for efficient overview and management of the operation. It is unlikely that any other venue in this State provides for such an intense catering exercise and the Entertainment Centre proposes to have state of the art systems at lowest possible cost.

The overseas sourced equipment is extensively used in leading entertainment centres in the USA and is under active consideration by the Brisbane and Sydney Entertainment Centres to replace existing equipment.

The Project Director further advises that many of the local products appear to be designed to maximise flexibility to service a variety of establishments including restaurants, hotels and theatres and a multitude of catering arrangements. This results in some applications being compromised. The emphasis on flexibility in the local products is understandable given the diverse nature of entertainment and catering facilities in this country and the limited number of entertainment centres.

### LIST OF ACHIEVEMENTS

In reply to Mr BRINDAL (Hayward) 12 March.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In response, I provide the following details:

*Minister for Environment and Planning:*

- Added a further 5.5 million hectares to South Australia's system of parks and reserves, bringing the total area to 16.7 million hectares or 17 per cent of the State.

- Proclaimed four new parks in the Adelaide metropolitan area—Marino Conservation Park and Anstey Hill, Cobbler Creek and O'Halloran Hill recreation parks.
- Reintroduced the endangered brush-tailed bettong on St Peter Island in Nuyts Archipelago Conservation Park.
- Upgraded visitor facilities and services funded by park use fees.
- Protected total of 98 814 hectares of native vegetation under heritage agreement.
- Introduced management assistance program of native vegetation areas under heritage agreement.
- Completed computerised central archive and register of Aboriginal sites and objects.
- Prepared a major report, Environment South Australia—creating an environmentally sustainable society.
- Established a Climate Change Committee to advise the Government on global warming.
- Released the natural resources management strategy for the Murray-Darling Basin.
- Prepared a proposed recycling strategy for South Australia.
- Commenced planning reviews for the Barossa Valley and Southern Region.
- Completed planning reviews for Gillman, Thebarton and Normanville.
- Completed Industrial Land Review.
- Prepared 1989-94 metropolitan development program.
- Established heritage advisory services at Port Adelaide, Hahndorf and Burra.
- Historical documentation of all South Australian shipwrecks.
- Completed heritage surveys for Marion, Colonel Light Gardens and Port Pirie.
- Introduced ozone protection legislation under the Clean Air Act to provide for the rapid phase-out of ozone-depleting substances.
- Tabled new regulations to ensure the continued success of South Australia's Beverage Container Act.
- Prepared marine pollution legislation to control point source discharges to the marine environment.
- Introduced legislation to allow local councils to prohibit backyard burning.
- Dredged and trucked 275 000 cubic metres of sand as part of the metropolitan beach replenishment strategy.
- Prepared coastal hazard and sea level policy.
- Released Coastal marina strategy for South Australia.
- Produced and installed audio-visual presentation at the Wadlata Outback Centre in Port Augusta.
- Launched natural ecosystems education package—an environmental teaching kit for use in South Australian schools.
- Designed and produced over 200 departmental publications.
- Established Task Force on Contaminated Land comprising of both Government authorities and community representation.
- New legislation assented to is as follows:
  - Marine Environment Protection Bill.
  - Wilpena Enabling Act.
  - Ozone protection legislation under the Clean Air Act.
- Participation in a native vegetation mapping and classification program to identify the value and extent of remnant native vegetation in the agricultural regions of South Australia.
- Established a wilderness inventory program in South Australia in cooperation with Department of Geography, Adelaide University.
- Completed the second year of the 'Don't Muck Up the Murray' Campaign.
- Released paper on Implications of Climate Change for South Australia.
- As a member of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, released the natural resources management strategy for the Murray-Darling Basin.
- Commissioned and opened highly acclaimed Bicentennial Conservatory as the first part of redevelopment of Hackney Depot site by Adelaide Botanic Garden.
- Completed extension to State Herbarium, Adelaide Botanic Garden.
- Provided technical assistance to the Australian Arid Lands Botanic Garden Management Committee, Port Augusta.
- Relandscaped Government House Grounds.
- Provided extensions to the Adelaide Botanic Garden Kiosk.
- Initiated computer database for Botanic Garden and State Herbarium collections.
- Established a community based Recycling Advisory Committee.
- Established the Recycling Development Fund.
- Established a Government purchasing policy for recycled materials.

- Developed a strategy for hazardous waste management in South Australia.
- Published a recycling manual to assist councils in establishing recycling schemes.
- Prompted a collection and recycling system for office waste paper in the metropolitan area through KESAB.
- Established a collection depot for household hazardous chemicals.

#### *Minister of Water Resources*

- Developed a computer model to identify real rates of return by business undertaking and region which is used as a strategic planning tool.
- Established the Technology Steering Committee together with a technology fund to encourage and test new ideas and technology.
- Established a water use advisory service.
- Developed a business plan for the department.
- Developed a Customer Service Information System.
- Developed and implemented a workforce plan for the department.
- Commissioned Stage 1 of Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant.
- Introduction of a new structure for rates and charges for services provided under the Waterworks and Sewerage Acts.
- Developed program for environmental enhancement, funded from environmental levy.
- The following Acts have been assented to:
  - Renmark Irrigation Trust Act
  - Murray-Darling Basin Agreement Act.
  - Water Resources Act 1990.
  - Waterworks Amendment Act.
- Established concept design for Myponga Water Filtration Plant.
- Commissioned Finger Point Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commissioned Phase 1 of the Woolpunda Salt Interception Scheme.
- Established water supply infrastructure for the Seaford development with completion in 1999.
- Commenced Stage 2 of headworks for water supply system for the Northern Adelaide Plains with completion in 1995.
- Commenced Stage 1 of Angle Vale-Virginia Water Supply.
- Commissioned Port Parham-Webb Beach Water Supply.
- Sewage reticulation provided to both Seaford and Golden Grove Development.
- Commenced the reduction of nutrient discharges into the River Murray from Mannum and Murray Bridge Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commenced elimination of sewage sludge discharges into the Gulf from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works by pumping to the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commenced the reduction in nutrient levels in the effluent discharging into a catchment area from the Hahndorf Sewage Treatment Works.
- Established a trial woodlot at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works (16 ha) to assess the viability of woodlotting as an effluent disposal option for the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commissioned conceptual design of the Port Lincoln Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commissioned conceptual design work associated with the Aldinga Limited Sewerage Scheme, which will provide sewerage works for identified properties in the Aldinga Beach and Port Willunga areas suffering from saturated ground due to septic tank effluent overflow.
- Engaged a consultant to develop nutrient reduction options for the effluent discharge from the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commenced an accelerated program to progressively sewer the Adelaide Hills and improve water quality in Metropolitan Adelaide reservoirs by eliminating discharges from septic tank systems.
- Commenced a major assessment of nutrient reduction options for effluent discharged from the Victor Harbor Sewage Treatment Works.
- Commenced a review of land based effluent disposal alternatives for the Whyalla Sewage Treatment Works.
- Completed the western suburbs section of the linear park, from the city to the sea of the River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme.

#### *Minister of Lands:*

- Relaunched Land Ownership and Tenure System (LOTS) to celebrate its 10th Anniversary.
- Launched computerised title system—Torrens Automated Title System (TATS).

- Joint convenors with SAGRIC International and the United Nations Department of Technical Cooperation for Development of the inter-regional seminar on 'Land Information and the Developing World.'
- Developed the new departmental revenue system.
- An International Award for Exemplary Systems in Government from the North American Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA) and a Gold Award from the Australian Technology in Government Committee for the South Australian Land Information System.
- Launched training program for potential Land Information Managers.
- Established Client Contact Group to facilitate direct contact with the real estate industry.
- Pastoral Land Information Management and Conservation Act. Changes introduced through the new Act are being implemented.
- Developed a Business Plan for the Department.
- Consolidation of the South Australian Remote Sensing Centre within the Survey Division.
- Liaison with Public and Consumer Affairs and Local Government to upgrade section 90 service.
- Review of Department's Strategic plan commenced.
- Administrative procedures for implementation of the Shack Policy determined and distributed—training program commenced to enable new leases to be issued regionally rather than centrally.
- Progress continued in rationalising and reviewing regional activities. Murray Bridge Office separated from the Berri region to enable increased decision making at local level.
- Pastoral Board held regional meetings to improve communications with pastoralists and all pastoral leases reviewed for rental valuation purposes within the agreed timeframe.
- Heads of Agreement negotiated with Carmo Pty Ltd for substantial redevelopment of the Goolwa Wharf.
- Extension of State's network of Conservation and National Parks.
- Amalgamation of SACON Land Survey Group with the Survey Division of Department of Lands.
- Hydrographic survey of the metropolitan foreshore from Seaclyff to Outer Harbor for Department of Environment and Planning utilising new survey technology.
- Pastoral Board formed, comprising representatives of major user groups.
- Grand Junction Industrial Estate—subdivision of Crown land.
- Publication of the new State Map.
- Commencement of the Digital Topographic Data Base of South Australia (TOPIS) which is a key element of the Corporate Land Information System.
- Publication of the Tourist Map for Kangaroo Island.
- The first Strata Plans covering boat marinas were deposited.
- The Department of Lands participated in six SAGRIC overseas consultancy projects, including a major LIS Project in Cyprus, aerial mapping for Thailand, a Valuation Project in Indonesia, and a Natural Resources Management and Development Project in the Philippines.
- As Minister responsible for Animal Welfare the Minister established a task force to review duck hunting practices. The task force prepared a report which was released by the Minister in November 1990. Cabinet subsequently approved a number of new hunting practices for South Australia.

#### STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles)** 12 March.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The increase in the capital base of the State Bank which was outlined in SAFA's 1987-88 Annual Report was authorised to provide the Bank with a solid capital base in the light of its asset growth and the new capital adequacy requirements of the Reserve Bank. This increase in capital was not authorised specifically for the bank's overseas operations.

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 13 March.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have been informed by the State Bank that the directors and officers liability of the State Bank is organised through Sedgwick Limited Insurance Brokers. FAI Insurance provides the principal primary cover and C.E. Heath Insurance provides additional cover.

SGIC has informed me that they have not been approached to insure this liability.

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** 9 April.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have been informed that the State Bank of South Australia has no lending activity in Turkey; nor does it have any lending activity in regard to Turkish interests.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SGIC

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** On 12 March 1991 the member for Mitcham asked a question regarding directorships held by executives of the SGIC in companies in which the SGIC has an investment. The Chief General Manager, Mr Gerschwitz, provided me with a written response and this information was tabled in this place on 19 March 1991. Subsequently, I have received advice from Mr Gerschwitz requesting that the Alliance International Corporation and its subsidiary, Alliance Reinsurance Corporation, be added to the list. The SGIC holds 28.9 per cent of the organisation in question and Mr Gerschwitz is a director of both companies. He does not receive any board fees and has not attended any board meetings of the company but receives regular reports and briefings. Alliance International Corporation is listed in SGIC's Annual Report along with all other companies in which SGIC has a shareholding.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Today's *News* carries an article on hospital waiting lists. The article, quoting the Opposition health spokesman, claims that, 'South Australians are waiting up to 10 years for surgery in the State's public hospitals'. Mr Speaker, naturally I was concerned to read this report and requested information from the Health Commission on the claims it contains. Before examining the claims, let me first put on the record the situation concerning waiting times for elective surgery in this State. This objective information is important to correct alarmist fears in the community which may have been created by today's claims. The facts are as follows:

- Approximately 55 000 elective surgery procedures are carried out in South Australian public hospitals each year.
- The majority of people needing elective surgery have surgery within a month.
- Two-thirds of people needing surgery, that is some 66 per cent, are dealt with within six months.
- Of those small number of patients who wait over 12 months for elective surgery, many are deferred patients who are not yet ready for surgery on medical grounds, or have been given a low medical priority by the surgeons because of the procedure they are seeking. For example, this includes persons seeking cosmetic face lifts, tattoo removal, scar revision or removal of fat from the abdomen.
- To deal with increasing public demand the Government announced in 1989 a \$46 million funding package for metropolitan hospitals. Following this announce-

ment an additional 1700 elective surgery procedures were carried out by metropolitan hospitals in 1989-90.

- In the first six months of the current financial year some 1 400 additional procedures have been performed—that is a total of over 3 000 additional procedures have been carried out over the past 18 months, and consequently the total number of people waiting over 12 months for elective surgery has declined.

South Australia has an open public hospital system and information on that system is provided regularly to the public—we are one of the few States to release booking lists.

The Health Commission has regularly requested all public hospitals to review their booking lists and to examine cases where people are reported to be waiting more than 12 months for elective surgery. The information provided by the *News*, which is regularly published by Flinders Medical Centre, shows the median waiting time for booking list procedures at FMC is 106 days, that is just over three months. In fact, the figures quoted by the *News* studiously ignore this and, instead, report the maximum waiting times, which invariably represent a single patient who has either deferred surgery for personal reasons or who is not yet ready for surgery on medical grounds or who is booked in for a cosmetic procedure which does not attract a Medicare benefit.

In response to the *News* article the head of the department of surgery at Flinders Medical Centre (Professor Willis Marshall) issued the following statement:

There is a booking list for surgery at Flinders Medical Centre which is constantly under review. It is reviewed on a bi-monthly basis and the average waiting time for all surgery is 106 days. The long waiting times quoted in the article represent exceptional cases where patients had in fact been offered a booking for surgery but declined for reasons of convenience, or where surgery was for cosmetic reasons.

He goes on to say, importantly:

The figures indicate the original date patients were placed on the booking list and not the date of review.

Some sections of the media continue to ignore these facts but members might like to consider some comments made by Professor Coster in the 1988 Coster report into the management of booking lists:

The number of patients subjected to long waits are small in both absolute terms and relative to turnover... Certainly the way in which data is published by the media and analysed by some interested parties has at times been alarmist and unfair...

How prophetic are those words. Let me say that I would be the first to welcome informed public debate on this important matter. But such debate is not possible when politicians and those who should know better exploit the media's voracious appetite for a headline.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling for questions, I advise that questions directed to the Minister of Education will be taken by the Deputy Premier; questions directed to the Minister of Employment and Further Education will be handled by the Minister of Agriculture; and questions directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction will be handled by the Minister for Environment and Planning.

#### STATE CHARGES

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition):** As these decisions will be made before this House sits again, will the Treasurer give a guarantee that any rises from 1 July in



electricity tariffs, water rates, public transport fares, public hospital fees, Housing Trust rentals and motor vehicle registration fees will be contained within the CPI?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We have had a policy over recent years of containing those charges at or below the CPI.

**Mr Ingerson:** What about land tax?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The rate of land tax has been consistently reduced.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The rate of land tax has been reduced in every budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Until recently, the value of land has been rising quite considerably, which has nothing to do with the rate of tax. In this year's budget in relation to land tax we manipulated the rates in order to ensure that, despite the increases in values, the overall figure would be on or about the CPI level. Putting that aside, as far as the rates of these charges are concerned, that has been our policy, and I see no reason to change that policy. In some areas, such as electricity, we have a very good record and I must commend the trust for the way in which it has been able to deliver increases in tariffs well below the rate of inflation. There has been a major real reduction in electricity charges to both private domestic households and business in this State over the past few years, and that is continuing as part of an ongoing program.

As for most of the other charges that we are involved with, we have seen the same pattern emerging. Members opposite have been keen on user pays. It irks them that, for instance, if we moved to a charging system in relation to water rates that would see a total user pays system, we would probably get a reduction in the metropolitan water rate and an increase in the country water rate. I would imagine those members opposite who represent a country constituency would be the first on the doorsteps saying, 'What is going on? This is unfair removal of a subsidy.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** When considering those charges, electricity is the same. The local undertakings receive a subsidy from the trust. Every year those undertakings make submissions, and the tariff is kept to ETSA's general tariff, which involves a subsidy being made direct to those bodies. I am not complaining about that, but I think those who want to vigorously raise this issue on the other side ought to remember this before they get overexcited about the rate of increase. So, I can inform the Leader that that is our policy, and to the greatest extent possible—and we have been able to do it successfully over the past few years—we will be able to achieve it this year.

#### WATER SUPPLY

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister for Water Resources provide the House with an update on the water level in Adelaide's reservoirs? The Minister and the House will be well aware that in my electorate there are many like myself who originated from the United Kingdom. It has been put to me by some of those people that if the rains do not appear shortly, and the level of the reservoirs runs low, they will have to revert to their old habit of showering monthly, which could create a health hazard.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure that, when our former colleague Mr Jack Slater reads his *Hansard*, he will be delighted that the tradition he proudly kept going has been resurrected on this last sitting day. I am aware that it has been a tradition in this Parliament to hold the Minister for Water Resources personally responsible for the level of water in the reservoirs and, indeed, by implication, for the rainfall in the catchment area. On the second score, I have let the House down badly in the past few months, because the rainfall in the catchment area has indeed been very low. This Government has a proud tradition of being able to produce rain when it is most needed.

I remind the House that when the Bannon Government came to power in 1982 the drought broke and there was considerable rainfall throughout the pastoral lands. I certainly hope that we can again perform this feat, and I will be looking forward to doing so. I have been reliably informed that we may well see some water appearing from the skies as soon as this weekend. I hope that that is the case. I cannot actually promise it, but I will certainly be doing my best.

Returning to the serious part of the question, I know there are some people in the community who are concerned that we have had such a long period without rain. They may well be concerned about whether we have an adequate water supply, given—to use the old cliché—that we are the driest State in the driest continent. I want to assure the community of South Australia that, because of the prudent foresight of Ministers and Governments in the past, as recently as yesterday 42 per cent of the total storage capacity of the metropolitan reservoirs contained water. When you look at last year's figure, that is exactly the same percentage in terms of capacity: yesterday 12 months ago there was 42 per cent of storage capacity, and that is the situation at present.

We do have adequate storage, but that does not mean that we are not desperately in need of rain to replenish the storage levels, and also generally for the gardens and parks and the environment of South Australia. I am sure we would all welcome rain. I am delighted to inform the House that there is nothing to worry about, and we will not—as happens in other countries (the United Kingdom being a classic example), and indeed in other States such as New South Wales—have to look at any form of water restrictions.

We must give credit to former Governments and Ministers who have ensured that we have the capacity to store water and ensure that in times of low rainfall, and indeed, drought we have adequate water for the people of South Australia.

#### STATE BUDGET

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer assure the House that the Budget is on track and will he direct that monthly figures on the progress of the State budget during January, February and March are released immediately? On 18 January the Government released monthly Consolidated Account figures for November and December. They showed an excess of payments over receipts for the six months to December 1990 amounting to \$211.5 million even after borrowings of \$216 million, \$141 million of which was in December alone. Despite the increased interest and concern with the State economy, the normal monthly figures for January, February and March have still not been released.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The statements to which the honourable member referred are the so-called Neimeyer statements which all States are required to produce monthly and which represent a cash flow basis. This has been so since the early 1930s as part of the Premier's arrangements of those days. The Neimeyer statements have been under review from time to time over the past few years.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, in terms of modern accounting they simply cannot properly or accurately reflect the state of finances.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** One of the harshest critics is the Premier of New South Wales, Mr Greiner, so I imagine that his views would be shared by members opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** In fact, his figures disclosed a \$300 million deficit last January, which he was not too happy about, and he has already announced massive budget problems this year.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am surprised at the interjection by the Leader of the Opposition in light of those disclosures. The Neimeyer statements, many would argue, have outlived their usefulness and a better way of providing periodic records of State finances should be found. In consequence, in recent years the statements have not been treated as seriously as they once were and every now and again there are delays in the issuing of statements. The figures to which the honourable member refers will be issued within the next day or so, it might even be today. They have been approved for release and they will go out. We have certainly tried to ensure (as it is unfortunate when a month goes by without their being issued) that they are issued on a monthly basis.

My second point relates to what the statements disclose and they will continue to disclose that there is a deficit as we go through the year. One of the reasons is that one of the most substantial contributions to the State budget comes from SAFA. We have budgeted for \$270 million this financial year. SAFA may do a bit better than that, but payment is not received until the end of the year. We do not take progressive payments through the year, so in consequence those receipts are missing from the statement throughout the year. That is simply one example of numerous payments—payments from the Commonwealth, various other receipts that the State gets, and other payments. The month to month statements, as the accompanying message points out, are really not very much to go on. At the moment the budget, is running at or below budgeted expenditure, setting aside the implications of the State Bank's servicing fee for the indemnity fund which will need to be taken into account.

At this stage, receipts are running below budget, particularly in areas like stamp duties, payroll tax and so on, as would be expected, because they are related to economic activity and economic activity has been recessed. But, at this stage, I can say that nothing discloses massive problems in our budget position or in our net borrowing requirement. That is not to say that 1991-92 will not be a very difficult year indeed, and I had occasion to say last night at the Australian Finance Conference that, in fact, we are very dependent, as always, on the outcome of the Premiers Conference this year.

We go into it this year with a guarantee of maintenance of real payments made at last year's Premiers Conference. That is very welcome: it is the first time in two or three years that we have managed to get that. The problem is that there is small print attached to that guarantee which

refers to its being dependent on the surrounding economic circumstances, and there not being any drastic change in those circumstances.

The fact that we are in a recession and that the recession has, at this stage, not bottomed out, suggests that, coupled with the massive fall in the projected Federal budget surplus, the Commonwealth may use these factors to say, 'Well, these supervening events mean that we cannot maintain that guarantee.' That would be disastrous, not just for South Australia but for all States. It would make our budget task virtually impossible. At the Premiers Conference a range of matters will be discussed because, as well as the financial deals, we will be looking at various microeconomic reform and other matters that were raised through the Special Premiers Conference. I have urged the Prime Minister, both privately and publicly, to stand by that guarantee to ensure that, whatever else is on the table at the Premiers Conference, we at least go into the conference on the basis that we start with the guarantee made at last year's Premiers Conference, and then we argue about what variations can be made in an upward direction or in the special payments area or whatever.

I state that, because it is very relevant for this House to understand that, with approximately 50 per cent of our receipts coming from the Federal Government, until we know the outcome of the May Premiers Conference, it is very difficult to even begin budget planning for the next financial year.

#### COASTAL LAKES STRATEGY REPORT

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House when she proposes to release a strategy report currently being prepared on the coastal lakes in the South-East of South Australia? For some months conservationists, landowners and members of the South Australian Field and Game Association have been awaiting the outcome of an extensive review of the Crown wetlands which constitutes the coastal lakes system from Kingston to Port MacDonnell in the South-East.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Perhaps if the member for Mount Gambier is patient, his queries will be answered. The honourable member who asked the question was correct in observing that the review currently being conducted by the Department of Lands will be of significant importance to a large section of the South Australian community, particularly those who utilise coastal wetlands for recreation and grazing purposes.

The latest advice available to me is that the report will be available for public release and comment by the middle of June of this year at the very latest and, at that time, it is my intention to seek expressions of interest from various competing interests and groups who wish to use the lakes areas.

It was also my intention to ensure that the conservation value of the more pristine lakes is maintained and that, where possible, the degraded fringing vegetation around other lakes is restored to a more natural condition. In some cases it will be possible to do that within the framework of traditional grazing and land management practices but, in other cases, it may be more appropriate to consider leasing some of those Crown lakes and their surrounds to groups such as the South Australian Field and Game Association, who have already indicated to me their willingness to be

involved in revegetation programs and, indeed, the restoration of some of these lakes to more pristine conditions.

I look forward to being able to release the strategy report in June and I shall be interested to hear the comments which I am sure will be forthcoming, both from the local community and from the broader community of South Australia, who indeed have demonstrated a very significant interest in the proper management of our land and water resources.

#### STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Did the Treasurer approve, and does he agree with, SGIC's writing residual asset risk insurance contracts and engaging in credit enhancement activity; and can he inform the House in round figures of the maximum liability SGIC has insured through these forms of financial risk insurance? I have a copy of a confidential memo signed by the Under Treasurer which states that as at July 1990 SGIC had written at least 19 residual asset risk insurance contracts and that lawyers Thomson Simmons had provided an opinion that SGIC did not have the power to enter into such transactions. In his memo of 6 July 1990 Mr Emery wrote:

... it would be appropriate to establish a Crown view of whether the SGIC is able to undertake such business and whether the obligations of the SGIC under such contracts are guaranteed by the South Australian Government.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suspect that the honourable member, rather than just reading out that question, should have referred it to his Leader. It is probably one of his bottom drawer things, where in fact the answer is already known.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** This is what we have been told. I wonder whether the honourable member will contradict me, or perhaps he has not been told.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, there we are.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is the last day of the session. It would be a pity if anybody were to miss this day. I draw the attention of all members to the rules of conduct in the House.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is very hard when these games with our financial institutions continue to be played. If it were some sort of political football that we could throw around, I do not think anybody would mind—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Such pompous, phoney indignation! I do not know—we have had to sit here for years watching the honourable member who, as I was saying to my colleague the Deputy Leader just the other day, has probably had responsibility for environment and planning on the Opposition side longer than anybody in Parliament, my Deputy's career included, and do we get questions on that? No, we get nonsense questions—

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. We have had a number of examples of the question being debated. Under Standing Orders, that should be ruled out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I can see that some members do not want to be here tonight.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold the point of order. Relevance is covered in Standing Orders and there has been a growing tendency to digress from the subject matter. I ask

the Premier to come back to the subject and answer the question.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I was addressing very much the point of relevance—the relevance of the environment and planning shadow Minister reading out a question supplied by the Opposition Leader on something he knows nothing about. It is time these games finished. I will not join in them any more, thank you very much.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Heysen.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Has the Premier been contacted by the Public Service Association concerning the use of parliamentary privilege to attack members of the State Public Service? If so, what was the Premier's response? This morning's *Advertiser* carried a story concerning allegations made by the Hon. Mr Lucas, the Opposition education spokesperson, which claimed that widespread nepotism and manipulation of appointments in the Education Department was occurring.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order—

*The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order before the Chair, and I will take note of that point of order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, members are not allowed to refer to debates in another place.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The Chair did not hear any reference to a debate in the other place.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I, too, read the press report referred to by the honourable member and heard some discussion taking place on the ABC morning talkback program that Keith Conlon conducted on this very issue. It is very much in the public domain. I can confirm to the honourable member that the General Secretary of the Public Service Association wrote to me on 5 February this year expressing his association's concern at the actions of certain members of Parliament, who name public servants quite recklessly, defame them, under the protection of parliamentary privilege, without any right on their part to defend themselves or even to set the record straight.

That letter was prompted by a series of incidents following, in particular, an attack by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw on officers of the Department of Local Government and the reading of anonymous letters. Mr Crawshaw, who is the General Secretary of the association, pointed out that, under the Government Management and Employment Act, public servants are restricted from making a public response and, in any event, would obviously be reluctant to become involved in political argument.

I think that was classically rejected today when the Director-General of Education, Dr Boston, took part in the debate on this issue, and obviously felt quite constrained because, as a public servant who is not in a position—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** He, in fact, felt himself constrained, as he stated, in having to debate this issue in this way and being drawn into a political debate. He mentioned that in fact he respected and had good dealings with the shadow Education Minister; yet it was very difficult in that sort of environment. That is typical of the dilemma that was highlighted by the General Secretary of the Public

Service Association report again: under that Act, under their Public Service charter, they are restricted from making a response. There is the Westminster system, which is supported by all members in this House. They are obviously reluctant and are put in great difficulties if they are getting involved in defending themselves in what is essentially a political debate.

I replied to Mr Crawshaw saying that I shared his concern at what could be called 'unwarranted abuse of parliamentary privilege'. I pointed out that the Minister of Labour, my colleague, had delivered a ministerial statement in this House refuting allegations made in that instance by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw and that he had asked the Opposition to publicly apologise to the individuals concerned for the damage that had been done to them. No apology has been forthcoming, no explanation, no further back-up or statement—a deafening silence, which I think is quite disgraceful in the circumstances.

On receipt of that letter, I also wrote to the Leader of the Opposition urging him to take some hand in getting his colleagues to refrain from abusing privilege in this way. I am not sure what the Leader's position on that matter is. I understand that the General Secretary of the PSA wrote to him in similar terms as well. Whatever the reply might be, the practice is certainly one which suggests that the Opposition does not accept in any way the constraints or difficulties that public servants are placed in when they are slandered under parliamentary privilege. I would have thought that the Leader, in particular would be sensitive to this area. I recall the embarrassment caused to him when he was given a question to read out about a particular marine development in this State which implied that a Melbourne businessman was implicated in the death of a colleague—a quite scandalous and outrageous situation. It embarrassed severely the then honourable member—he was not the Leader at that stage. I thought he handled the aftermath quite appropriately, I might say, when confronted with the embarrassing and difficult situation. He should never have been in that position.

If members were prepared to exercise a bit more care, both the Leader's office in generating questions to be asked and members in actually critically assessing what they are being asked to get on their feet and say in this House, I think we would all be much better served.

Yesterday we had yet another incident which has been the subject of comment, to which the honourable member referred. Parliamentary privilege is a vital and necessary part of our democracy. Only a few weeks ago I tabled in this House a report of the NCA on Operation Hydra. In doing so, I pointed out how the misuse of parliamentary privilege can demean the political process and damage the credibility of all politicians.

On that occasion I suggested to the House that the readiness to trade in rumours, to rush allegations into *Hansard*, had become all too prevalent in recent years. Well, it seems to be becoming the stock-in-trade of the Opposition. Again, I appeal to the Leader, this time publicly in this House, to impose some discipline and some responsibility on his colleagues to ensure that those abuses cease.

#### HIGHWAY 12 ACCIDENT

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** Will the Minister of Transport investigate the serving of a bill for \$2 101.61 by the Department of Road Transport on parents whose son was killed in a motor accident on the Ouyen Highway (Highway 12) at Jabuk on 14 July last year? Material for the repair

of the gouge in the road caused by the accident cost only \$16. The rest of the \$2 101.61 is made up of \$1 831.87 for labour and \$253 for machinery hire. It has been put to me by constituents who are members of a local service club with whom the family was involved that this in itself shows incredible inefficiency on the part of the department, which is quite apart from the department's insensitivity for the feelings of the parents of the dead boy who was only a passenger in the car. I can supply the names of the parents to the Minister if he will investigate this matter further.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

#### FIRE DANGER SEASON

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Emergency Services indicate to the House why the CFS has considered it necessary to extend the fire danger season for a further period this year?

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I thank the honourable member for her question and I can advise the House that the CFS today took action to extend the fire danger season for a further two weeks. The reason is clearly the extremely dry conditions which continue to prevail over virtually the entire State, and that was referred to earlier by my colleague the Minister of Water Resources. The effect of the Easter rains, which fell over some parts of the State, have long since been dissipated by the continued warm weather.

Acting under section 35 of the Country Fires Act, the board has gazetted an extension of the fire danger season from 16 April to 30 April in the following fire ban districts:

North West Pastoral  
North East Pastoral  
Flinders  
West Coast  
Eastern Eyre Peninsula  
Lower Eyre Peninsula  
Riverland  
Murraylands  
Yorke Peninsula  
Mid North  
Upper South East; and  
Kangaroo Island.

I have been advised that the CFS consulted widely before making this decision. That consultation included a cross-section of district councils, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Woods and Forests Department and the Bureau of Meteorology. The latter three organisations all support the extension.

However, with a number of exceptions, the general consensus among district councils is that an extension is not warranted as grasses and stubble have been significantly reduced through normal agricultural practices.

While the CFS accepts that this view has some validity, the fact that areas of native vegetation and forests remain extremely dry, and have a high fuel load, and that hot, windy weather may still occur (and today is a good example of such hot weather) makes an extension of the fire danger season a necessity.

While the decision may attract some criticism from local government because of the additional administrative requirements from councils through the issuing of permits to authorise the lighting of fires, I am sure that most people will understand that it is better for the CFS to err on the side of caution in circumstances of this kind. Of course, if we do have widespread rains over the next few days or weeks, as indeed all of us hope, such an extension of the fire season could be rescinded immediately.

## STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I direct my question to the Treasurer. When SGIC sought his approval, as is required by its Act, to buy shares last financial year in a Sydney based investment company called Pedara Management Limited, what explanation did the commission give for this investment? Is the Under Treasurer, Mr Emery, still a director of the company?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I will take that question on notice and provide the honourable member with a reply.

## HOMESTART

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning, on behalf of the Minister of Housing and Construction, advise the House on the guidelines for eligibility for HomeStart loans? In this morning's *Advertiser*, the Opposition housing spokesman (Hon. Legh Davis) called for a review of the HomeStart scheme to place a cap on the value of houses to be bought under the scheme. Mr Davis also said that some borrowers under the scheme had incomes of over \$100 000 per year.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question because the article in this morning's *Advertiser* was based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the HomeStart scheme and how it operates. The HomeStart scheme was set up as a commercial operation to provide housing loans in a similar way to other lending institutions. Normal HomeStart loans are commercially based products and do not contain any Government subsidy to clients, and I emphasise that, so therein lies Mr Davis's first misunderstanding of the HomeStart scheme. General HomeStart borrowers are not subsidised borrowers and they pay their way like all other home buyers. That situation has always applied.

When launching the scheme before the last election, the Premier clearly indicated that there would be no income restrictions on HomeStart borrowers, and that is the case. However, the scheme was specifically targeted at the low income end of the housing market to provide that sector with greater purchasing power. Experience has shown that this sector of the market has taken up HomeStart loans in by far the greatest numbers. I therefore wish to be very clear that HomeStart currently does not have income limits and the loans are not restricted only to first home buyers.

Mr Davis seems to think that a family on a high income taking out a HomeStart loan is receiving some sort of Government subsidy. That is completely wrong and clearly he does not understand the scheme. I certainly hope that he is the only person who misunderstands it. The only subsidies in the program are to householders with gross incomes below \$21 250 per annum. That subsidy is not an interest rate reduction. It is provided through what is called a top-up and that loan can be up to \$10 000 and has no interest charge for five years. Thus it improves the borrowing capacity of low income earners.

In conclusion, I should like to share one statistic with the House that puts this whole question in perspective. Of almost 5 500 HomeStart loans, Mr Davis complained that 61 are for houses valued at more than \$150 000. These figures indicate that almost 99 per cent of all HomeStart loans are for houses that are valued at less than \$150 000. Clearly the objective of loans for low income people is being met and I am disappointed, as Acting Minister, that Mr Davis has not seen fit to ask the department or the Minister's office for a clarification of the way in which HomeStart

works. Rather, he has rushed out to the media and peddled a lot of misinformation, which is most unfortunate.

## CASINOS

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I direct my question to the Treasurer. Did the SGIC invest in Pedara Management because this company is seeking the licence to operate a proposed \$400 million casino project in the Australian Capital Territory, and how is his approval for this investment consistent with his rejection of a proposal for a casino in the Mount Gambier area on the grounds that casinos outside capital cities are not viable?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am very surprised that the honourable member, who I know has many concerns in his constituency and is in fact a very keen advocate on behalf of those constituents, allows himself to have his time wasted with this sort of question. I will certainly take the matter on notice, although I would have thought that he would better occupy the House by talking about something of direct concern to his constituency, particularly in the rural area, instead of picking up the nonsense peddled to him by the Leader's office.

## OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** Will the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety advise the House on the success or otherwise of the campaign to promote the new laws on manual handling? Earlier this year new regulations and a code of practice on manual handling came into effect. At the time, it was announced that the Occupational Health and Safety Commission would undertake a publicity campaign to promote the new laws.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I am pleased that the member for Gilles asked me this question, because I was advised today that more than 10 000 copies of that manual handling code and regulations have been sold to South Australian businesses. Manual handling injuries are this State's most expensive injury. Nearly 10 000 people a year are injured and it is estimated that the cost to South Australian industry is more than \$80 million per annum.

The new laws came into effect on 1 January this year and, as I said earlier, more than 10 000 copies have been sold so far. That means that one-fifth of the employers who are registered with WorkCover have seen fit to purchase a copy. That is a remarkable response. State Print has had to transfer two staff to temporarily handle this influx of inquiries. I have been advised that between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. daily they have been receiving facsimiles every two minutes from people seeking a copy of that code and regulations.

These sales do indicate a response. I was gratified to be told of this today, and I am starting to think that perhaps the pressure from WorkCover, the publicity that has been given to back injuries, the costs and the awful effect upon some people is getting through. It also means that the work of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission, the work of the people who have assisted in drafting this code and the publicity have been right, and it is getting through to employers that perhaps the best way to avoid injuries is to work so that they do not happen.

This code calls upon employers to think through their manufacturing and work processes to avoid every possible opportunity for injuries to people's back or soft tissue. They are the hardest to remedy in any area, in any country, and they are the most prevalent. This might be the beginning

of a new dawn in South Australian industry, where less people will be injured each year.

### STATE BANK

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Will the Treasurer ensure that the State Bank's financial and investment services advisers are trained and qualified to the standard industry level required under Commonwealth corporations law and will he obtain a list of all advisers and managers and their qualifications? I have been informed by former and current senior State Bank sources that many of the bank's investment advisers have no formal qualifications and only eight days of in-house training before being told to give highly technical investment advice which affects the financial futures of customers. My informants state that, because large commissions are paid to advisers for placing funds with particular outside institutions, this is often the primary motivation for their advice.

Chapter 7 of the Commonwealth Corporations Act, which is followed by other banks, includes stringent rules on the essential competence of investment advisers, including licensing requirements. But I am further informed that the financial and investment services areas of the State Bank are currently in a unique position to avoid these rules through having obtained an exemption because they are a State public authority.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** This is, of course, part of the ongoing guerilla warfare on the State Bank. It is the last flurry, the last opportunity to do so, so we will cram in as many questions as we can today in this nice little hit and run exercise! The honourable member said that 'former and current' bank sources had given him the information. I wonder, first, why he did not tell us who those former and current bank sources are to try to give some credibility to the question he asked and the explanation attached to it. I wonder whether he will deny for the House that he did not just receive that question—

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** He is beginning to interject—I think he knows I am on to something. Will he deny to the House that he did not directly receive any such information from any source and that, in fact, the office of the Leader of the Opposition provided the question to him, got him on the list and said, 'How about asking this one Wayne; this will be a beauty. You'll make your name with this'.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker; I transgress. I will come back to the point. I would have thought that the honourable member has many constituents in Bright who would be looking to matters of real relevance to them. 'Former and current' sources have come to the honourable member, he tells us. I assume that that is correct and that he is not misleading the House. They have come to him and he will tell us who they are. He nods. He does not nod very confidently and it is as well that he does not nod confidently, because you can bet your life that that question was prepared and typed in the Leader's office and handed to the honourable member, and he asked it.

As part of that guerilla warfare, I am not prepared to engage in it. In the interests of the State we should not be part of it but should be assisting the bank to get on with trading successfully and profitably rather than peddling scuttlebutt and innuendo in order to denigrate it. If the honourable member would like to put his question into some sort of balance and get for me the qualifications, training and other attributes of all other credit advisers in this State

in private banks and other financial institutions and give us some sort of conspectus, if he would speak to 'former and current' employees there to gain a comparative picture, his question might have more credibility. I suspect that he is peddling secondhand nonsense and he ought to get back to his task, which is to represent the electors of Bright.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### OUT OF SCHOOL HOURS CARE

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Children's Services. Will the Minister redirect surpluses from existing out of school hours programs to establish new programs? What are the criteria for funding out of school hours care? Parents from the Findon Primary School have asked me why their application for an out of school hours care program failed last year and whether it has any prospects of success this year. Many parents of pupils at the school are shiftworkers and include a community of newly-arrived Portuguese families. A spokesman for the Findon parents, Mr Mark Walton, states that the Portuguese families will move their children from the Findon Primary School, which has a specialist Portuguese program, to other schools with out of school hours care if the program is not instituted at Findon. Mr Walton said that the program lacks a social justice criterion.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member would be aware that the Minister of Education is currently chairing a meeting of the Australian Education Council across the road. I will refer the matter to him and ask him to provide an early reply.

### RURAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. What assurances will the Minister give that rural persons on farms can be guaranteed household support? It has been brought to my attention that the only way people on farms can be guaranteed rural support for food, clothing and other household essentials is if they offer to put their property on the market for sale. At a time when we are experiencing a serious rural depression, I believe it is essential that changes be made to the Rural Assistance Act, through the Rural Finance and Development Division, so that people do not have to give a commitment to sell their property when they need the basic essential elements of food, clothing and the like.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** To an extent, the honourable member was correct in what he said about household support when he made the comment that there is a commitment to leave the farm, or to leave farming. He was not correct when he said that people are forced to sell, implying that that was a forthwith activity. Those who receive household support under rural assistance must undertake to leave farming within three years. If they do not do so, they could be liable to repay the amounts they received as, I think, an interest-free loan. I could be wrong about the loans being interest-free, but I will certainly check that.

The honourable member has raised the question about the very important need of financial support for people who have no other means of access to finance, and he has said that that should come under household support if people are not prepared to leave the land; in other words, a change should be made to the guidelines for household support. To

an extent, I do agree that a change should be made to the guidelines for household support, and the South Australian Government has already communicated views on this matter to the Federal Government.

I hope that the views we have expressed for some easing of the rigidities of the guidelines will be heard, but I do not yet know what the answer to that will be. I remind the honourable member, as I am sure he must be aware, that these are not issues on which the State Government can go it alone. The household support, as other parts of rural assistance, is subject to a Federal/State agreement and, indeed, some months ago in this Parliament we debated the legislation that enables rural assistance to take place in this State.

But I query whether or not it is reasonable, even under amended or more favourable guidelines, for household support to be the method of finance, to which the honourable member was referring, for those who do not intend to leave farming. Surely, if people are planning to stay on in farming over the longer time, we must look at other ways of freeing up support for them other than by providing household support, which is designed to say, 'You are leaving farming at some stage, and you are going out of farming activities.' That then brings us back to the key question of carry-on finance, and that is the issue that I have been addressing with various banks I have met so far, raising with them the query of not only carry-on finance for purchasing seed, fertiliser, and the like, but how they actually get access to money to live on in the meantime whilst they are waiting to receive a cheque at the end of the sale of their produce.

Indeed, as we have been doing the mathematics of how much they would need for carry-on finance, we take into account the amount that would be needed for living expenses; in other words, for food and clothing that the honourable member talks about. I think that that matter really should be addressed for those farmers who may be technically non-viable at the moment but who, in the longer term, are viable farmers. We should look at it under the carry-on finance side rather than under the household support side. Notwithstanding that, the need for a liberalisation of the household support guidelines is supported, and has been supported, although I suspect not to the extent that the honourable member is implying in his question.

### MOLOKANS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier):** Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs advise the House whether he has made any representations to the Federal Government concerning the granting of special entry permits to Molokans from Armenia?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In fact, I made representations to the Federal Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs last Friday when I had a meeting with him following representations to me by members of the Molokan community in South Australia. For the information of members of this place, the Molokans are a denomination of the Christian church who originate from Russia but a number of whom, over the years, have dispersed to other communities. There are significant communities within Byelorussia and the United States, and 70 to 80 families are resident in South Australia.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, there are some in Jerusalem as well; the member for Henley Beach is quite correct. Most of those in South Australia live in the northern suburbs. Another area in Australia where a significant number,

relatively speaking, of Molokans live is Bunbury, Western Australia. However, there is a group in Armenia, and they are facing a problem at the moment. This matter has been put to me by the Molokan community in South Australia.

In as much as they are Christians, one would expect that they would be on reasonable terms with the Armenian population in the present tensions between the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis (or Azeris as they are also called). However, the situation is not like that because the Molokans are what are referred to as one of the historic peace churches—in other words, people whose theological relatives are the Doukhobours, the Mennonites, the Amish and the Quakers. Therefore, they do not take up arms in any conflict. So, they are earning the enmity of both the Armenians and the Azeris, and they are under very real threat of massacre. Indeed, in the present tragic lawless state that is applying in much of that part of the world, gangs of both Azeris and Armenians have talked about having a massacre of Molokans, and actually named a date on one occasion which was only stopped by a further tragic event taking place, namely, an earthquake.

These people live in great fear of their well-being, and their relatives and members of the community in this country have asked that the Australian Government consider treating these people as refugees and giving them special entry. They have indicated that there would be community support here in South Australia. I think a case has been made by these people that should be considered by the Federal Government, and I put that proposition to the Federal Minister, Gerry Hand. He has also spoken with a couple of members of the Molokan community and indicated that the Federal Government is considering the position of groups such as the Molokans and other groups under threat in the Soviet Union.

One may ask why they do not move from that part of the Soviet Union to another part of that country. The situation is that the border or transmigration requirements within the Soviet Union are as rigid as they are from any part of the Soviet Union to the rest of the world. In any event, there is no certainty that they would be freed from religious oppression if they stayed in the Soviet Union because some of their colleagues in other parts of the Soviet Union are the subject of religious oppression as the National Church in that country is trying to enforce views other than those they have carried with them for many centuries.

### ADELAIDE WATER QUALITY

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Does the Minister of Water Resources intend to take any action to reassure Melbourne-based AFL teams as to the quality of Adelaide's water? It appears that even the fiercest opposition turns to mineral water in the face of the Adelaide Crows. I ask this question following a report in last Thursday's Melbourne *Age* which states:

When Hawthorn and Carlton flew into enemy territory for the first two AFL games at Football Park over the past fortnight, they both took drinking water from home. When the Blues' supply dried up, someone was dispatched to buy mineral water rather than take any risk with the notorious stuff that comes out of Adelaide's taps.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** This may well be our secret weapon in terms of the Crows' eventual success in the AFL, so I am not sure really what sort of an answer the honourable member wants. However, I think the question was actually whether I could give the Victorian AFL teams an assurance of the high quality of our water.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Notwithstanding my colleagues' urging me to give them nothing, I certainly can give them an assurance of the very high safety and quality of Adelaide water. Indeed, that is all I will give them because they will need a lot more than an assurance about the quality of our water to be able to come over here and defeat the Crows in subsequent games. It just shows that, no doubt, they are preparing some excuses. If we defeat them, they will be able to say, 'We ran out of mineral water', or worse that they drank our water!

Of course, we will not accept such excuses and, indeed, my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport will be sorry that he was not present to hear the question because he would be barracking at some length in terms of my answer. Our water is safe, and I am sorry that the Victorian football players are such wimps that they are not able to drink our high quality water. I guess there is something in this for the manufacturers of mineral water. The players will need a much better excuse than that when we subsequently thrash them in the competition.

### LAND TAX

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Is the Treasurer aware of the 'industry uproar over land tax' in New South Wales as quoted in the *Australian Business Magazine* of 13 March 1991 and the suggestions for a national formula based on the ability to pay and, if so, what could be the implications for South Australia of such a national formula?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I am aware of the problems and the issues. In South Australia, a detailed study has been done into the land tax structure. As I indicated earlier today in a quite different context, we have consistently adjusted the rates and scales of land tax in order to deal with some of the larger anomalies. The fact is that land tax is based around value. In that sense it is a very equitable tax, except that it has the unforeseen effect that, where it can be directly passed onto tenants and others, it can have an unfair effect on those tenants if, for instance, the owner of the property has aggregated other properties or values have jumped greatly but the owner is not realising those values.

In South Australia this has been kept under constant review. We have made adjustments year by year to try to ensure that there is some evening-out of that impact. The tax itself is an important part of our structure and, basically, it is a fair and equitable tax. In New South Wales the problems have been quite horrendous, as has been outlined in the article to which the honourable member referred and also in other publications. In fact, the article states:

Landowners feel they have been cheated by the New South Wales land tax concessions.

When one analyses it, one can see how they have been caught in that upward jump in valuations with no real adjustments and, when they thought they were getting adjustments, they were delivering no benefits. Included in the article is a table comparing the States.

If one looks at the property values chosen in that table—and there are five of them at various stages—one sees that South Australia has either the lowest or the second lowest land tax in Australia. I think that is a pretty good answer to those critics and people who get agitated about it and carry on about it in South Australia. We are well below the rate interstate and, while one can see the States alter in their ranking as the value rises from \$500 000 up to \$50 million, South Australia remains consistently as the lowest or second lowest. Therefore, we certainly do not believe that land tax in this State is levied unfairly or onerously.

The second point the member made related to a new national system based on what is called 'ability to pay'. I am not sure what that means, but I would think that a national system can only suggest a severe disadvantage to landowners in South Australia. They would have to pick up the increases in property values, over-heated boom values in other States—and I guess that could be of benefit in Government revenue, but it certainly would not be fair to landowners here—or, alternatively, we would find our system distorted by it. It relates to the ability to pay in so far as it is based on the actual value of the property.

Admittedly, in cash terms, there might not be a clear ability to pay and, because the owner cannot realise on that value at any particular time, there may be some difficulties. Nonetheless, a basic fairness is built into the system and, providing the rates are reasonable—and they are reasonable in South Australia—I do not think that there can be any objection.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 14 May at 2 p.m.

In speaking to this motion it is traditional that I should place on record my gratitude to a number of people who have assisted in the proper functioning of this House throughout the session, which is now rapidly drawing to a close. I am very happy to do so. My own responsibility in this matter as the leader of the House is the scheduling of the business, and I can certainly say that I have received a great deal of cooperation from all members in that matter.

Long gone are the days when members see that there is any political advantage in prolixity. Certainly, the productivity of the House of Assembly reflects that realistic appreciation by members. Without in any way wanting to reflect on another place, I would point out that it does not have our sort of management procedures and cooperation on both sides of the House and, as a result, it is not unreasonable to predict that we may complete our business by 6 o'clock this afternoon, whereas the other place may be in debate for some time after that.

I will put it no higher than that, except to say that we do benefit from the advantage of being able to come to some agreement each week as to how we operate. In that respect I ought to place on record my appreciation of the cooperation I have received from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who, without in any way resiling from political advantage or the political cut and thrust in this place, has been accommodating in trying to ensure that we are able to dispense with the business in a reasonable length of time. Of course, that is in contrast to what we have sometimes seen over the years in this place.

In that respect I cannot go further without acknowledging that, before the House again assembles, a number of members on the other side of the House will join with me in celebrating a 21st parliamentary birthday. Of course, I refer to the members for Light, Kavel, Hanson and Eyre. All of those members, along with me, were among that extraordinary influx of new blood into this place in 1970 following the redrawing of the electoral boundaries in 1969.

We are the survivors of that and when you, Mr Speaker, look at all of us, you can see how unscathed we are as a result of the political battles that have occurred since that time. Also, I want to place on record the appreciation of all members to you, Mr Speaker, for your firm but benign control of the business of the House. We know that that



will continue. We are also grateful to the staff of Parliament House, to the Clerks and attendants, the catering service staff, the library staff, the caretakers and the people involved in the maintenance of Parliament. In each case we receive magnificent support and assistance from all such people. I think that we must be the envy of other Parliaments for the way in which this occurs. I refer to the *Hansard* staff, where all the reporting apparatus of the Parliament works extremely efficiently.

We also see the members of the fourth estate down here so frequently that we often think they are actually on the staff of the place, and we take the opportunity of wishing them perhaps different sorts of experiences during the adjournment of the House until August. I commend the motion to the House. We are aware of the tradition which underlies the date in the motion and, of course, the House will reassemble for business in August.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I thank the Deputy Premier for his generous words. I indicate that the Opposition will formally oppose the motion for adjournment because we believe that many more questions need to be answered. Indeed, we have many more questions to ask. The people of South Australia deserve some answers, and they deserve far greater consideration than this session of Parliament has allowed.

A large amount of legislation on the Notice Paper needs to be dealt with, but it has been set aside. We believe that the House should proceed with further sittings beyond this date because the State economy and State finances are in critical balance and everyone has a right to know more and more about what has been done to correct the situation. We have not had the respect and the response that we would wish from the Government on these matters of vital concern, and so we will be opposing the motion formally.

True, this is generally a moment of reflection when thanks are given. I will not let that moment pass without commending the staff and the people who have made this place a very livable establishment for the past 20 days of sitting and for the 29 days prior to that, which make up the forty-seventh Parliament. I would like to commend, on behalf of all my colleagues, the library and research staff who do such a wonderful job. I refer also to the people involved in the provision of food and refreshment and those who record our words, who sometimes have to change those words to make sense of what has been said. I acknowledge those who attend the Parliament and look after the needs of parliamentarians, whether they be in the Parliament itself or within its confines. I acknowledge also the work of those behind the scenes in the administrative area, those with technical expertise and the caretakers.

My last thankyou goes to you, Sir, and the Clerks who directly control the Parliament. I agree with the Deputy Premier. I have been here for over eight years, and whether it be the crisis that we are in or whether it be the closeness of the Parliament and the fact that we depend on one seat for Government in this State, it has been a good Parliament, a very human Parliament. There has been no time wasting. It has been a period when people have expressed their views in a less controversial manner than I have seen over the eight years that I have been in this place.

Much of the credit for the conduct of this place and the way in which we conduct ourselves belongs to you, Mr Speaker, and the Clerks. There are two other matters that I wish to raise before we pursue the motion. The first is that we now have a larger number of select committees, and I commend that. I believe that we see far greater sense through the select committees than if the matters are debated in the

open forums of Parliament where we tend to take sides. Therefore, I commend the fact that more select committees are being formed to preside over matters of importance.

The second point is that, despite the good way in which I believe we have worked over the past eight or nine months, there is a need for a review of Standing Orders. For example, we should guarantee members a right of grievance and we should have a longer Question Time to allow all subjects to be aired and canvassed. I would like to think that in the early part of the forty-eighth parliamentary session those matters will be embraced, and we will see further improvements to the Parliament. I thank all those people who have made this a good and constructive Parliament over the past session.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I am in an awkward position. Duty bound, I have to support the motion, but I must admit that I find attractive the proposition put forward by the Deputy Leader that if I join with him in opposing the motion we will be here for a few more weeks. I feel very tempted to do that, because I know that, if the Opposition happens to defeat the motion moved by the Deputy Premier, Opposition members would lynch me on the spot. Apart from what the Deputy Leader said about you, Mr Speaker, which was truthful all the way down the line—you are fair but firm—and what he said about everyone else, which was also okay, the rest of it was pure hypocrisy. I feel tempted to take him at his word and desert my colleagues on this side and make sure that we sit right through until Christmas.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I support the opposition, in effect, of my colleague the Deputy Leader.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The proposition is to destroy the motion that is currently before the Chair, so let us not be pedantic about it. Apart from the 16 very important questions that have been identified in a letter to the Premier from the Leader of the Opposition in recent days that are awaiting an answer—

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** When are you going away, Bruce?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Unlike the member for Napier, who is going away, this member is not going away. A number of questions asked this week require an answer, and there is no clear indication that we will get those answers. More specifically, I want to draw attention to the fact that, on the supposed last day of this session, Parliament has still not had the benefit of the supplementary volume of *Hansard* relative to the questions asked during the Estimates Committees that were conducted in September 1990.

This matter has been raised for the past three years. The Deputy Premier, who is responsible for the business of the House, has given a clear indication that there is an expectation that Ministers will comply with the dates set by the Committee Chairmen. In some cases, those answers are passed on to members of the Committee, but they—

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** They have been.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Not all of them have been.

**The Hon. D.J. Hoppood:** They should have been.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** While they should have been, they have not been. Those people in the community who are interested in the deliberations of this place and have followed the questioning in the Estimates Committees, having sighted a guarantee that answers will be forthcoming, are still waiting for those answers. If nothing else, I believe that this situation is demeaning of the parliamentary system.

Yet again this parliamentary year we are waiting an inordinately long time for the answers that are so vital a part of Estimates Committee activity. I am hopeful that, by extending the sittings, the fault may be remedied before the House rises. Like my colleagues on this side, I will oppose the motion that has been moved by the Deputy Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take note of the vote of thanks to the staff and I will see that it is passed on to those officers. I support everything that has been said about the support from the joint parliamentary services—catering, the library and *Hansard*. The services provided to all members of this House are excellent. I note the kind comments about the service provided by the table officers, and I thank them for their forbearance and assistance in this session. Despite the proposition that has been put forward, I wish everyone a pleasant break.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke and Trainer.

Noes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker (teller), Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 20 Ayes and 20 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON WORKCOVER AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

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

That the members of this House appointed to the Joint Committee on WorkCover and the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege have power to act on those committees during the recess.

Motion carried.

#### AMBULANCE SERVICES BILL

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the licensing of persons who carry on the business of providing ambulance services; to repeal the Ambulance Services Act 1985; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to repeal the Ambulance Services Act 1985 and to introduce new legislation which will provide for a new entity (the South Australian St John Ambulance Service Inc) to operate ambulance services previously controlled by St John and the licensing of other persons who carry on the business of providing ambulance services in this State.

The existing Ambulance Services Act 1985 was enacted as a result of the work of a Parliamentary Select Committee in 1984 which, among other things, recommended that ambulance services be licensed, and that the St John Ambul-

ance Service be controlled by an ambulance board with responsibility for maintaining an appropriate balance between St John Ambulance Brigade volunteer ambulance officers and paid employees, training and development and general administration of the ambulance service. The permanent licence issued to St John is currently in the name of the St John Council.

Volunteer and paid officers have worked together for many years providing a highly professional ambulance service to the South Australian Community. However, late in 1989, as a result of differences between volunteer and paid staff, the Priory in Australia of the Grand Priory of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem (the Priory) decided to withdraw St John Brigade volunteers from the ambulance service and to separate the ambulance service from all other St John activities. This decision followed many months of discussion about the working arrangements between volunteer and paid ambulance officers. It was then resolved to move towards an ambulance service fully staffed by paid employees in the metropolitan area by 1993. In addition it was agreed that ambulance services with paid staff and volunteer involvement in some of the larger country centres would become fully paid and 64 country centres would continue to be operated wholly by volunteers.

Transition to these new staffing arrangements involve significant additional funds for the required increase in recruitment and training of additional paid officers. As a result of Priory's decision and the resulting funding implications, a comprehensive assessment of the St John Ambulance Service has been undertaken by a Steering Committee with the assistance of a private consultant.

This comprehensive assessment has involved a review of the implementation process for the transition to a fully paid ambulance service in the metropolitan area, organisation and management structures, ownership and rights of use of assets used for providing an ambulance service, service standards, fee policies, performance guidelines and the handling of industrial issues. The Steering Committee also assessed the relevance of existing legislation covering the provision of ambulance services in South Australia. As part of the comprehensive assessment, extensive consultation was undertaken with interested parties.

The Consultant has recommended and the Government has accepted that ambulance services throughout the State should be provided by a new entity, which will be a joint venture between the Government and the Priory, as equal partners, to be known as the South Australian St John Ambulance Service Inc. The agreement between the Government and the Priory will be formalised in a 'Heads of Agreement' document. General agreement on principles such as continuity of employment of existing employees and access to existing property and equipment has been reached and the document is being drafted.

The new body will be incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 and controlled by a nine person Board of Directors. The Board will comprise a chairperson nominated by the Minister; a person nominated by the Priory to represent country volunteer ambulance officers; two additional persons nominated by the Priory; a person nominated by the Ambulance Employees Association who is a member of that Association; two additional persons nominated by the Minister; a person nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council and a person who in the view of both the Priory and the Minister has experience in community voluntary work or activities. The proposed Rules of Association require that all directors have proven man-

agement skills and that at least one be a legal practitioner and one a person with proven financial skills.

In order to achieve the necessary degree of public accountability, the accounts of the new ambulance service will be audited by the Auditor-General and audited accounts along with a report of the ambulance service's activities will be tabled in Parliament each year. Considerable thought has been given to the operation of the new service and a document setting out the principles governing the conduct of the new ambulance service is being prepared. The existing Ambulance Services Act 1985 does not provide an appropriate legislative framework for the proposed new entity and it is therefore necessary to repeal the existing Act and introduce new legislation to reflect the new entity's arrangements, licensing requirements and other related matters. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 repeals the Ambulance Services Act 1985.

Clause 4 provides interpretation of terms used in the Bill. The purpose of subclause (2) is to ensure that voluntary ambulance services must be licensed under the Act as well as ambulance services that charge for the services provided.

Clause 5 makes it an offence to carry on the business of providing ambulance services without a licence.

Clause 6 provides for the granting of licences by the Minister.

Clause 7 provides for conditions to be attached to licences.

Clause 8 provides for revocation of licences.

Clause 9 is a delegation provision.

Clause 10 provides for the formation of South Australian St John Ambulance Service Inc.

Clause 11 requires the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of the association. Subclause (4) removes the accounting and auditing requirement of the Associations Incorporation Act 1985. These are not required in view of the other provisions of this clause.

Clause 12 obliges the Association to provide the Minister and the Priory with a report in respect of each financial year.

Clause 13 restricts the borrowing and investment powers of the Association.

Clause 14 provides for the fixing of fees and makes it an offence to overcharge.

Clause 15 is a holding out provision.

Clause 16 provides a general defence.

Clause 17 provides for summary offences.

Clause 18 provides for the making of regulations.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSING COOPERATIVES BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until the first day of the next session, and the committee have power to act during the recess.

Motion carried.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE (MISCELLANEOUS POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 7)—After line 14 insert subparagraph as follows:

(iia) on a vessel whether at sea or anywhere not in a Country Fire Services region (within the meaning of the Country Fires Act 1989);

No. 3. Page 2, lines 18 and 19 (clause 7)—Leave out all words in this line and substitute:

'public hearing' includes any structure or place (whether permanent or temporary or fixed or movable) that is enclosed or partly enclosed.

No. 4. Page 4 (clause 8)—After line 7 insert new subclause as follows:

(2) This division applies only to a building, vessel, vehicle or place in a fire district.

No. 5. Page 4 (clause 8)—After line 39 insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) Where a notice containing a rectification order is served on the occupier of the building, the Chief Officer or authorised officer must as soon as practicable cause a copy of the notice to be served on the Building Fire Safety Committee established under the Building Act 1971 for the area in which the building is situated.

No. 6. Page 5 (clause 8)—After line 27 insert new subclause as follows:

(5a) Where a notice containing a closure order is served on the occupier of the building, the Chief Officer or authorised officer must as soon as practicable cause a copy of the notice to be served on the Building Fire Safety Committee established under the Building Act 1971 for the area in which the building is situated.

No. 7. Page 7, lines 26 to 29 (clause 13)—Leave out all words in these lines and substitute:

(a) conceal, remove, interfere with or obstruct access to—  
(i) a fireplug, hydrant, booster or suction point;  
(ii) a mark or sign used for the purpose of indicating the presence of a fireplug, hydrant, booster or suction point;

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I am not going to take up much time of the Committee, because most of these amendments are in fact a polishing of the amending Bill rather than a changing of its facets or its structure. First, the amendment to clause 7 makes clear that the Metropolitan Fire Service has jurisdiction to attend a vessel that is at sea or anywhere else that is not within a Country Fire Service region. There is no problem with that.

There are a number of amendments to clause 8. One of them inserts a new subclause which provides:

(2) This division applies only to a building, vessel, vehicle or place in a fire district.

A 'fire district' is defined in the principal Act to be a district within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Fire Service. There is an amendment which widens the definition of 'public buildings', which recognises that there were concerns that previous definitions would not include temporary structures, such as perhaps a grandstand at the Grand Prix. There is a further amendment which inserts a new subclause which basically provides that, when a rectification or closure order is served on an occupier, a copy of that order should be served on the appropriate building fire safety committee. I assume that that would have been done in any case, but there is no reason why that should not be included in the Act. There is an amendment to clause 13 which widens the offence dealing with interference to fire hydrants. The Government has no objections to any of those amendments.

**Mr MEIER:** The Opposition supports the amendments. Motion carried.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 April. Page 4287.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** The Opposition supports the Bill. First, we note that there has been an acceptance in the other place that some clauses of this Bill need to be considered later. We support the provisions whereby the court imposes a fine, a sentence of community service, or both a fine and community service without recording a conviction. We believe that this additional opportunity for the court to impose a sentence of community service is very important. We also recognise that there are many instances where the recording of a conviction is critical to a young person's future. In the case of a first offence, the non-recording of a conviction is an important issue. We have no problem at all with that amendment.

The Bill also enables the Children's Court, under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, to impose a community service order for young offenders, again without recording a conviction. In terms of both the young adult and the person under 16 years, the amendment will be very effective. We have pleasure in supporting these amendments.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I support this proposition. I recall that this matter was first brought to my attention, if my memory serves me correctly, when a juvenile was fined \$10 without a conviction being recorded following an incident on the Outer Harbor railway line. I was angry indeed, having come from that industry and having been President of the Australian Railways Union, to find that, in my humble opinion and in the opinion of a number of railway workers, this juvenile was dealt with in a very lenient manner. I rang the Attorney's office and expressed my strong feelings on this matter. It was suggested that I put my views in writing, and I did. It is important that the Children's Court imposes community service orders on some of these juveniles, because there is a feeling out there in the community—rightly or wrongly—that some young offenders are getting away with acts such as this. I know from the feedback in my electorate that a number of people are angry about this issue. I have received a considerable number of phone calls in my electorate office from people who strongly support the proposition that I put to the Attorney-General. I strongly support this proposition.

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

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 9 April. Page 4213.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I support, in principle, the bulk of this Bill, which is a new type of measure being introduced into the House for the first time. It brings together a whole range of minor statute law revision amendment Bills, and in principle we support the concept of having many small amendments brought together under the one Bill. There is, however, one section of the Bill that will not be supported by the Opposition, namely, the provision whereby, for homicide to be considered, death must follow within a year—or what is commonly called the 'year and a day' rule. It is our intention to oppose the relevant clause. I take this opportunity to voice the concerns of the Law Society, particularly as expressed by Mr Mark Griffin, Chairman of the committee considering this matter. I have a copy of the letter from the Law Society to the Attorney-General regarding the criminal law amendments to the 'year and a day' rule, which states:

I have been informed that yesterday in the Legislative Council, you indicated to the Council that the Law Society, by silence, had no objections to the proposed amendment to the 'year and a day rule'. I refer you to my letter to you of 27 March 1991, a copy of which is annexed hereto.

It is important that I also read that letter, which refers to the 'year and a day' rule, as follows:

I write to you to ask on behalf of the Law Society that you defer the passage of legislation presently before the House which will abolish the 'year and a day rule' in criminal law. The reason that this deferral is sought is to enable the Law Society to have more time to consider the implications of abolition of the rule, particularly in relation to double jeopardy and issue estoppel.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** As usual, the member for Hartley likes to chitter chatter away and I suppose on the last day of Parliament we ought to let him. I will continue reading the letter so that the honourable member might understand the principal reason why the Law Society disagrees. The letter continues:

Further, I remind you that your own discussion paper on the law of homicide said that the closing date for submissions was 30 April 1991.

I do not believe as yet that we have reached 30 April 1991, the date on a document put out by the Attorney-General requesting submissions. The letter continues:

I understand that following your representation, which I assume was made by you not being aware of our letter of 27 March, that the Bill passed through the Council and that it is due to be submitted to the Lower House either this evening or tomorrow.

Again, I request on behalf of the Law Society that you defer further consideration of the legislation until the society has had a proper opportunity to consider the implications of the abolition of the rule, particularly in relation to double jeopardy and issue estoppel. I ask that the Bill be adjourned until the next sitting of Parliament.

I also wish to read into *Hansard* a letter from Mr Mark Griffin to the Law Society in relation to the proposed amendment to the 'year and a day' rule.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** The member for Hartley gets his facts wrong. The letter is addressed to the Law Society and states:

Further to my conversation with you this morning, I enclose a copy of the *Hansard* reference forwarded to me by the Hon. Trevor Griffin. The Attorney-General's comment about Matthew Goode meeting with our committee twice is correct. However, he is quite incorrect when he says or infers that the 'year and a day' rule was something which the society took no issue about. It was never an item of discussion between us. The first meeting with Matthew Goode was before Christmas last year. The sole subject of that meeting, and indeed the purpose for him attending, was to discuss the discussion paper on committal hearings.

We invited him back again to a meeting this year for the purpose of discussing his paper on the laws of homicide in particular, self-defence, provocation and a proposed amendment of the law regarding intoxication. The minutes of our Criminal Law Committee meeting were taken by me and they accurately record the subjects of our conversation with Matthew Goode. The 'year and a day' rule never got a mention because it wasn't before us in any draft legislation. I think I can speak for all committee members when I say that we were led to believe that anything that wasn't in draft legislation and before us was more of a medium term objective of the Government and not something that we needed to be concerned with during those discussions with Matthew Goode.

In those letters the Law Society states that the very important 'year and a day' rule was not mentioned during any formal discussions in which it was involved, and it has requested the Opposition and the Government not to proceed with this important section of the Bill. As a consequence, the Opposition will oppose this section of the Bill so that those who understand the ramifications of the change have more opportunity to discuss them.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** I note the cynicism with which the member for Hartley interjects.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The members for Spence and Hartley are out of order.

**Mr INGERSON:** The member for Hartley cynically interjects and suggests that the Opposition wishes to protect criminals, which is absolute nonsense. Surely it is obvious to this House that the advice given to the Attorney-General was incorrect and that the Law Society—a very important organisation in our community and held in high esteem—believes it has been held in contempt. The advice it gives to the Parliament through Opposition members and occasionally Government members is a very valuable part of the process, and in this case its argument is valid, I will ask the Government to support our opposition to this clause. As I have said, the Opposition supports in principle the concept of bringing together many minor amendments under the one Bill. We support all other amendments in the Bill and hope that it has a speedy passage through this place.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I thank the honourable member for his consideration of the measure. In response I put on record a statement from the Attorney-General which is partly covered by what the member for Bragg has already said in relation to the 'year and a day' rule. I will read as much as is pertinent into the record, as some has already been covered. The Attorney-General states:

Some misunderstanding may have arisen in another place as to the position of the Government in relation to that part of the Bill which seeks to abolish the 'year and a half day' rule. The facts of the matter are these: the President of the Law Society wrote to the Attorney-General on 27 March seeking deferral of the abolition of the 'year and a day rule' while the Law Society further considered the implications of the measure. Since then, they have written to the Attorney-General again, this time by letter . . .

I think that further letter is the one from which the honourable member quoted, and I have the exact quote here, so I will not further detain the House by reading it. The letter I have been quoting continues:

It is quite clear that there has been some misunderstanding in the consultation process, but there should be no misunderstanding about the position taken by the Attorney. It is this: the provision was inserted into the portfolio Bill because, having been publicly announced as long ago as February, no opposition had been received to it and no reason why it should not proceed had been offered. The Attorney had made it clear, however, that if the Liberal Party is opposed to it, or if the Liberal Party wants to give more time to the consideration of it and wishes to delete it from the Bill, they may move to delete it and the Government will not oppose that deletion. The matter is entirely up to the honourable member and his colleagues. However, the advice given to the Government is that there is no reason why the provision should not proceed, and that no legal objection has been made to it which warrants its withdrawal. But, again, I make it perfectly clear that, if the Opposition wants more time to consider the issue, then the Government will not oppose deletion of this provision from the Bill.

With that proviso, I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Safe custody of wills, etc.'

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

Page 2, line 15—After 'The Governor may,' insert 'with the concurrence of the Chief Justice.'

After consultation with the Chief Justice in relation to this provision, it has been decided to amend the Bill to provide that the Governor may, by notice in the *Gazette*, appoint places for the safe custody of certain wills with the approval of the Chief Justice. This amendment was moved because wills are documents of the court, and it is proper that the Chief Justice should approve places for custody of docu-

ments under the control of the court. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Abolition of year-and-a-day rule.'

**Mr INGERSON:** I am disappointed that the Government has insisted that only the Opposition will cause the removal of this particular clause. I understand that there may perhaps be some difficulties for the Government, but I cannot see what they are, and I cannot see why there is such an insistence that it is done at the behest of the Liberal Party. I would have thought that, with the request and the obvious comments made by the Law Society, there is a need for this clause to be more closely looked at, and I would have hoped that the Government would be more amenable than it has been. But, irrespective of that, it is our intention to oppose this clause for the reasons given in my second reading speech.

The Committee divided on the clause:

**The CHAIRMAN:** Since there is no-one on the side of the Ayes, the division is cancelled and the clause is negatived.

Remaining clauses (8 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### HOLIDAYS (LABOUR DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 March. Page 3563.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** The Opposition supports this very important Bill. We recognise that it is very important for South Australia to come into line with other States in relation to the Labour Day holiday weekend. We believe that the whole area of holidays in this State needs to be reviewed in an attempt to bring the States into line throughout Australia. It seems quite ridiculous that we have these so-called national holidays throughout Australia but do not have them in some consistent form. We support the Bill purely and simply to assist the commerce of this country and to ensure that the holidays we have currently are celebrated consistently.

We are concerned to know whether the Government is looking at some other agenda in respect of changing the holiday structure in this State, and there are several other holidays in which the community is interested as to the direction of the Government. In his reply, will the Minister explain to the House what is being considered by the Government in relation to holidays? The Adelaide Cup holiday is an example of another holiday that might be under consideration. We support very strongly the idea of consistency in the timing of public holidays throughout Australia.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I thank members opposite for their support. It is not very often that the Minister of Labour brings a measure before this House and receives total support from members opposite. I accept the invitation of the member for Bragg with respect to the Government's future intentions in relation to holidays. At the Ministers of Labour conference, which is held approximately every six months in Australia and will be held in Adelaide on 19 April, I will be putting forward a paper calling for uniformity of public holidays throughout Australia.

The Labour Day holiday, as it is known, is currently celebrated in South Australia on the second Monday in October; in New South Wales and the ACT, it is celebrated

on the first Monday in October; in Queensland, it is celebrated on the first Monday in May; in Victoria I think it is celebrated on the first Monday of March as the Moomba holiday, and Tasmania possibly celebrates it on the same date; and in Western Australia it is celebrated on the second Monday in March. There is diversity in this area, and I will be seeking a uniform approach.

Other public holidays during the year do not coincide throughout Australia. I am advised that the Queen's Birthday holiday is celebrated occasionally on different weekends in June throughout Australia. I used to get fed up telephoning people interstate only to find that the office was closed because there was a public holiday, whilst we were working, and I am sure that people interstate have experienced the same problem—telephoning us when we were having a public holiday but they were working.

In my experience as a trade union official, I came across a Federal official who had an office in Sydney. His office was closed on any day there was a public holiday in the State in which his union had a branch. He was fortunate to have branches in the country areas of Tasmania and, as members would know, they have different holidays at different times. I could never work out when this old bloke had his union office open. He was an enterprising person who made sure that he had plenty of rest and recreation. I thank members for their support for this Bill.

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

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 4.5 to 5 p.m.]

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 13 (clause 2)—Leave out 'a day to be fixed by proclamation' and insert '1 January 1992'.

No. 2. Page 1—After line 13 insert new clause as follows:

Annual Report

2a. Section 42a of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) The report must state the number of council certificates issued under section 65av in respect of restricted documents, the nature of the documents to which the certificates related and the provisions of Part VA by virtue of which the documents were restricted.

No. 3. Page 1, line 24 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of 'District Court'.

No. 4. Page 3, line 16 (clause 3)—After 'from' insert 'either a council, the Government of South Australia or'.

No. 5. Page 3, line 18 (clause 3)—After 'of' (first occurring) insert 'this Act, the Freedom of Information Act 1991 or'.

No. 6. Page 3, lines 27 to 30 (clause 3)—Leave out subparagraph (ii) and substitute subparagraph as follows:

(ii) would divulge information communicated in confidence by or on behalf of a council or the Government of South Australia or of the Commonwealth to a council or a person or body receiving the communication on behalf of a council;

No. 7. Page 6, line 15 (clause 3)—Leave out all words after 'to' and insert 'commercial activities engaged in by a council'.

No. 8. Page 7, line 7 (clause 3)—After 'council' insert '(including of any board, committee or other body constituted by two or more persons that is part of the council or has been established

for the purpose of advising the council and whose meetings are open to the public or the minutes of whose meetings are available for public inspection)'.  
No. 9. Page 8 (clause 3)—After line 13 insert subsection as follows:

(1a) Subsection (1) does not apply in relation to a policy or administrative document that an agency is required by the Freedom of Information Act 1991 to make available for inspection and purchase by members of the public.

No. 10. Page 8, line 19 (clause 3)—After 'policy' insert 'or administrative document'.

No. 11. Page 8, line 39 (clause 3)—Leave out 'the council may determine' and insert 'may be prescribed'.

No. 12. Page 9 (clause 3)—After line 14 insert new sections as follows:

##### *Transfer of applications*

65wa. (1) A council to which an application has been made may transfer the application to another council if the document to which it relates—

(a) is not held by the council but is, to the knowledge of the council, held by the other council;

or

(b) is held by the council but is more closely related to the functions of the other council.

(2) A council that transfers an application to another council must, if it holds the document to which the application relates, forward a copy of the document to the other council together with the application.

(3) A council that transfers an application to another council must forthwith cause notice of that fact to be given to the applicant.

(4) Such a notice must specify the day on which, and the council to which, the application was transferred.

(5) A council is not required to include in a notice any matter if its inclusion in the notice would result in the notice being an exempt document.

(6) An application that is transferred from one council to another is to be taken to have been received by the other council—

(a) on the day on which it is transferred;

or

(b) 14 days after the day on which it was received by the council to which it was originally made,

whichever is the earlier.

##### *Councils may require advance deposits*

65wb. (1) If, in the opinion of a council, the cost of dealing with an application is likely to exceed the application fee, the council may request the applicant to pay to it such reasonable amount, by way of advance deposit, as the council may determine.

(2) If, in the opinion of a council, the cost of dealing with an application is likely to exceed the sum of the application fee and of any advance deposits paid in respect of the application, the council may request the applicant to pay to it such reasonable amount, by way of further advance deposit, as the council may determine.

(3) The aggregate of the application fee and the advance deposit or deposits requested under this section must not exceed the council's estimate of the cost of dealing with the application.

(4) A request for an advance deposit must be accompanied by a notice that sets out the basis on which the amount of the deposit has been calculated.

(5) The amount of an advance deposit requested by a council in respect of an application must be paid to the council within such period as the council specifies in the request.

(6) The period between the making of a request under this section and the payment of an advance deposit in accordance with the request is not to be taken into account in calculating the period of 45 days within which the relevant action is to be dealt with.

No. 13. Page 9 (clause 3)—After line 23 insert subsections as follow:

(2a) A council may refuse to continue dealing with an application if—

(a) it has requested payment of an advance deposit in relation to the application;

and

(b) payment of the deposit has not been made within the period specified in the request.

(2b) If a council refuses to continue dealing with an application under subsection (2a)—

(a) it must refund to the applicant such part of the advance deposits paid in respect of the application as exceeds the costs incurred by the council in dealing with the application;

and

(b) it may retain the remainder of those deposits.

No. 14. Page 10, line 15 (clause 3)—After 'usually' insert 'and currently'.

No. 15. Page 10, lines 16 and 17 (clause 3)—Leave out paragraph (d) and substitute paragraph as follows:

(d) if it is a document that—

- (i) was not created or collated by the council itself; and
- (ii) genuinely forms part of library material held by the council;

No. 16. Page 10, lines 19 and 20 (clause 3)—Leave out 'the commencement of this section' and insert '1 January 1987'.

No. 17. Page 11 (clause 3)—After line 4 insert subsections as follows:

(2) Access to a document to which subsection (1) (a) applies may not be deferred beyond the time the document is required by law to be published.

(3) Access to a document to which subsection (1) (b) or (c) applies may not be deferred for more than a reasonable time after the date of its preparation.

No. 18. Page 13, line 2 (clause 3)—After 'charge' insert ' , having regard to the sum of any advance deposits paid in respect of the application'.

No. 19. Page 13, line 26 (clause 3)—After 'access' insert 'under this Act'.

No. 20. Page 13, lines 33 to 39 (clause 3)—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and substitute paragraphs as follow:

(a) in the case of an application for access to a document referred to in subsection (1) (b)—

(i) the council determines, after having sought the views of the person concerned, that access to the document is to be given and the views of the person concerned are that the document is an exempt document by virtue of section 65g; or

(ii) after having taken reasonable steps to obtain the views of the person concerned, the council is unable to obtain the views of the person and the council determines that access to the document should be given; or

(b) in any other case—the council determines, after seeking the views of the Government, council or person concerned, that access to a document to which this section applies is to be given and the views of the Government, council or person concerned are that the document is an exempt document by virtue of a specified provision of Subdivision II of Division II.

No. 21. Page 14, lines 25 to 30 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (5) and substitute subsection as follows:

(5) A reference in this section to the person concerned is, in the case of a deceased person, a reference to the personal representative of that person or, if there is no personal representative, the closest relative of that person of or above the age of 18 years.

No. 22. Page 17 (clause 3)—After line 18 insert section as follows:

#### *Interpretation*

65an. In this Division—'local court' means a local court of limited jurisdiction, within, or nearest to, the area of the council whose determination is the subject of appeal under this Division.

No. 23. Page 17 (clause 3)—After line 23 insert paragraph as follows:

'(ab) must be accompanied by such application as may be prescribed.

No. 24. Page 17 (clause 3)—After line 34 insert subsection as follows:

(3a) If on a view the council varies or reverses a determination so that access to a document is to be given (either immediately or subject to deferral), the council must refund any application fee paid in respect of the review.

No. 25. Page 17, line 36 (clause 3)—Leave out '14' and insert '45'.

No. 26. Page 18, line 21 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District Court' and insert 'local court'.

No. 27. Page 18, line 37 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District Court' and insert 'local court'.

No. 28. Page 18, line 42 (clause 3)—Leave out 'chief executive officer of the council' and insert 'Minister administering the Freedom of Information Act 1991'.

No. 29. Page 19, line 7 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District Court' and insert 'local court'.

No. 30. Page 19, line 10 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District'.

No. 31. Page 19, line 12 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District'.

No. 32. Page 19, line 15 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District'.

No. 33. Page 19, lines 18 to 20 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (4) and substitute subsection as follows:

(4) After considering any document produced before it, the court may make a declaration—

(a) if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for the claim—that the document is a restricted document by virtue of a specified provision of subdivision I of Division II;

(b) if not satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for the claim—that the document is not a restricted document.

No. 34. Page 19, line 21 (clause 3)—Leave out 'District'.

No. 35. Page 19, line 29 (clause 3)—Leave out '28' and insert '45'.

No. 36. Page 19, line 33 (clause 3)—After 'the' (second occurring) insert 'Minister administering the Freedom of Information Act 1991 and the'.

No. 37. Page 19, line 45 (clause 3)—Leave out '28' and insert '45'.

No. 38. Page 20, lines 2 to 5 (clause 3)—Leave out section 65at and substitute section as follows:

#### *Disciplinary action*

65at. Where a local court, at the completion of an appeal under this Part, is of the opinion that there is evidence that a person, being an officer of a council, has been guilty of a breach of duty or of misconduct in the administration of this Part and that the evidence is, in all the circumstances, of sufficient force to justify it in doing so, the court may bring the evidence to the notice of—

(a) if the person is the chief executive officer of a council—that council;

or

(b) if the person is an officer of a council but not the chief executive officer of the council—the chief executive officer of that council.

No. 39. Page 20, line 8 (clause 3)—Leave out 'the District Court' and insert 'a local court'.

No. 40. Page 20, line 9 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (2).

No. 41. Page 21, lines 8 to 27 (clause 3)—Leave out section 65az and substitute section as follows:

#### *Fees and charges*

65az. (1) The fees and charges payable under this Part must be fixed by the regulations or in accordance with a scale fixed in the regulations.

(2) The regulations—

(a) must provide for such waiver or remission of fees as may be necessary to ensure that disadvantaged persons are not prevented from exercising rights under this Part by reason of financial hardship;

(b) must provide for access to documents by members of Parliament without charge unless the work generated by the application exceeds a threshold stated in the regulations,

and (except as provided above) the fees or charges must reflect the cost incurred by councils in exercising their functions under this Part.

(3) Where a council determines a fee or charge it must, at the request of the person required to pay, review the fee or charge and, if it thinks fit, reduce it.

(4) A person dissatisfied with the decision of a council on an application for a review of a fee or charge may apply to the Ombudsman for a further review, and the Ombudsman may, according to his or her determination of what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances of the particular case—

(a) waive, confirm or vary the fee or charge;

(b) give directions as to the time for payment of the fee or charge.

(5) A fee or charge may be recovered by a council as a debt.

Consideration in Committee.

#### *Amendments Nos 1 to 39:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 39 be agreed to.

**Mr MEIER:** The Opposition is happy to agree to these amendments.

Motion carried.

#### *Amendment No. 40:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 40 be disagreed to.

Mr MEIER: The Opposition cannot agree with the Government on this and believes that the amendment should be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 41:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 41 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day: Other Business, Nos 2, 4, 13, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44 and 45 be taken into consideration forthwith and any necessary questions put without further debate.

Motion carried.

### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 4416.)

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, Atkinson, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Blacker and Brindal (teller), Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

### ENERGY SECTOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 4418.)

Motion negatived.

### SEACLIFF HOCKEY AND TENNIS COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 4419.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 3641.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

### RURAL YOUTH

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House recognises the importance of the South Australian Rural Youth organisation, deploras the reduction of resources to the organisation by successive Governments and urges the Government to recognise the cost effectiveness of the training function of Rural Youth by providing incentive based grants designed to attract private sector funding to assist while projects for the benefit of rural youth in South Australia,

which Mrs Hutchison had moved to amend by leaving out the words, 'deploras the reduction of resources to the organisation by successive Governments and urges the Government to recognise the cost effectiveness of the training function of Rural Youth by providing incentive based grants designed to' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'and urges Governments to recognise the training function of Rural Youth by continuing to provide support which can'.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 3647.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### GLENELG CRIME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House concurs with the public statements expressed by the Glenelg council at the alarming increase in vandalism, graffiti, housebreaking, vehicle theft, consumption of alcohol in 'dry' areas and associated illegal activities taking place in the Glenelg area which is becoming extremely disturbing to the local community and visitors to the area and calls on the Government to increase law enforcement by increased policing of the region and by the insistence on realistic penalties in the courts,

which Mr Ferguson had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

notes the cooperation of local government with the Government's crime prevention strategy including that of the Glenelg and other seaside councils in developing cooperative strategies to deal with vandalism, graffiti, housebreaking, vehicle theft and alcohol abuse and further, this House notes with satisfaction the increased resources being allocated to the police and the support provided by the police to local community based crime prevention initiatives.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3133.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### EMERGENCY SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House urges the Government to more actively support the ethos of volunteering in emergency services to ensure the genuine participation of bodies representing the volunteer in the decision-making process and to provide essential equipment and appropriate training necessary to enable their duties to be carried out effectively.

(Continued from 21 February. Page 3135.)

Motion carried.

### ECONOMY

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

That this House—

(a) views with alarm the dramatic deterioration in the rural economy, the cost pressures bankrupting small businesses, the inflated Australian dollar destroying export



potential and the decline in domestic demand impacting on manufacturing and commercial enterprises which collectively are contributing to a severe recession in this State and nation;

- (b) condemns the Federal Government, and in particular Prime Minister Hawke and Treasurer Keating, for the high interest rate, high inflation, high external debt and high Australian dollar policies being pursued; and
- (c) calls on the Federal Government to radically change its policies to reverse the downward economic trend, or resign.

(Continued from 22 November. Page 2186.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis (teller), Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

### ECONOMY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That this House congratulates Senator Walsh for his remarks in stating that the Prime Minister 'needs a spine transplant' and congratulates Senator Button for predicting the inevitability of hard times ahead for Australia and no improvement in living standards and condemns both the Federal and State Government for the way they have handled the economy during the past eight years and in particular for the way they have treated the agricultural and rural industry in general.

(Continued from 22 November. Page 2189.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier (teller), Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood (teller), Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

### HALLETT COVE SCHOOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to make provision for education to year 12 at the Hallett Cove School,

which Mr Ferguson had moved to amend by leaving out the words 'as a matter of priority to make provision for' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'consider the provision of' and by adding, after the word 'School', the words 'according to the priorities of the area and the Education Department'.

(Continued from 8 November. Page 1679.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### MARINO ROCKS MARINA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government to accept the offer from the Burlock Group of Companies to conduct an environmental impact statement for the proposed Marino Rocks marina or, in the event of any other company proposing a marina development at Marino Rocks, that an EIS be required before approval is given for the project to proceed to construction stage.

(Continued from 11 October. Page 963.)

Motion negatived.

### CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 4420.)

The House divided on Mr Oswald's amendment:

Ayes (22)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald (teller), Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder (teller), Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Mr Oswald's amendment thus negatived; Mr Ferguson's amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### VANDALISM AND GRAFFITI

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House enjoins the Government to initiate specific programs to effectively reduce the incidence of vandalism and graffiti in our community and that the House believes that all sections of the community including the Local Government Association be involved with the Government to formulate position strategies to address these two issues.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1191.)

Motion carried.

### NATIONAL PARKS

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

### HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.34 to 11 p.m.]

### STAMP DUTIES (CONCESSIONAL DUTY AND EXEMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**STATE SUPPLY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Bill**

The State Supply Act 1985 became effective on 30 September 1985. As a means of ensuring that the legislation continued to meet the objectives of Government, Section 23 of the Act required the Minister to have a report prepared on the operation and effectiveness of the Act after a period of three years. This report was prepared and laid before this Parliament in February 1989.

The report concluded that the objectives of the Act, as specified at the second reading stage of the Bill, had been achieved. It highlighted the change in emphasis in public sector management towards agency autonomy and accountability, and recommended that the objectives of the Act, and in fact the Act itself, have a broader focus. It proposed that the Act should apply directly to agencies as well as the Board, and a greater recognition be given to supply as a means of facilitating the service delivery of agencies, and Government.

The objectives of the Act have been redefined as follows:

- (1) To establish a framework for public sector supply which will facilitate the cost effective delivery of services by public authorities.
- (2) To establish a mechanism through which public sector supply activities can be carried out objectively and independent of political persuasion.
- (3) To establish a mechanism which will ensure public accountability, fairness, consistency and high ethical standards in public sector supply.
- (4) To provide a mechanism whereby public sector supply activities can be used to assist in the achievement of social, economic and environmental objectives of Government (e.g. provide assistance to Australian industry).

During the past two years the State Supply Board has taken a number of steps to change the emphasis of management of public sector supply towards agency autonomy and accountability. The policies of the Board have been rewritten to support these changes and provide assistance to agencies to gain the benefits of more effective procurement and supply practices. In addition the Board has taken action to encourage agencies to use quality management principles for the management of their supply operations. The Government proposes, in this Bill, to focus a greater responsibility for supply with individual agencies and clarify the responsibility of chief executive officers in regard to supply activities.

Although the Board has worked closely with the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology in developing and implementing strategies to use public sector procurement to assist local industry it is considered important to continue with these initiatives, develop new initiatives and ensure that the impetus is maintained. Therefore the Government proposes, in this Bill, to increase the number of members of the State Supply Board by one so as to specifically include a person with expertise in economic and industry development.

Notwithstanding that the existing functions of the Board are confined to the acquisition, distribution, management and disposal of goods, the Board has found it necessary on a few occasions to let contracts for services (e.g. car hire, light plane hire and burial services) because no other central agency has the facilities to provide these services. Therefore it is proposed, in this Bill, to amend the Act to enable the Board to establish service contracts on behalf of consenting agencies or where the Minister requests such action.

In addition this Bill provides for a further review of the Act to be made by 31 December 1994. This should provide the mechanism for ensuring that the framework within which public sector supply is conducted, continues to be appropriate for the ever-changing demands on Government and public sector management generally.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3 inserts two new definitions in the interpretation provision. In section 4 'chief executive officer' is defined as the person appointed to, or acting in, the office or position (however named or described) of chief executive officer of an authority. 'Supply operations' is defined as the acquisition of goods required by an authority for its operations and as including the distribution and management of the goods and their subsequent disposal.

Clause 4 replaces section 7 with a new provision dealing with the constitution of the State Supply Board. The Board is, under the new provision, increased from five to six members. The additional member is to be a person with knowledge and experience of economic and industrial development. The qualifications for the other members remain the same as under the current provision.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment relating to the chairing of meetings of the Board.

Clause 6 inserts new sections 14a and 14b.

Proposed new section 14a provides that the chief executive officer of a public authority is responsible for the efficient and cost effective management of the supply operations of the authority subject to and in accordance with the policies, principles, guidelines and directions of the Board.

Proposed new section 14b authorises the Board to undertake the acquisition of services on behalf of a public authority at the request of the authority or the Minister.

Clause 7 makes an amendment to section 15 that is consequential on the introduction of the defined term 'supply operations'.

Clause 8 amends section 23 of the principal Act so that it will require the Minister to cause a report on the operation and effectiveness of the Act to be made on or before 31 December 1994.

The schedule makes amendments of a statute law revision nature only, corrective obsolete references, introducing gender neutral language and adopting current drafting styles.

**Mr S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

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

That the sitting of the House be suspended until Friday 12 April at 4 p.m.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** We have had enough of this absolute nonsense that has gone on here.

**The SPEAKER:** As it is a procedural motion, leave will be granted for a short time.

**Mr GUNN:** All the members of this House have been sitting around here for hours tonight doing absolutely noth-

ing, and we will be dragged back here tomorrow. Surely the Parliament can organise itself in a sensible fashion. This sort of nonsense should be brought to a stop once and for all. I do not mind putting in the hours in this place, if it is necessary, but I believe that tonight's exercise and what will go on tomorrow, or perhaps tomorrow night, has demonstrated clearly that there is a need to change the Standing Orders so that this sort of nonsense comes to an end and a bit of commonsense prevails.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call on the member for Morphett, I draw the attention of the member for Eyre to the fact that he is on the Standing Orders Committee. He knows that the Standing Orders Committee is sitting, and I am sure that if he raises the matter before that committee we can consider it. I draw to the attention of the House that this is not a full debate. We have a procedural motion before the Chair to adjourn.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is a bit late in the night to throw somebody out. I ask the House to come to order. I am doubtful about allowing ongoing debate on this matter. I have taken advice and, in my opinion, we should put it to the vote.

**Mr OSWALD:** Will you accept an amendment to the motion, Mr Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** It is up to the House.

**Mr OSWALD:** I have listened carefully to the member for Eyre and, bearing in mind the time of the evening and tomorrow's commitments, it would be fair and reasonable if the House adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow. Therefore, I move:

Leave out '4 p.m.' and insert '9 a.m.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is the amendment seconded? As the amendment is not seconded, I put the motion.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 11.6 to 4 p.m. on Friday 12 April]

#### RACING (SPORTING EVENTS BETTING AND APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1 Page 2, line 8 (clause 6)—Leave out clause and insert new clause as follows:

6. Section 84i of the principal Act is amended—

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

(d) may conduct totalisator betting on any other sporting event or combination of sporting events (whether held within or outside Australia) prescribed by regulation;

and

(b) by striking out subsection (2).

No. 2 Page 2, lines 12 and 13 (clause 7)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

'approved sporting event' means a sporting event or combination of sporting events (whether held within or outside Australia) declared by regulation to be an approved sporting event for the purposes of this Part.

No. 3 Page 2, lines 16 to 23 (clause 7)—Leave out all words in these lines.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

As to amendment No. 1, I refer in particular to proposed new paragraph (d). The Government believes that that is unnecessarily bureaucratic but that it does not, in fact, destroy the intention of the Bill. In those circumstances,

the Government, with some reluctance, urges the Committee to accept the amendment of the Legislative Council.

**Mr OSWALD:** I am pleased the Government has taken that decision. Having spoken at length in the second reading debate I will not repeat the points I made in that speech. I know that sports betting will be well received by the racing fraternity, albeit that it will not be taken up by a lot of bookmakers. However, it is something which has to be tested, and I hope the Minister will take up my offer of support to bring in amendments to the rules of racing to permit exotic betting to be conducted on course as soon as possible.

Motion carried.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the House for its indulgence. This statement is merely to clear the air as to the operations of the Parliament in the next hour or so, and I am aware that members would be very keen to know what that situation might be. I will briefly review what is left for us to do. There is a Bill from the Legislative Council—the State Supply (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill—which I introduced yesterday afternoon on behalf of my colleague in another place and in respect of which I would crave the indulgence of the House for its consideration through all stages. I understood that the House would be in a position to put its mind to that Bill at 5 o'clock.

In addition, there is a message from the other place in relation to amendments to the Citrus Industry Bill, which I know has attracted the concern and support of all members. The Minister of Agriculture is paired until 5 o'clock and will therefore be available then to address himself to those amendments.

There are two other minor matters which are subject to message between the two Houses but which, in fact, will not overly detain us. That leaves the matter of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration (Commonwealth Provisions) Amendment Bill which, when I last checked in another place, had reached about clause 45, although one cannot discount the possibility that there will be some sort of third reading debate.

My proposition, then, is that shortly I will move that the sitting of the House be suspended until 5 o'clock. At that point we would proceed with the State Supply (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill through all stages. We will then consider the message from the Legislative Council in relation to the Citrus Industry Bill. At that stage I would hope to be in a better position to advise members as to whether the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration (Commonwealth Provisions) Amendment Bill has passed through all stages in another place, whether the setting up of a conference is necessary, whether members in the other place feel inclined to sit this evening, or whether indeed their preference is that they sit at a later date. So, in these respects we are in the hands of the other place. Obviously, we cannot force the other place to sit simply for our convenience. Therefore, I will provide a further report on that matter at the appropriate time.

[Sitting suspended from 4.7 to 5 p.m.]

## CITRUS INDUSTRY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, line 12 (clause 5)—Leave out 'seven' and insert 'eight'.

No. 2. Page 3, line 14 (clause 5)—Leave out 'three' and insert 'four'.

No. 3. Page 4, line 29 (clause 7)—Leave out 'Four' and insert 'Five'.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The spirit of the amendments moved in another place does not in any way contradict the philosophy of the legislation introduced into and passed by this place and I believe they may be of benefit to its outcome.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The Opposition certainly supports the amendments. The object, as I understand, was to try to bring the situation into line with the Murray Valley Citrus Marketing Board. The Murray Valley Citrus Marketing Board is made up of nine members: four are growers, and there are four others and an independent Chairman. The amendments will have the effect of the board's having four growers and four others including the Chairman nominated by the Minister. I think it brings it into line with the Murray Valley Citrus Marketing Board. I understand that the Chairman will have a deliberative and casting vote to enable business to be transacted as a result of this measure. The important thing is that the Bill should pass through both Houses before we adjourn for the break. That, above all else, is essential.

Motion carried.

STATE SUPPLY (MISCELLANEOUS)  
AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 4443.)

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition does not oppose the Bill: it merely wishes to raise some concerns about the operations of State Supply. This legislation is meant to provide an improved operation for supply and tender. This system has served South Australia well over time and, on occasions, has been quite efficient in the way that it has provided goods at the cheapest price to the Government or the public sector.

The Bill seeks to set up a new regime in terms of the board. We shall be opposing the inclusion of a trade union member on the board. The Bill, when it was originally put together, attempted more accurately to define the functions of the board. Those functions have now been removed from the legislation. Therefore, in some ways we have a mere shadow of the legislation that was originally brought before the Parliament. Indeed, it reflects an emasculated piece of legislation.

The matters that the Opposition wish to canvass during the debate relate to competition. We have received a large number of complaints and queries about the operations of the supply section and the way in which tenders are managed within State Supply. On a number of occasions suppliers have approached the Liberal Opposition and said, 'It is an unfair system because, before we can supply our goods, we must guarantee that our work force is fully unionised.' Over a long period I have said that that is inequitable.

On other occasions people have felt that they have been left out of the tender system because of the way in which

the tenders have been drawn. Officers within the Department of State Services have misconstrued the range of goods on the market to meet particular needs. A number of suppliers came to me, when I was shadow Minister of Industrial Relations, and said, 'The tender document is deficient. It does not allow our product to be considered.' What we have found on a number of occasions is that goods have been imported to meet a need, for example, in the hospital sector or in transport, where there was a good local product; however, because of the way in which the tender document had been drawn and the scope that was canvassed within it, people were effectively left out of the system, so there has been a fair amount of criticism.

The third criticism of State Services is the extent to which it acts as an entrepreneurial agency. We have had complaints that State Services dispensed goods not only to the public sector but to the private sector. Therefore, there have been complaints by firms and individuals who believe that they were being undercut by the way in which State Services operated.

The Opposition does not have a great deal of difficulty with the legislation, but it would like to place on record its discontent with the system. There have been improvements over the past 12 months. I know that the present Chief Executive Officer of State Services is held in high regard as a person who is interested in getting the best supply and tender system that is possible for the public sector. I have had feedback from a number of people in industry and within the State Government who have been impressed by the way in which Mr Dundon has approached the task of improving the present system.

One area about which I have raised concerns over a number of years relates to computers. We found that, because nobody had enough expertise, some of the computers which were vetted and bought by State Services did not seem to meet the needs of the various departments at the time. Indeed, they seemed to have been bought more because they could be obtained at the right price rather than for the functions they were to perform.

There are some positive signs on the horizon, but I and some of my colleagues have some discontent with the operations of State Services over a long period. We want some effective reform of the procedures and operations. We would like South Australian firms to be given a fair go; we would like officers of State Services to acquaint themselves with the marketplace; and we would like State Services to consult, for example, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which is getting a computerised system of South Australian-produced goods, so that the department is aware of the alternatives which are available on the market. Sometimes it is not the fact that there is a deficiency of supply: it is quite often the case that there is a lack of knowledge as to what is readily available, particularly local products.

The Bill is fairly innocuous and, as I said, it has been emasculated previously. Under normal circumstances, we would have liked to move part of our freedom package in this Bill. We would like it clearly understood by all members of this House that it is totally unconscionable for any firm tendering to the State Government for the supply of goods or services to have to guarantee that it will comply with the union requirement, namely, that all members of that supplying firm shall be fully paid-up union members. In this day and age, that is totally inappropriate; it will be one of the first things that is removed when the Liberal Party gains Government in this State within the next one, two or three years. The Opposition raises no objection to the Bill.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I support the Bill and congratulate the Minister for, in effect, picking up the

State Supply mechanism and the State Supply Board and, over the past two years, working towards an organisation which is not only more accountable to the Parliament and the community of South Australia but also more efficient. When one looks at the objectives of the Bill, one can only be reassured that it will not only consolidate what has already happened but ensure that that continues, with improvement in the future.

I would like to refer to a comment that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made in regard to this Bill and State Supply itself. He said, 'I would like to see State Supply have a fair go.' I have no problem whatsoever with those words but, when I look at the actions of members opposite in regard to State Supply and in particular to the vehicles that come under the auspices of State Supply, I get a different picture. I would be the last person to want to attack a member of this House who is not here to defend themselves. I refer to the member for Hanson because, if I read the newspapers correctly, he along with the Minister of Recreation and Sport has his own little battle going over in Malta and I am sure—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Napier must return to the provisions of the State Supply Bill.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** In the nearly 14 years I have been in this Parliament, I have seen the questions on notice come in day in, day out, the member for Hanson querying, 'What was this Government vehicle UQT 708, or whatever, doing at the Marion Shopping Centre between the hours of 2.15 and 2.18 on a certain date of a certain year?' We would have a string of those questions, and each time State Supply, through the client Minister who is actually leasing or renting that car from State Supply, would have to conduct an investigation into why that vehicle was at the Marion Shopping Centre. And 99.99 per cent of the time that vehicle would be at a particular place at a particular time of the day for a legitimate reason.

That is all right. If the member for Hanson gets his jollies by loading the Notice Paper with questions such as this, so be it. What the member for Hanson and other members do not think about is the cost associated with investigating why a particular vehicle was at a particular spot at a particular time. The member for Hanson has even asked why a baby carriage was on the back seat of one vehicle, as if a major crime was being committed. In that situation it is usually a Department for Family and Community Services vehicle delivering a baby for some very legitimate reason. I am sure the member for Newland will not let herself fall into this trap. The member for Hanson does not realise that the average cost of an investigation of that kind is between \$125 and \$200 of taxpayer's money, which is wasted to satisfy the jollies of the member for Hanson.

The member for Hanson is a member of the Public Accounts Committee, the structure of which is soon to change. I congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your role in that legislation which was introduced in the other place yesterday. The member for Hanson has been saying on and off that we waste far too much money yet, by imposing this cost on the taxpayer, he is a catalyst. I am not a mathematician, but I would hazard a guess that if the member for Hanson had not embarked on this path some 17 years ago the cost saving would have been enormous, because the member for Hanson used to do it when his own Party was in power. I am pleased to say that the Treasurer has taken the trouble to come into the Chamber to hear the speech I am making. He would have been able to do wonderful things with those dollars on behalf of the community of South Australia.

During his second reading contribution I thought that the Deputy Leader would say that he would like to see State Supply get a fair go but, reluctantly, I must come to the conclusion that what the Deputy Leader says and what he does is totally different. There are other areas which I am sure my colleague the member for Henley Beach will canvass. There are instances where State Supply has been questioned in this House because, supposedly, it receives a better deal than those people out in the private sector conducting Government business. Again, following investigations of these allegations, it is usually found that State Supply is doing the correct thing, working in competition with the private sector. We usually find that State Supply does things better: better quality service in better time. However, that does not satisfy the philosophy of members opposite—they believe that private enterprise is the way to go, no matter what.

I am sure my colleague the member for Henley Beach will touch upon StatePrint. In relation to the committee which I have the pleasure of chairing—the soon to be defunct Public Works Standing Committee—StatePrint supply us with almost a turnaround service, which we could never get from the private sector. I think you made that comment to me some time ago, Mr Deputy Speaker, that with StatePrint's involvement in the committee system we will be able to deliver reports into this Parliament much quicker, much better and perhaps, more importantly, much more efficiently. With those few words, I urge all members to support the Bill.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** There were three things that I wished to pick up in relation to the remarks made on this Bill by the Deputy Leader. I believe three matters need to be corrected. The first relates to his remark about giving South Australian firms a fair go. At first glance that appears to be the thing that State Supply should be doing. A great deal of debate and time was taken by both sides in this Chamber and at Party meetings regarding the decision to give State Supply an Australian preference rather than a South Australian preference. The reason for this is very simple. The fact is that the amount of money that the New South Wales and Victorian Governments spend on their State Supply departments, compared with the amount of money spent in South Australia, gives South Australian firms, if they are on their toes, a huge market.

In effect, if a South Australian firm was prepared to properly research the provision of goods and services to State Governments, it could be in a better position to provide for an Australian preference rather than a South Australian preference. As far as our motor car industry is concerned, and given the number of motor cars that we produce in South Australia, one would not have to be a pharmacist or an Einstein to work out that the return to firms in this State would be far more with an Australian preference than merely a South Australian preference. It is unfair that South Australian firms go bleating to the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

As I understand the Deputy Leader's contribution, complaints have been made to both the Opposition and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry about the way State Supply is making its purchases. I make this criticism in return: it is about time that South Australian firms got on their toes and did a bit of research and became dedicated to their manufacturing industry to ensure that they receive a larger share of Government contracts throughout the whole of Australia.

It is not merely a question of a database provided by the Chamber of Manufactures on South Australian products

that are available. South Australian firms should conduct proper research into the possibility of selling to all Government services throughout Australia. For many years in this House we have been talking about a level playing field and equal competition. If South Australian firms do their proper homework and research, they will not come back bleating to this House, saying that they should be given a fair go.

The other matter is that the Deputy Leader complained about State Supply providing goods and services to private enterprise. It is no secret that State Supply has been providing private enterprise with things like exercise books. This occurs for a very practical reason: StatePrint has taken the opportunity to introduce specialist machinery, which is available only to StatePrint. In exchange, private enterprise provides StatePrint with their products from the specialist machinery that they have introduced into their factories, and this seems to be the most proper way to go about it. I refer specifically to exercise books—and it has been many years since I have been down there—which StatePrint used to be able to produce at a cheaper rate than private enterprise. These books eventually find their way not only into the Government schools but private schools and into private firms like E.S. Wigg and Company.

It is very appropriate that this should happen. The total budget of StatePrint is divided in half, and half the goods and services are provided by private enterprise and the other half are produced at the Government Printing Office. They rely on one another, and it is proper that they should do so. The criticisms made by the Deputy Leader would mean that it would cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars on the one hand to scrap specialist machinery and, on the other, to have all this material supplied by private enterprise. I believe that this is probably multiplied in dozens of cases.

The third matter I wish to raise is the Deputy Leader's attack on unionism. There is no doubt about it, the Liberal Party never misses an opportunity to have a go at the trade union movement. Did you know, Sir, that the richest and most successful firms throughout the world are those that cooperate with trade unions and do not involve themselves in a constant war? To suggest that State Supply should cease buying from those people who are not fully unionised is ridiculous. As far as I know, the delivery of materials to State Supply has never been held up because of an industrial dispute. One reason for that is the fact that this policy is in place. It is a most sensible policy, and it is very churlish of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to suggest that it should be changed. Not only that, but I believe that the long-term consequences would be most unpleasant for the State Government. I support the Bill.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I never cease to be amazed by the Deputy Leader's contributions in this place. I often wonder whether he just stands up and, as the bug bites, so utterances pour from his lips. One reason that I entered this debate is that State Supply is within my electorate and, in the years I have been the member for Albert Park, I cannot recall having had one complaint about State Supply, its management or staff. I think they do a magnificent job.

Conversely, I am amazed by the Deputy Leader who, on the one hand, believes in free market forces but, on the other hand, seeks protectionism or trade barriers to be put up in South Australia for the manufacturing industry. Whilst one can have some sympathy for him and for industry in this State, as my colleague the member for Henley Beach so eloquently pointed out, this could cost the State many millions of dollars, so one must be very careful.

From my involvement on the Public Accounts Committee, I know that these issues have been looked at previously. What I dislike is people saying they believe in free market forces and then wanting to put up barriers or give protection to some of the industries in South Australia. I concur with the comments of the member for Henley Beach. If those firms are market orientated and believe very strongly in the free enterprise system, let them do their research, get out into the marketplace and find out what the Australian and perhaps overseas markets desire. Do not let the Deputy Leader come into this place whingeing about State Supply because I and my colleagues on this side of the House believe overwhelmingly that State Supply does a fantastic job.

With reference to the motor vehicle industry in South Australia, I know that this Government has a balanced purchasing policy between the car manufacturing companies in this country, and quite properly so. As I understand it, State Supply considers the relevant prices and types of vehicles that are necessary. I suspect that it would be very easy for the State Government to purchase only Magnas or Holdens because they are manufactured in South Australia, but equally the Victorian Government could purchase only Ford Company vehicles because they are manufactured in that State. It may well be that, in the final analysis, this State would lose and lose badly if that occurred. That situation equally applies to other industries in other States.

I agree with the member for Henley Beach that manufacturing industries should get out into the marketplace, do their homework, be aggressive and find out what is required in the community, both in the public and private sectors. I believe they would be much better off if they did that. However, the Deputy Leader should not come into this place whingeing about State Supply. I do not say that State Supply is 100 per cent perfect, but it does a damn good job. I support the Bill.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I support the Bill. It offers the opportunity for improvement, but that is all it is, an opportunity. Those who are given the opportunity will need to make sure they make use of that opportunity. I know the benefits of State Supply, but I also know there have been concerns in the business community within this State, and maybe other States, about its operations. Some time ago I wrote to the Premier about the method of advertising for tenders, because a business house raised a query with me about the methods used, particularly with regard to advertising and giving people the opportunity to know that a department was advertising through State Supply or that State Supply was advertising on its behalf.

It is very easy in a system for graft, corruption or 'wink, wink' with mates to operate just by heading deals in a particular direction. I will cite one example. It is possible to draw specifications for a tender in a way that you present the opportunity to tender for the type of equipment to one particular group of companies or just one company. That occurred on one occasion with a department (not State Supply) in respect of tractors. The specifications were such that the field was narrowed down to virtually one manufacturer of tractors. That is where the danger lies in a system unless Parliament makes sure, if it receives complaints, that people know about them.

Finally, I refer to the comments of the member for Hanson, his questions about Government motor cars and the fact that it costs \$200 each time to investigate his queries about the use of Government motor cars. The reason the honourable member started out on this campaign was that he asked questions on one or two occasions and the Min-

ister, through the department, found that there was misuse of Government vehicles. That resulted in people in the community expressing their concerns to the honourable member and detailing times and situations in which they viewed cars and the number of people or the type of equipment in them or the equipment attached to them.

If it cost \$200 a time to investigate those queries and we did the figures, we would find that the member for Hanson would have saved the Government money because his actions would have made sure that more people now than in the past are conscious of their responsibility in relation to driving their motor cars. People still come to me complaining because they see cars with Government registration plates in all sorts of situations at all times of the day and night. It is a concern to the community. If one member of Parliament has the courage to do this, we should not object because the cost would be minimal in relation to what would occur through the misuse of motor cars.

I return to the Department of State Supply. It is imperative that tenders for consultancies be advertised in the broadest possible way, even to the point of looking through the *Yellow Pages* to see who operates in the relevant area and to inform them of the proposal. That was not happening. When I raised the point, through the Premier, the department, quite properly, took up the challenge. It did not totally go the way I wanted it to go because there were some difficulties, but I appreciate that an attempt was made.

Coming back to the position of the member for Hanson, it is not State Supply but the departments which have the control and allocate the cars. Most people think every member of Parliament gets a motor car, but only a privileged few get them; the rest do not. So, it does hurt a bit if you are accused of having a car and you see Government cars at fishing resorts or other places. I reiterate that that is the problem not of State Supply but of individual departments. In our country in recent times we have seen graft and corruption in all sorts of areas. As long as we can keep the Department of State Supply honest and free from that, as it has been in the past, I will be happy. But, we should be conscious of the fact that it is very easy for that to occur in connection with specifications submitted to State Supply by other departments. That is where we need to look for the problem.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education):** I am certainly pleased to have the carriage of the Bill in this House because it is an area of special interest to me. To counter some of the points raised by the Deputy Leader, the State Supply Act is not intended to regulate the extent to which a business unit of State Services operates in the marketplace: that is quite wrong. It is coincidental that one of the business units of State Services is State Supply. This issue is a matter of Government policy. With this in mind the Government has agreed that State Supply, the business unit, may provide services to organisations that receive significant Government funding and/or are tax exempt.

It does this so that public funds provided to these organisations can be made to go as far as possible. Such customers purchase voluntarily. State Supply does not compete in the private market nor in many products required by Government agencies. For example, a large stationer in Adelaide may stock 10 000 to 12 000 stationery lines; State Supply would stock only 1 500 to 2 000. Therefore, the private sector would have this portion of the market to itself in both the public and private sectors.

A number of other points were raised which show basically that members of the Opposition do not understand

what the State Supply Board does in terms of the method of advertising for tenders. The board endeavours, as far as practicable, to purchase through open and effective competition. The national preference agreement prohibits specifications that are written around a particular manufacturer's item. Of course, the State Supply Board monitors specifications to ensure that they comply.

Let us remember that the State Supply Act refers to goods and not services. So, half the debate we have heard this afternoon is totally spurious. We have heard mention of unions. The inclusion of the nomination from the UTLC is not new. Indeed, that was agreed with the Opposition when the principal Act was passed in 1985. Once again, the Opposition does not know what it is talking about. It actually agreed to the UTLC nominee in 1985, unless there has been a specific change since the former Leader, Mr Olsen, left to go to the Senate.

There is no requirement in relation to the purchase of goods in regard to giving preference to employers who employ union labour. Again, half of this argument this afternoon has been quite spurious. The main objectives of this Bill are to increase the number of members of the State Supply Board by one, to specifically include a person with expertise in economic and industry development, to focus a greater responsibility for supply with individual agencies and to clarify the responsibility of chief executive officers in regard to supply activities. This amendment Bill today is about accountability and modern business practice. As such, I am pleased with the Opposition's support but I am puzzled by some of their contributions this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Constitution of the board.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** We do not have the time available to move an amendment, as is usually the case. The Committee would appreciate that, in its normally constructive way, the Liberal Opposition in other circumstances would be seeking to reduce the size of the board to four and to remove the UTLC representative. I formally place on the record our opposition to the nomination of a UTLC member. The Government is well aware of our stance on this matter. I am simply reiterating a policy that we have had over a long period. At another more appropriate time that matter will be addressed, as will be the issue of non-discrimination among suppliers of goods and services to the State Government.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition reads my reply to the second reading debate he will realise that I have totally covered those points. This is something that we can perhaps address during the break. I am prepared to give him a full and adequate briefing. The position concerning the UTLC representative has been strongly supported by the Opposition in the past.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 8), schedule and title passed.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.45 to 8 p.m.*]

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I move: That the sitting of the House be suspended until 8.15 p.m. Motion carried.

[*Sitting suspended from 8.1 to 8.15 p.m.*]

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-  
GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL**

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

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL (No. 3)**

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 40 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

**INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION  
(COMMONWEALTH PROVISIONS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 6, lines 4 to 7 (clause 7)—Leave out subsection (2) and substitute:

(2) A commissioner may be appointed on an acting basis and, in that event, the appointment will be for a term (not exceeding six months) specified in the instrument of appointment.

(2a) Subject to this section, a commissioner is, unless lawfully removed, entitled to hold office until the age of 65 years, and will cease to hold office on attaining that age.

(2b) A commissioner who has been appointed on an acting basis ceases to hold office on the expiration of the term of appointment.

No. 2. Page 6, line 41 (clause 7)—Leave out 'except on leave of absence,' and substitute 'except for the purposes of leave.'

No. 3. Page 8, line 3 (clause 10)—Leave out paragraph (a).

No. 4. Page 8, lines 15 to 21 (clause 10)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 9, lines 24 to 47 (clause 15)—Leave out the clause.

No. 6. Page 10, lines 3 and 4 (clause 16)—Leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert:

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

(b) by an employer, or group of employers, employing not less than—

(i) 20 employees in the industry concerned where the commission is satisfied that there is no registered association to which the applicant or applicants belong, or could appropriately and conveniently belong, that could reasonably be expected to bring the application on behalf of the applicant or applicants;

or

(ii) 200 employees in the industry concerned or 75 per cent of the employees in that industry (whichever is the less);

(b) by striking out paragraph (c) of subsection (1) and substituting the following paragraph:

(c) by not less than—

(i) 20 employees in the industry concerned where the commission is satisfied that there is no registered association to which the applicant or applicants belong, or could appropriately and conveniently belong, that could reasonably be expected to bring the application on behalf of the applicant or applicants;

or

(ii) 200 employees in the industry concerned or 75 per cent of the employees in the industry concerned (whichever is the less);

No. 7. Page 11—After line 37 insert new clause as follows:

**Insertion of s. 48a**

22a. The following section is inserted after section 48 of the principal Act:

**Ability of Commonwealth registrars to act under this Act**

48a. A registrar appointed under the Commonwealth Act may, pursuant to an arrangement made between the Minister and the Minister responsible for the administration of the Commonwealth Act, and subject to such conditions or limitations as may be determined by the Minister, exercise the powers of a registrar appointed under this Act.

No. 8. Page 12, line 10 (clause 23)—Leave out 'appointed'.

No. 9. Page 12, lines 12 and 13 (clause 23)—Leave out '(issued under this Act or the Commonwealth Act)'.

No. 10. Page 14, lines 17 and 18 (clause 35)—Leave out all words in these lines after 'Full Commission' in line 17 and insert 'may stay the operation of the award'.

No. 11. Page 15, lines 9 and 10 (clause 39)—Leave out paragraph (a).

No. 12. Page 15, lines 26 to 29 (clause 39)—Leave out subsection (8) and insert:

(8) After the commencement of this subsection, an industrial agreement to which an unregistered association of employees is a party cannot be approved by the commission unless—

(a) the membership of the association consists (wholly or substantially) of employees who cannot appropriately and conveniently belong to a registered association of employees;

or

(b) the agreement varies an industrial agreement previously approved by the commission.

No. 13. Page 15, lines 30 to 32 (clause 40)—Leave out the clause.

No. 14. Page 23 (clause 42)—After line 15 insert new section as follows:

**Federations**

126a. (1) Where—

(a) a federation of organisations is recognised under the Commonwealth Act;

and

(b) one or more of its constituent members are registered under Division III,

the federation may, subject to subsection (2) and the regulations, act under this Act as the representative of the constituent members that are registered under Division III.

(2) Nothing in this section limits the right of an organisation that is a constituent member of a federation to represent itself or its members.

No. 15. Page 24, lines 32 to 37 (clause 43)—Leave out subsection (3) and insert:

(3) Where—

(a) —

(i) an industrial dispute has been resolved by conciliation or arbitration under this Act;

and

(ii) the Full Commission determines on application under this section that in the circumstances of the particular case the industrial dispute arose or was prolonged by unreasonable conduct on the part of the person against whom the action is to be brought;

or

(b) the Full Commission determines on application under this section that—

(i) all means provided under this Act for resolving an industrial dispute by conciliation or arbitration have failed;

and

(ii) there is no immediate prospect of the resolution of the industrial dispute,

a person may bring an action in tort notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1).

No. 16. Page 25—After line 24 insert new clause as follows:

**Employees to keep certain records**

47a. Section 159 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (7) the following subsection:

(8) Unless otherwise provided by an award or industrial agreement, where an employer is required to make contributions to a superannuation fund in accordance with this Act or an award or industrial agreement for the benefit of an employee, the employer must, at the time that the employer makes a payment of wages, provide the employee with a written record showing any amount paid by the employer to the superannuation fund for the benefit of the employee during the period to which the payment of wages relates.

No. 17. Page 25 (clause 48)—After line 42 insert new subsection as follows:



(4) The court or commission must not proceed to act under subsection (3) without first giving the relevant party an opportunity to be heard in relation to the matter.

No. 18. Page 26, lines 3 and 4 (clause 49)—Leave out 'subsections (1) and (2)' and insert 'subsection (1)'.

No. 19. Page 26, line 5 (clause 49)—Leave out 'and'.

No. 20. Page 26 (clause 49)—After line 7 insert:

and

(c) by striking out subsection (2).

No. 21. Page 29, lines 12 to 16 (clause 55)—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

(b) any proceedings before the Teachers Salaries Board at the time of those amendments may continue before the Teachers Salaries Board as if those amendments had not been effected.

No. 22. Page 29, lines 17 and 18 (clause 55)—Leave out '(9), (10) or (11)' and insert '(9) or (10)'.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

**Mr INGERSON:** The Opposition supports the Legislative Council's amendments. It is good to see that the Liberals have been able to get some important victories, one of which is that commonsense has at last prevailed in the area of preference to unionists. It is because of the support of the Democrats that we have at last got some commonsense in this whole preference clause area. It really is a very important decision for the State. Looking at the television this evening, I saw that the union movement, along with the Employers Federation out there in the real world, has actually decided to recognise that we need to have variations from awards. We need to have new guidelines, we need to go in totally new directions in the industrial relations area.

It is invigorating for us on this side to see that, at least in the real world, commonsense prevails.

The other two areas of victory for the Liberal Party are: limited tort action will be retained and, of course, the very important clause in relation to unregistered associations. I notice that the Minister was supporting this with glee, and in fact commonsense prevailed in the other place. We strongly support these amendments.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I must add my congratulations to those members in the other place who have come forward with these amendments and who have shown a gifted view of industrial relations. They have brought to us a set of amendments that have shown an extraordinarily sophisticated view of industrial matters. This has been settled—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FERGUSON:** I say this genuinely. This has been settled in what I would say is a traditional way. It is the old-style way, in the spirit of compromise. It is almost like an employer and employee settlement of a dispute. For the industrial knowledge of the people in the other place and for these amendments that are before us I have nothing but praise. I will say one thing in relation to the preference clause: we were unsuccessful this time with that clause, but we will be back.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 8.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 May at 2 p.m.