

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28 November 1991

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

FIRE CONTROL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Ted Chapman:

That a select committee of this House be established to inquire into and report on the application of fire control management and suppression of fire on:

- (a) public broadacre lands and road sides generally; and
- (b) national parks, fauna and flora and recreation reserves in particular, and, where required, identify recommended changes to the relevant fire control Act(s).

(Continued from 20 November. Page 2151.)

The **Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning)**: I support this motion for the establishment of a select committee that will inquire into bushfires. There are a number of terms of reference. In supporting the motion, I do so on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Emergency Services and Minister of Forests, as well as other Government members on this side of the House. The Government seeks to amend the motion and, accordingly, I move:

That the motion be amended by leaving out all the words after 'application of' and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

of bushfire protection and bushfire suppression measures on:

- (a) public lands in general; and
- (b) National Parks and Wildlife Act reserves in particular.

The fire protection inquiry to consider:

- (1) The nature of bushfire hazard in South Australia by location, fuel type and meteorological influences.
- (2) Practicable measures to minimise bushfire hazard on both public and private lands.
- (3) Current fire protection planning and programs including integration with fire protection programs on private lands.
- (4) Operation of the Country Fires Act 1989 in relation to bushfire protection.

(5) Recommendations for policy and legislative change.

The fire suppression inquiry to consider:

- (1) Available human and equipment resources for bushfire suppression.
- (2) The extent of training for all personnel who can be expected to suppress bushfire in public lands.
- (3) The chains of command and their integration within the Country Fire Service and public instrumentalities.
- (4) Setting of bushfire suppression strategies.
- (5) Recommendations for policy and/or legislative change.

The **Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra)**: It is with just a little caution that I support the amendment to the original motion. In principle, the amendment moved by the Minister on behalf of the Government is sound and more embracing than the original motion. My caution extends in particular to just a couple of parts of that amendment to which I draw the attention of the House. Under 'bushfire protection and bushfire suppression measures on (a) public lands in general and (b) national parks and wildlife reserves in particular', no reference is made to the public lands that are held by the Woods and Forests Department. They are public lands; they are forest reserves, and whether or not the term 'reserves' embraces forest lands is probably being just a little pedantic at the moment. I sincerely hope that it does, and it may well be that, upon taking the evidence, a select committee chooses not to indulge in that area.

It may be an area that is found to be totally and adequately catered for now with respect to bushfire suppression measures and indeed proper land management. All those factors may be well covered by the authorities of the Woods

and Forests Department and its officers without further need to investigate or report in that respect. However, I just mention it because it was initially intended, as the Minister I am sure will agree, not to segregate, identify, incriminate or point the finger specifically at any special reserves but indeed to have particular attention and blanket cover to public lands at large.

I am just a little cautious about my support for—or, I suppose in fairness, perhaps in the absence of a proper understanding—another aspect of the amendment, and that is in relation to part (3) under 'The fire suppression inquiry to consider': this deals with chains of command and their integration between the Country Fire Service and public instrumentalities. It is a bit late at this stage for the Minister to explain on the record precisely what that means. I hope that in the longer run an explanation is not necessary and that the words are broad enough for the committee to take properly into account whether or not multiple authorities or one authority should prevail with respect to the suppression of fires and whether or not that authority is the CFS, National Parks and Wildlife Service Department officers or indeed a third or additional authority.

However, I think it would be most unfortunate if the select committee were confined by subtle direction with respect to what it may inquire into and what it may report on, especially as it relates to the authority or authorities that need to be preserved, identified, fully respected and understood by the community to be the one or those that are in charge of a fire when it takes place. In other words, it may well be that the committee receives evidence which does support the view that the multiple authority concept that we have at the moment should be preserved. It may well recommend that it be preserved in a modified form; it may well be that its findings indicate that there should be only one.

Therefore, I think it is unwise that the Government through its Minister or the Opposition through my colleague, the Hon. Mr Goldsworthy (whom I hope will be identified on the committee shortly), and me should be inhibited in any way by such directions—even subtle directions—if they are to be interpreted in that way. Otherwise the amendment put forward by the Minister enhances the original motion and pads it out with the sort of detail that is seen to be desirable by the Government. With those few comments about the cautions that I have referred to, I wish the passage of the motion to take its speedy and appropriate course.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Messrs Chapman, Goldsworthy, Hemmings, Holloway and Quirke; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 13 February 1992.

GOLDEN GROVE ARTERIAL ROADS SYSTEM

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier)**: I move:

That this House records its admiration for the high standard of design and workmanship carried out by the Department of Road Transport and others associated with the construction of the arterial roads system in the Golden Grove area.

I was prompted to move this motion as a result of a letter I saw in my local newspaper on 2 October. Members know the kinds of letters that one sees in local newspapers, but rarely do they relate to roads in a congratulatory tone as did this letter, and I would like to share the letter with the House. Headed 'Thanks to Salisbury East's roadworkers', the letter states:

May I congratulate the men on the site who have transformed the landscape of Salisbury East. The extension of Bridge Road to The Grove Way, that meanders its way over the hills to Golden Grove, is an incredible feat of civil engineering.

The average motorist who travels our byways is never fully aware of the workmanship that has gone into a project such as this. I am referring to the underground work, beneath the cosmetic finish of the roads, such as storm drains, cables, conduits, the cutting through the rock face at the top of the hill, and of course the bridge over Cobblers Creek.

As an early morning walker in this area for many years I have witnessed the birth and fruition of this massive project and have tried to envisage how it would all come together. It has. I would once again like to say congratulations to all the men who, with blueprint and shovel, have done a great job.

Well done, mates!

There is another letter which, in a way, is related. It says:

May I, through your column, thank Briggs MP, Mike Rann, who quickly came to my assistance when I had a problem because of the bloody-mindedness of the accounts department of the E&WS. He immediately contacted Water Resources Minister Susan Lenahan, who wasted no time in solving the problem that should never have been allowed to confront me. I live in a strata title complex of 20 units and, being No. 1, receive the total excess water account. Fair enough, someone has to handle it and to pass it on to the management. However, this year the accounts department insisted on lumping the charge for the other 19 unit owners on my account.

I was right to demand my own separate account and now, because of Mike Rann, I have it. I consider Mike Rann, MP, is worthy of being the elected member for Briggs, and I am not normally a Labor voter.

That letter has nothing to do with the motion, but I thought I should share it with the House.

Golden Grove is a joint venture between the South Australian Urban Land Trust and the Delfin Property Group. Under the terms of the Golden Grove (Indenture Ratification) Act, the State Government and State instrumentalities, at timely points in the development, must have in place the schools, roads and community centres. One of the integral parts of the Golden Grove development is not only to have the roads that link the individual developments within Golden Grove but also the arterial roads system which feeds the traffic in and out of that development through to the city, the south, the north-east and Eldorado up in the north where I live. There are a number of arterial roads: McIntyre Road, between Bridge Road and North East Road; Golden Grove Road, between North East Road and Grenfell Road; Grenfell Road, between Golden Grove Road and The Golden Way; The Golden Way itself and The Grove Way. They are almost finalised.

There is no doubt that the roads system is an achievement in civil engineering. It has been done with the minimum of fuss, the minimum of disruption and, more importantly, it has been done on time and within budget. Very rarely do we get major road projects these days coming in under budget. I know that the member for Custance has a great interest in roads out to his electorate and that he suffers a lot of frustration. It may seem that in Golden Grove massive amounts of money are being spent, whereas major highways into country areas may seem to be neglected. The member for Stuart has moved a motion, to which I think the member for Custance will be speaking later this morning, which actually says the opposite: that a massive amount of money is going into rural areas.

What priority the member for Custance sees in relation to his roads compared with the arterial road system in Golden Grove I do not think will be decided in this Chamber immediately. It is a long-term argument, and I look forward to it over the years. Because the arterial roads system in Golden Grove is a joint venture, it is a credit not only to the Department of Road Transport but to private contractors—the Department of Road Transport gives most of its work to the private sector—to local government, to

the Delfin Property Group and to the South Australian Urban Land Trust.

I will now outline how money has been saved in relation to the roads system. For the 3 kilometre section of McIntyre Road, the estimated cost was slightly over \$6.85 million. The estimated cost for the 2 kilometre stretch of Milne Road was \$7.31 million, and it came in at \$7.3 million—it was a close shave. The bridge over Dry Creek, which is a magnificent achievement (and I know the Minister on the front bench often crosses it on his weekly jog), was estimated to cost \$1.12 million, and \$300 000 was saved on that project.

These roads are already in operation. They are attractive, two carriageway roads, which maximise the total width available in order to meet the growing demand for that area: ultimately, about 30 000 people will be living there. There is a rumour that the whole of Golden Grove will make up the electorate of the Minister on the front bench and, if that does happen, I know that the people will be served well for about the next 20 years while the Minister is in this House.

Each carriageway comprises two travelling lanes and a sealed shoulder. There is also a protection zone for cyclists and semi-mountable kerbing adjacent to the pavement, which enables broken down vehicles to clear the main carriageway. Detailed attention has been given to the reduction of detrimental effects, such as noise, fumes, visual intrusion and environmental damage, yet traffic safety and operation have not been compromised. The development of the McIntyre Road section has also alleviated traffic problems for motorists who travel between Salisbury and Para Hills and provides a linear park enhancing the amenity for the residents. That little exercise has meant that not only do the residents of Golden Grove get the full benefits of the arterial road system but also the existing residents of Salisbury and Para Hills will benefit from the improvement in their transport facilities.

One only has to go up the Golden Grove Road and the Golden Way to see what this road system is all about. No-one would deny that the Golden Grove development has been one of the major achievements of the private sector and the Government getting together to provide good quality housing blocks, with all the amenities that go with it, at a minimum price. It is a credit to those in the Delfin Property Group and the Urban Land Trust who had that vision to put to Government the benefits of an indenture such as Golden Grove. When we travel up the Golden Grove Road and the Golden Way, over the hills from Main North Road, and we see the vista of the Golden Grove development, we see that those who chose to live in that area chose wisely.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Local representation was a key factor.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Minister on the front bench interjects—and I know that I should not respond to interjections—but he is dead right: the parliamentary representation for those in Golden Grove is superb. As one of those who represents an area slightly north of Golden Grove, I sometimes feel envious that, whilst my majority is considerably higher, it is based on personality, whereas the other Labor members who represent those areas have achieved that with a little bit of charisma (I would accept that but mainly because the residents have seen that the Government those members represent is a good Government and is providing all the facilities). However, I have digressed, and I should not do that.

Finally, I ask the House to travel with me along The Grove Way. This is an east-west link between Golden Grove

Road and Main North Road connecting The Golden Way with Bridge Road. It is the major route between Salisbury and Golden Grove. The scope of the original project was enhanced, including the extensions to Bridge Road, to relieve traffic pressure on Smith Road, Salisbury East. The route makes a large Armco horseshoe arch across Cobbler Creek and a pedestrian underpass. During construction of the road, most of the material was actually obtained at that site, so there was no cost of transportation of materials for any great distance. I think I have said enough. I understand there are a few more motions that need to be debated. I hope I will receive bipartisan support to enable quick carriage of this motion through the House. However, I cannot guarantee that I will do the same with other motions that follow. I think this motion deserves the support of the House, and I urge members to support it.

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

COMMUNITY POLICE STATIONS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to investigate as a matter of priority the establishment of police stations at Hallett Cove and Brighton as part of the commencement of a move back to community police stations.

On first hearing the words of this motion, undoubtedly some members in this Chamber will claim that the motion is narrow and seeks to satisfy concerns in my own electorate. Those who make that claim should read the second part of the motion, 'as part of the commencement of a move back to community police stations'. There is no doubt at all that the community is demanding greater visibility of and greater contact with police in this State. People are fed up with the rising crime rate. They believe that the only opportunity they have to see police officers is when those officers react to crime. Members of our community have little opportunity to mix with their police officers and talk to them about their crime concerns and advise them of crime before it happens rather than after it has actually happened.

This motion could be about any area in our State. Prior to moving it, I tested out community reaction to community policing by initially floating a petition in Hallett Cove. I chose Hallett Cove for a very good reason: it was identified to me privately by police as being a sensible area in which to place a police station, because such a station would serve the growing areas of Hallett Cove, Trott Park and Sheidow Park, which will have well over 20 000 people by the end of this century. Secondly, that area actually had a police station planned for it some 12 years ago when part of the area of Hallett Cove was first being developed.

The development map for the Hallett Cove area clearly showed a police station site that was to be developed on the corner of Lonsdale Road and Cove Road. That land is still owned by the State Government. In fact, many people who bought their land in that area did so in the belief that they would be buying their home in an area that would have the added protection of a local police station facility. Of course, this Government has let that sort of commitment slide; it has not been honoured. I placed the petitions in the Hallett Cove shopping centre and to date have presented some 1 700 signatures to this Parliament. Those signatures were not collected from door to door but by people going into shops and signing their name because they see this as something that is needed.

After seeing the results at Hallett Cove, I decided to test the water in a similar manner in the Brighton area. Those petitions are only starting to trickle back to me. The Bright-

ton area does not have the advantage of a big, centralised shopping centre where petitions can be collected easily, so to date I have presented to Parliament only 165 signatures, but I am confident that after Parliament resumes next year well over 1 000 people in that area will also be demanding a police station facility. There is some irony in having to push for a police station in the Brighton area, because a police station operated there until the 1970s, and that station was demolished only last June. The ire of members of the local community was raised when they saw, in times of such a high incidence of crime, their police station being demolished.

It is important to dwell briefly on the reasons for this demand for community policing. We need only look at the nine-year legacy left to South Australians under the present regime of the Bannon Government. In the past nine years, under this Government, we have seen a 176 per cent rise in violent crime, from 23 a week in 1981-82 to 71 a week in 1990-91. Over the same period, property crime has risen by 66 per cent, from 1 455 a week or 208 a day to 2 650 a week or 378 a day. Most South Australians realise that we have now reached the point where one break-in occurs in South Australia every 11 minutes compared with every 25 minutes nine years ago. Serious assaults have increased by 144 per cent; rapes by 243 per cent; drug offences by 99 per cent; and wilful damage by 100 per cent. Recently in this Parliament, through a Bill presented by my colleague the member for Hayward, we heard that motor vehicle theft has increased by 92 per cent per 1 000 motor vehicles registered. That is the legacy that this Government has left to South Australians over the past nine years. It has an opportunity to do something about it, but it will not.

The petitions signed in my electorate show clearly that people want their community police stations back again. The reasons for that are quite logical. Beyond the rise in crime that is of immense concern to those people, they have witnessed a move toward large regional police stations—big patrol bases that allow police to react to crime after receiving a call when that crime has occurred. Police therefore do not have the opportunity through small police stations to mix with the community, to get to know the community and to understand where the problems exist, or to hear about a crime that might be going to happen in a week or two weeks or even in two hours time; they have to respond after the event or during the event. This means that the police feel that they are out of contact with the community.

I have been approached by numerous police officers in a private capacity from all ranks in the Police Force, from patrol officers right through to the top echelons, who are frustrated by the way in which they have to operate, by the shackles that are being placed on them, and who clearly see the direction in which law and order could go, but this Government will not listen, their requests fall on deaf ears. We get plenty of hot air from the other side of the Chamber about what members would like to do with law and order and about what they are doing, but the fact remains that crime is increasing drastically. I have given the figures during this debate. The Government cannot argue with those figures: they are factual and, in fact, are derived from the Government's own figures.

This motion will allow the Government to give some sort of commitment to getting back to realistic policing, the sort of policing that police officers want, because they are sick and tired of reacting to crime and of being stuck with paperwork. In recognition of this need, recently the Liberal Party released its policy paper on public safety, a major ingredient of which was a return to neighbourhood policing, to shopfront police stations, in order to allow police to

become more visible, to work with the community and to work on crime prevention. This Government keeps espousing crime prevention. Police stations in the community provide the ultimate in crime prevention strategy, as they enable police officers to work with their community.

Before closing, one further point needs to be made. I recognise that this sort of strategy is more intensive in terms of police resources but not necessarily in overall police resources. It is more intensive in operational police resources, which means more operational police and fewer police behind desks, something that I hope members of this Parliament want—I know that members on this side of the House certainly do—something the community wants, and therefore something the police want. I therefore commend this motion to the House.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That this House reaffirms the Government's policy not to accept the transfer of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park to the State health system unless—

- (a) the veterans community represented by the RSL is satisfied with the arrangements, particularly those relating to priority of access and quality of health care;
- (b) general access to comprehensive health and hospital services for veterans will continue at the level they have always enjoyed;
- (c) the Commonwealth provides a guarantee that all funds for operating the hospital will be transferred to the State and indexed for inflation;
- (d) the Commonwealth completes the comprehensive upgrading of the facilities at Daw Park; and
- (e) the staff of the hospital are satisfied that their interests will be adequately safeguarded.

This motion reaffirms the position of the South Australian Government on the absorption of the Repatriation Hospital into the State health system. That intention was stated as far back as 30 November 1987 when Dr Cornwall was Minister of Health, was reaffirmed by the present Minister of Transport when he held the health portfolio and reaffirmed again as recently as the Estimates Committee this year by the present Minister of Health. The most important condition of those stated in my motion is contained in paragraph (a). I should also point out that a number of other ex-service groups who have a keen interest in this matter should be satisfied with these arrangements.

I will begin by saying something about the significance of the Repatriation Hospital. This country has a national obligation to look after ex-servicemen and women who fought for their country in both wars and other conflicts. The repatriation system has been in existence for some 70 years, and is a very important part of this country's national obligation towards veterans. My experience of the Repatriation Hospital goes back to a very early age when I visited both of my grandparents, who were Gallipoli veterans, at that hospital. The significant thing to me about the Repatriation Hospital was that it was like no other hospital. The attitude of doctors and nurses towards patients was quite different from what one would see in other hospitals. It is a hospital apart and it should be treated in that vein.

The reason for this issue emerging at the moment is that currently there is legislation before the Federal Parliament that will allow the integration of repatriation hospitals throughout this country into State health systems. I point out that this particular legislation does not compel the transfer of those hospitals but would facilitate it. Another feature of the Commonwealth legislation is that it seeks to

establish a repatriation private patients scheme of insurance for veterans that would enable eligible veterans to utilise private hospitals.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: The Opposition spokesman says 'Maybe', and it is probably as well he should do that, as the Federal Coalition's health policy does not include such a scheme. I should point out that this repatriation private patients scheme is supported by veterans. It is of particular benefit to those who live outside the metropolitan area, especially in remote regions. It provides them with an additional option. I believe that the ex-service organisations support such a proposal.

However, it is the issue of the integration of the hospital with which we are concerned today. In relation to the Federal legislation, the position is different in other States. Obviously, the questions that face the integration of repatriation hospitals in large cities such as Sydney or places such as Tasmania, which are greatly decentralised, will be different from those in this State, as we have a large proportion of veterans living in close proximity to the repatriation hospital.

I now wish to comment on the background to this issue. As I understand it, for some 20 years there have been proposals to absorb the Repatriation Hospital into the State system. The matter has been pushed from within certain sectors of the Federal bureaucracy, but these proposals have been successfully blocked. At the time of the Whitlam Government, I believe that some proposals had been made by various committees and that part of the Public Service had been trying to push the matter. Fortunately, they were deferred. Why, then, do we have this push to integrate the hospitals? The following three reasons are being given, and I quote here from the Murray report into the integration of the Daw Park RGH:

(a) to allow entitled veterans and war widows access to a wide range of hospital and medical services as close as possible to where they live;

(b) the traditional veteran and war widow patient population at RGHs will age significantly over the next 15 years, to the point where RGH, DP serving only a veteran client base, will not remain viable as a general acute teaching hospital;

(c) the State health system is in a better position to deliver the range of general and specialised hospital services required by an ageing and contracting patient group.

The point that needs to be made about the first and third of those reasons is that those problems can be addressed without integration, and some of that has already taken place. Veterans attending the Repatriation Hospital are already given treatment within the State hospital system at Flinders Medical Centre and other public hospitals, and it is not essential to absorb the Repatriation Hospital into the State system to accommodate those concerns.

The second reason given is the decline in the expected patient population at the Repatriation Hospital over the next 15 years, and this is the nub of the issue. I believe that most veterans accept the fact that, at some stage in the future, the Repatriation Hospital will need to be absorbed into the State system as the number of veteran patients declines. The real question then is when the integration would need to take place and, as a secondary question, how that would be achieved.

Does this integration need to take place sooner rather than later? That is a legitimate question that the veterans' organisations are asking, and one that the Federal Government needs to answer. Why the haste? Why do we need to absorb the hospital into the State system prior to a decline in the veterans population occurring? When this matter was originally mooted, it was suggested that the transfer would be looked at in 1996, the target date originally suggested.

More recently, the date for the absorption has been discussed as 1 July next year, and that is the question I believe the Federal Government needs to answer and on which it needs to satisfy veterans groups.

What, then, are the concerns of the veterans about this transfer? The Repatriation Hospital has provided a service that has been appreciated by veterans for over 70 years. The veterans had been content with that service, so why do we need to change? The veterans are naturally concerned that, should the hospital be transferred into the State health system, resources for such a hospital would be strained. The veterans are also concerned that the value of any guarantees as to the level of service once the transfer takes place could be in question. Obviously, they need and deserve satisfaction on those questions.

I should like to comment on the efficiency policy currently being adopted in State health systems. We all know that with the drive for efficiency within our State health systems the modern idea is to keep patients within hospitals for as short a time as possible, and that will often mean that terminally ill patients, for example, will be removed to nursing homes for their remaining days. I believe that we need an entirely different philosophy in relation to the Repatriation Hospital.

Terminally ill veterans should be entitled to spend their last days with their friends within the veterans hospital system, and we should accept the fact that, for that reason alone, the resources we provide to our Repatriation Hospitals need to be different and need to be greater than those we would give to our State hospitals. In fairness to the Commonwealth Government, in the early years of the present Administration its record in upgrading the Repatriation Hospital at Daw Park was a good one. I well recall attending the opening of the new surgical theatres at the Repatriation Hospital, and I believe that they are as good as any in the country.

Certainly, they were much needed, because the original operating theatres had dated back to war-time, were totally inadequate for their task and were far too small for modern medical practice. There were cases where so-called dirty surgery (bowel surgery and the like) patients were kept in the corridors until those theatres were finished. That was a disgrace but, as I say, the matter has been addressed with the construction of new operating theatres at the hospital. There has also been considerable refurbishment of wards at the hospital.

As I noted in this place several weeks ago during a debate on Vietnam veterans' entitlements, the Commonwealth Government extended the entitlement to repatriation benefits to those who had been involved in a support capacity during that war. It is a pity, therefore, that the commendable record of the Commonwealth Government in those matters, and in terms of upgrading the Repatriation Hospital, should be brought into question with veterans by the current conflict over its haste to bring forward the integration of the hospital.

I also wish to comment on the current Coalition policy towards absorption, as the matter should be put on record. The current Bill before the Federal Parliament is a matter of some dispute. The Coalition's recent policy states:

We are also committed, over time, to the transfer of all Commonwealth Repatriation General Hospitals (RGHs) to the States. We will ensure that this process, now under way, does not diminish the quality of health care nor the priority of access currently granted to veterans.

It needs to be put on record that those members of the Coalition who are stirring up this issue at the moment have in the fine print of their policy a view identical to that of current Commonwealth policy except that, as I said earlier,

it is inferior in several respects, because it does not support the repatriation public patients scheme and it includes \$8 million of cuts to the veterans affairs budget, including the privatisation of the Artificial Limbs and Appliance Centre. I note from the statement that the cost of compensation for any goods and services tax to veterans' pension recipients has been put under the social service budget. Veterans would be well advised to ask the Coalition whether it intends to remove the Veterans Affairs Department and absorb it into social security.

As I have only a few moments left, I will conclude by quoting the Director of Nursing at the Repatriation Hospital from the hospital's last report. The Director of Nursing, Miss P.G. Deal, states:

I have been fortunate to have the privilege of nursing this wonderful group of clients for 32 years and I feel proud when I see my nurses care as much about them as I do. Now as they are growing old, when we should be relieving them of any unnecessary burdens, the process of the integration of the hospital into the South Australian Health Services has been accelerated and this thought is causing them grave concern.

I fully support Miss Deal's comments. It is up to the Commonwealth to satisfy veterans—the most important group in this whole issue—that any changes that are to be made in the future in respect of the Repatriation Hospital are to their benefit. If the benefits of any transfer are so obvious, it should not be difficult to convince veterans of those benefits. The passage of this motion will make it quite clear to Canberra that we will not accept any offer of the transfer of the Repatriation Hospital unless the Commonwealth addresses these concerns and, in particular, unless it is able to satisfy veterans that these changes are in their best interests.

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

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to commence construction of phase 2 of the third arterial road in order to alleviate traffic problems on Brighton and South Roads and condemns the Government for attempting to spread the road building project over an unacceptable length of time.

This motion is brought about today as a result of the hypocrisy and untruths spread by the present Government. For many years the Government has been stating that it will build a new road down south, and for many years we have heard nothing but verbosity. Over a year ago in this place I called on the Government to bring forward its third arterial road building schedule and it refused. That motion was defeated on Party lines. It is interesting to look at the latest publication released by this Government and also later to look at some of the previous statements it has made in contrast.

A document has just been released by the Department of Road Transport entitled 'Third arterial project—Phase 1—Proposal to Improve Traffic Flow in and around Darlington'. In part, the brochure states:

This brochure has been prepared to give you information about the third arterial project. Your comments on the project are welcome and will help finalise the scheme.

The brochure goes on to further state that there are two phases: phase 1 widens Main South Road from Ayliffes Road to Seacombe Road and Marion Road from Sturt Road to Main South Road; and phase 2 constructs a new 8.5 kilometre road which will extend from Main South Road,

Darlington to Reynella. We are told in the brochure that phase 1 will start in late 1993 and that phase 2 is now not scheduled to commence before 1996. That means that the southern area will probably not experience any significant alleviation of its traffic flow problems until well after the turn of the century. That situation is completely unacceptable and contrasts with what the Government has promised before.

The Government is trying to palm off phase 1 of this project, which will cost \$18 million, as the answer to our road problems. Phase 2—the proposal to provide the new road, and not simply to widen the existing road—will cost at least \$82 million and will not even start until 1996. I will go back a little in time to August 1984 because at that time an announcement was made. This Government had scrapped the north-south corridor—a decision which goes down as one of the most short sighted of all time—but it later realised the mess it made of that decision and so announced a \$45 million road plan (it was only \$45 million then) to cut the Darlington bottleneck.

That plan was to include a two stage road building plan—the two phases we now have—and indeed that was to include a \$30 million first stage (it was \$30 million back in 1984). However, we are now getting only \$18 million in 1991 for significant roadworks between Sturt Road and Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill. The second stage was to be \$15 million for the stage between Majors Road and Reynella. That \$15 million road works will now cost \$82 million in 1991 and perhaps a lot more. Because of the rate at which the cost has escalated, many of the Minister's own staff (and they do not mind saying it publicly and have said it to him time and again) have stated that that stage will probably not get up at all. In other words damn the southern suburbs, according to the Minister—they can live with their lot; what they have got is what they will get.

An interesting article appeared in the *Advertiser* of 16 August 1984 and the Premier himself was quoted as saying the Government, through the Minister of Transport, would direct the Highways Department to start immediately with design preconstruction work. It would start immediately in 1984—seven years ago. In the same article the Minister of Transport was quoted as saying that he hoped the road, 'a pretty high priority project, would be open in about 10 years'. In other words, it would be open by 1994. Now, the latest piece of information circulated by the department states that the first phase of the road will not even commence until 1993. Yet another untruth spread to the population by this Government! Yet another piece of deceit! Interestingly, the schedule for this road widening happens to be before the next State election. The people of South Australia will not be fooled by this any longer: they are fed up with broken promises; they are fed up with untruths and fed up with the traffic volume with which they have to contend on Brighton and South Roads.

Back in 1984 a number of publications were released and a steady stream of pamphlets given to people to make them believe that something would be forthcoming in the near future. That has not eventuated. I am mindful that not much time is available to us today, so I will draw rapidly to a close as my colleague also wishes to speak. South Road at present carries the bulk of traffic to and from the southern area in conjunction with Brighton Road. The capacity of those roads simply is not sufficient to cater for the growing population. Indeed, the brochure put out by the Government states in part:

The steady population growth in the suburbs south of Darlington such as Trott Park, Hallett Cove, Hackham and Aberfoyle Park, together with the continued concentration of employment north of Darlington, results in more and more traffic on the

north-south roads. Recent major residential development such as Woodcroft and Seaford will continue to increase the traffic pressure on these roads.

We have an acknowledgment that in 1991 these problems are serious, will continue to escalate and, seven years after the Premier's promise of 1984, nothing has happened. The Government acknowledges the problem but is doing nothing about it.

Debate adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the Orders of the Day.

TICKET SELLING FACILITIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to introduce ticket selling facilities onto train platforms and/or trains to enable commuters to once again conveniently purchase train tickets and to restore public confidence in the metropolitan train system,

which Mr Hamilton had moved to amend by deleting all words after 'Government' and inserting the words:

to continue to monitor technological advancements in the manufacture of ticket vending machines that are vandal proof and continue to increase the number of licensed ticket vendors to enable passengers to easily purchase a ticket before boarding a train.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1935.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I do not support the amendment that has been moved by the member for Albert Park. All it does is call on the Government to continue to monitor technology, hoping that one day it will come up with a method of offering a service, that is, to provide ticket selling facilities on stations or on trains, for those who use the STA as a means of transport. On Monday, a 77 year old lady came into my office with a complaint about this matter. She lives 400 metres from the Eden Hills railway station. However, to buy a ticket she has to walk a mile and a half, there and back, to a shop. She admits that she does not use the train or any transport very often. Because of her age she is more or less tied to her home. She is happy with that but, when she wants to use the train, that is the distance she has to travel to buy a ticket. Of course, she can use a multitrip ticket. She agrees with that but, when you get on in years, you do not always remember where you put things and, if you are on a pension, money is tight.

The member for Bright's motion suggests that ticket vending machines should be supplied by the Government, if not on the station at least on the train. The motion uses the expression 'platforms and/or trains'. The honourable member is suggesting that, in areas where there is a lot of vandalism, ticket machines should not be placed on stations but on trains, where there are personnel—the driver and, on routes where there is a lot of trouble, a transit officer, who watches out for the irresponsible element to make it safe for people to travel and to protect public property.

I do not support the amendment, but I do support the motion moved by the member for Bright. The electorate of Davenport gets very little public transport and, in some areas, there is none at all. As I indicated, some elderly people live a long way from a shop at which they can purchase tickets, so the motion is important to them, and the Government should implement the measure described in the motion.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I support the motion. Recently, a well-publicised golf tournament was held at the Royal Adelaide Golf Club and a large number of people utilised the train service provided for that event. A number

of those people were interstate and overseas tourists. One can imagine their embarrassment and that of the people responsible for the tourists when they attempted to board the train at the platform specially erected at the golf club only to find that there were no facilities for purchasing tickets, thereby being potentially liable to incur a fine. I understand that the inspectors or officers policing the trains took a very understanding point of view, and I congratulate them on that. Nonetheless, this type of incident may occur again if ticket vending facilities are not available. Our overall tourism potential might be harmed as a result. I support the motion.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I oppose the amendment and will point out some obvious flaws in it. Although the amendment calls on the Government to continue to monitor technological advances in the manufacture of ticket vending machines, that does not solve the basic problem faced by train commuters, that is, they cannot conveniently buy a train ticket. They can buy them only from nominated outlets. At seven of the eight stations in my electorate, there are no conveniently placed retail outlets for the sale of those tickets. That is a major hole in the amendment.

I recognise that the member for Albert Park's amendment provides the Government with an opportunity to continue to examine ticket vending machines, but I suggest that that matter could be satisfied by the State Transport Authority's sending an officer to one country every year to look at ticket vending machines. This goes nowhere near to solving the problem. I oppose the amendment and ask members to support my motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr L.M.F. Arnold. No—Ms Cashmore.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. Before casting my vote, I inform the House that I will be supporting the amendment. However, I believe the substance of the motion is correct. If it referred to trains only—and I believe that ticket vending machines should be placed on them—I would have supported the motion. However, the motion talks about platforms also, and I believe that to place ticket vending machines on platforms is impracticable because they are unmanned. Therefore, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

STATE FIRE SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House endorses the current constructive moves to rationalise the communications and training facilities of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service and the South Australian Country Fire Service.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2195.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This House has agreed to establish a select committee to look at the CFS, and for that reason I will not talk to this motion for as long as I had originally intended. The local papers that circulate in the foothills and in the central Hills area carried an article

recently that quoted me on this matter. I think that you, Mr Speaker, and every member of this Parliament are conscious of what I call the skulduggery that is going on with respect to this matter. Mr Bruce, a professional fireman who previously held high office in the Metropolitan Fire Service, was asked by the Government to look into the operations of and report on both the CFS and the MFS. Mr Bruce has a direct interest in the MFS more so than the CFS.

To do this, the Government made available \$70 000 last year, and \$90 000 was made available in this year's budget to continue work in this area, making a total of \$160 000. This motion picks up part of the report of Mr Bruce, although that report has not been released by the Government and the Minister will not release it to those people who are concerned, the CFS and MFS members. If we are to employ somebody at taxpayers' expense to look at the activities of two very important bodies that have overlapping responsibilities, and the Minister ends up with a report, that entire report should be made available to the public, and not just the one or two parts of it that the Minister is addressing initially which I believe will lead to the same fiasco for CFS volunteers as occurred with St John Ambulance volunteers. It is intended to shift the communications section of the CFS up to the MFS, and the MFS to take over training. That is the same rotten tactic that was undertaken by unionists to destroy St John volunteers.

What occurred in St John is that if something went wrong in an accident they would blame the volunteers but, if a mistake was made by a professional officer, you never heard a word about it. The next move in the St John fiasco was to put both professionals and volunteers at stations like Athelstone, Burnside, Happy Valley or Blackwood during normal working hours, so that they were in conflict with each other. The unions have the organisation, strength and ear of the present Minister and Government to say that the amateurs—the volunteers—are not efficient or professional enough, and do not understand the situation. They are not professional when it comes to money, because they give their time for nothing. It then reached the stage where some of the better volunteers—and most were excellent—with long experience stepped aside and said, 'It is not for us. We will protect our own. The Government can pick up looking after the rest.' As a result of what happened in St John, a call-out in a country area now costs \$450.

When I rolled my car on the freeway three years ago and somebody called a St John Ambulance, I jumped into another car and told them I did not want St John to attend even though I was injured. I believe that I would be a hypocrite to go in a St John Ambulance if I have the ability to say 'No'. We are doing the same thing to the volunteers in the CFS. We are going to shift the communications section to the MFS, but they will not even use the same office. The MFS is to retrain people to work in the CFS and use the communications office of the MFS. Do not tell me that that is not a dirty trick. I am sure that, when the communication officers in the CFS know the full story, they will realise what is happening.

After my article appeared in the local paper, a person from the CFS said that my comments were hogwash. However, after he got a copy of my press release, after being contacted by the paper, he said that after thinking it through he agreed with me. I hope that the proposed select committee places some emphasis on the Bruce report and makes sure that it is released for public scrutiny so that in future volunteers know where they stand. I have no doubt that the unionists believe that they can get rid of the volunteers

not in country areas but right across the foothills and out as far as Mount Barker and the bigger centres.

When that happens, the cost to the public will increase dramatically and extra burden will be placed on the community, which will result in people not wanting to volunteer for the firefighting services. I do not support the motion in any way, shape or form: it is just a means by which a Government member can talk in platitudes about his own Government and, at the same time, get a couple of pats on the back from his union mates.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have great pleasure in supporting the motion before the House. I would have thought that it would not be a matter of great controversy. I was extremely hurt by the remarks of the previous speaker. The Government has no intention of attacking the volunteers: it appreciates the volunteers and has supported them. I was surprised to hear the remarks of the previous speaker, because the Government has no intention other than to support the volunteers. It would be an impractical proposition to do anything other than that, because the amount of money involved in trying to replace the volunteers in the Country Fire Service would be impossible for any Government to amass, no matter what colour the Government was at the time. So, it would be senseless for this Government to go out of its way deliberately to attack the volunteer force that is now available through the CFS: and it would be an act of self-destruction.

There is nothing further from the truth than the proposition by the previous speaker that the Government is attempting deliberately to undermine the CFS volunteers. I am surprised that, in a debate on a congratulatory-type motion, we should hear that sort of remark. It is, and always has been, our intention to support the CFS volunteers. Indeed, in my experience in this House, this Government has been able to put resources and money into this area.

I was one of those who came into this House immediately before the Ash Wednesday bushfire. It was one of the greatest disasters that this State has ever seen. Arising out of that, I was a member of the committee chaired by Mr Gavin Keneally and his area of responsibility at that time was firefighting, although he did move on to other portfolios from time to time. We had the opportunity to analyse and have lectures on the problems associated with the Ash Wednesday bushfire. I pay tribute to the CFS volunteers because—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: They did a fantastic job.

Mr FERGUSON:—as the member for Napier says, they did a fantastic job. I do not think any organisation could have reached a 100 per cent level of efficiency because of the magnitude of that bushfire: it was enormous. It is a disaster that the State has probably never seen before, and I hope we never see that destruction again. That bushfire caught us with some administrative problems, which were brought to our attention by the heads of both fire services and, since that date, we as a Government have been trying to provide the answer.

In recent times, we have heard of differences between the CFS and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I do not want to enter into that controversy, because for one thing, my knowledge is limited to what I have heard in the debate in this House. I have listened carefully to what the member for Alexandra has said on this matter, and I have read *Hansard*. I understand that this matter will go to a select committee and that it will be examined thoroughly. When that report comes back, this Parliament will be able to look further at what should be done in relation to that dispute. It has been my impression, despite the remarks made by

the previous speaker, that the level of cooperation between the CFS and the MFS has been far greater in this era than in years gone by.

We know that great attention has been given to the necessity for training, in both the CFS and the MFS. Joint training of CFS volunteers and MFS whole-time staff to levels that will enable both services to respond on a pre-determined basis has been proposed; the service could operate jointly at fires and emergencies in a standardised manner. This was one of the criticisms that arose from the Ash Wednesday bushfire, that is, that there were problems in certain areas of the State in achieving a joint response from both these bodies. Training is also to continue to enable MFS country auxiliary firefighters to fully participate on CFS volunteer schedule training courses at all levels, as well as on specialised courses relating to breathing apparatus, vehicle accident rescue and dangerous substances.

Certain sums have been put aside also to ensure that MFS whole-time firefighters are completely trained by experienced CFS staff on bushfire operations, incident control and safety. We are more prepared now than we ever have been if we were to be confronted with another problem of the magnitude of the Ash Wednesday bushfire. Certainly, practices have been learnt in relation to bushfires, and they have been translated into training programs involving the CFS and the MFS. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion, and I hope that eventually all members will be prepared to support it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

'BUY A MATE A JOB' CAMPAIGN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House supports the 'Buy a mate a job' campaign by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. SA Great and Kickstart designed to encourage South Australians to support local jobs and industry by buying Australian made and locally produced items.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2198.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have great pleasure in supporting this motion. This campaign has been supported by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the SA Great organisation. More than 600 companies have taken the opportunity to give a mate a job since the launching of the SA Great campaign about six weeks ago. The South Australian Executive Director, Mr John Shepherd, has said that many companies have still not taken up the opportunity to join the scheme, and that is a great pity in view of the parlous state of employment at the moment. However, the South Australian employment situation is better to some extent than the situation in Victoria because of the crush of financial institutions in that State. Although there has been great play about what has happened to our financial institutions, such as the State Bank, the problems have been nowhere near the magnitude of those in Victoria.

The economic downturn has also reflected heavily on manufacturing industry, and manufacturing industry is largest in Victoria. Therefore, Victoria has found itself in a parlous state of affairs so far as employment is concerned. From time to time, although the headlines would lead us to believe that we are in desperate straits in South Australia, we have nowhere near the problems experienced in other States. SA Great has set up a central database which lists businesses that sell locally made goods to enable consumers

to support South Australian business. Companies are placed on the register at no charge.

I have heard many complaints in my electorate office, as I am sure have many other members, that people are not able to find goods that are actually made in Australia or, more particularly, in South Australia, in local supermarkets. There are very large supermarkets, for example, Arrow and Coles-Myer, situated in large shopping centres in my district, such as the one at West Lakes. It is difficult for my constituents who deliberately go into a supermarket with the idea of buying Australian made to actually find Australian made goods. I appeal to these big supermarkets and large shopping centres to give pride of place on their shelves to Australian made items, particularly South Australian made goods, because this is one of the difficulties that my constituents have come across.

The companies that have been listed with SA Great represent a wide variety of industry: they sell everything from furniture to pickled onions. South Australian made pickled onions represent the sort of product that people would like to find on their supermarket shelves. The SA Great organisation should be praised for initiating this campaign. It has produced a pamphlet, which is available for those who are looking for a particular product. I have nothing but praise for its actions, although people who, on the spur of the moment, would like to buy a particular product have to telephone the SA Great organisation to obtain that pamphlet. However, it is a move in the right direction and is therefore praiseworthy. Country towns, particularly the country press, have been prepared to take up this campaign, probably more enthusiastically than the local suburban press.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: The Minister travels in the country.

Mr FERGUSON: Well, the Minister has been specifically mentioned in a lot of the country press, and I refer to the *Murray Valley Standard*, and that would interest the member for Murray-Mallee. On 26 September 1991, under the very large heading 'Buy Australian and give a mate a job', the *Murray Valley Standard* gave a very good run to this campaign. The first three paragraphs of the article state:

Some 500 posters urging people to buy locally in order to 'give a mate a job' will appear throughout the region early next month.

As a community service in a time of slow labour market, Bridge Printing Office, publishers of the *Murray Valley Standard*, will print the posters free.

The 'give a mate a job—buy local' campaign will be launched by the State Government next month and will be promoted Statewide by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and the SA Great campaign.

The article goes on to flesh out the details. As an aside, when I was Secretary of the Printing Union, I would regularly visit the *Murray Valley Standard* office, and I have nothing but praise for that employer in that country town.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: It was a fully unionised shop, and it certainly looked after its employees. I have always been welcome in that establishment, unlike some of the other shops that I had to visit from time to time. We were surprised at the attack on this campaign by the Leader of the Opposition, who talked about it being a hypocritical campaign when indeed it was an attempt to do something for the unemployed.

In the *Advertiser* of 10 October 1991, the Opposition accused the Government of hypocrisy in telling South Australians to buy locally. The article states:

Opposition Leader Mr Dale Baker told Parliament yesterday more than 52 per cent of Government purchases by the State Supply Board in 1991 had been made overseas.

That is a completely different argument. The Opposition has attacked this campaign, which was a very good one that

endeavoured to assist South Australians to find employment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Every member in this place, including Government members, should be able to support this proposition. However, the tragedy of it is that the Government does not—it is hypocritical. I have cited instances in this place of where the Government has failed to measure up to its own propaganda. I have cited specific instances of that recently, as has my Leader. Why is it that no-one in this State can discover—and the Minister does not even care to investigate—what the Government needs to buy to supply its needs, while at the same time in this House it urges South Australians to buy locally-made goods if they are available? Why can the Government not publish a list of commodities that it seeks to purchase for its own purposes and allow the people of South Australia to participate in the competitive process of tender for that? More than half the goods we get come from elsewhere. I support the motion, and I believe that the Government ought to do likewise.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PORT PIRIE HARBOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House urges the Government to pursue funding at Federal Government level for the deepening of the Port Pirie Harbor, given this area's role in the production of export income for the State and nation.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2198.)

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Previously, when I spoke on this motion I gave some background information about the port of Port Pirie and concluded by saying that a number of changes had led to a decline in trade in the recent years, because of the conversion of petroleum imports from sea to rail in 1986, the cessation of lead concentrate imports in 1989 and a reduction in grain exports through the port. I will now provide details of some of the characteristics of the port for the information of members, although I am sure the member for Morphett would be aware of most of these.

The Port Pirie navigation channel is 14 km long, 92 metres wide and has a maintained depth of 6.4 metres below Chart Datum. However, recent hydrographic surveys indicate that the actual depth of the channel is deeper than the maintained depth (average 7 metres) and that the channel width reaches a maximum of 105 metres at bends. The swing basin is 325 metres east-west by 295 metres north-south. The principal berths are dredged to 8.2 metres. The official limits on vessel size in this port are 185 metres length, 29 metres beam for daylight operation and 180 metres length for night operation. Recently, larger vessels of 190 metres length and 32 metres beam have satisfactorily negotiated the channel, but only under favourable weather conditions. The maximum high tide draft is 7.9 metres. The tidal range (high to low) is 3.5 metres. The existing port infrastructure comprises 11 alongside berths with associated handling systems dedicated to particular commodities. Most of the quay wharves are of steel sheet piled construction. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table relating to cargoes in Port Pirie.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.H. Hemmings): Is the table purely statistical?

Mrs HUTCHISON: Yes, Mr Acting Speaker. Leave granted.

CARGOES IN PORT PIRIE

	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
Grains	Exports		
Wheat	255 317	306 761	137 018
Barley	167 294	102 912	66 346
Smelter Related	Imports		
Lime and Shellsand	16 614	32 970	14 681
Ores and Concentrates n.e.s.	43 059	84 829	25 664
Non-ferrous Metal Waste	5 633	7 495	0
Coal	45 582	46 491	48 632
Coke and Coke Breeze	n.a.	0	14 515
Ores and Concentrates	Exports		
Non-ferrous Metal	334 069	471 819	494 454
Fuels	Imports		
Petroleum products and related	23 701	0	n.a.
Ships Bunker Oil	Exports		
All other Cargo	337	0	204
All other	Imports		
	180	663	320
Total			844 799

Source: Department of Marine and Harbors annual report.

Some commodities, such as zinc concentrates, will be exported at a steady rate, over the life of the producing mine. Others, such as grain, are subject to seasonal variation and/or market forces.

The continuation or attraction of any cargo flow through a given port is not solely dependent on characteristics of the port, but also on a number of independent external factors and pressures.

Mrs HUTCHISON: The Port Pirie Development Committee conducted an economic and financial evaluation of the channel deepening for the port of Port Pirie, and that was completed in July 1990. The options considered were: first, dredging the navigation channel and harbor an additional 1.5 metres to 7.9 metres below Chart Datum; secondly, dredging the navigation channel and harbor an additional 2.5 metres to 8.9 metres below Chart Datum; and, thirdly, transshipment of cargo to other South Australian deepwater ports. The theoretical extra load that typical grain vessels could carry at increased drafts and the resulting improvements in cargo movement for other cargoes was determined for each option. So, quite a lot of work was done by the Port Pirie Development Committee on that evaluation, which was based on the draft/load characteristics of ships visiting the port in 1988-89. It resulted in a total extra potential grain tonnage of 100 000 tonnes per annum for 1.5 metres deepening and 150 000 tonnes per annum for 2.5 metres deepening, respectively.

An engineering analysis was also carried out and preliminary cost estimates were prepared for the dredged channel options. Six different channel configurations were analysed, and the dredging volumes were calculated from the most recent hydrographic survey of the channel and harbor, overlaid with the proposed channel cross-sections. The preliminary economic evaluation (July 1989) indicated that the only upgrading option for which the benefits were similar to the costs was dredging the navigation channel and harbor an additional 1.5 metres to 7.9 metres below Chart Datum; rather than the 2.5 metre option, which was to extend the channel to 8.9 metres below Chart Datum.

The objectives of the upgrading are as follows: Port Pirie is a city in the Mid-North of South Australia, 225 kilometres north of Adelaide by road, situated on the eastern side of Spencer Gulf. It was initially established in the mid-1800s as a port and service centre for agricultural production, and its growth as a city has arisen from a number of specific industrial developments, including lead smelting. This has

been a major factor in the city's growth since the 1800s. The lead smelting work (Pasminco Metals—BHAS) was established in Port Pirie because it had the closest harbor to the mines at Broken Hill. Obviously, there has been liaison between those two cities ever since. The operation in Port Pirie is the largest single lead smelter in the world.

Port Pirie is an agricultural service centre for the districts of members such as the member for Custance, who is involved in agriculture. The city functions as a port to market grain and provides retail and commercial facilities for the rural community of a relatively broad region, and has done so for the past 100 years. Port Pirie is the largest centre in the region and offers the widest range of services. Transport has also been a major factor in Port Pirie's growth. The city played an important part in the transport infrastructure of the State, and to a certain extent the nation. Apart from its role as a port, it has played a major service role to the national railway interconnection since the establishment of the east-west railway connections although, regrettably, railway operations in Port Pirie have become run down over the past few years.

The city is located just off the national highway system and has been a stopping-off point for travellers to the West Coast of South Australia or through to Western Australia, Alice Springs or Darwin. Significantly, Port Pirie is on the major transport corridor to the north, west and south, which is a distinct advantage in terms of access to major markets. Air transport has not performed a major role in the city because of the relatively short driving time to Adelaide, only some 2½ hours away. A regular air service recently introduced has now ceased, unfortunately, but we are very hopeful that a new service will be set up there for pilot training. That may strengthen Port Pirie's claims for harbor deepening.

These three elements remain the major driving forces of the economy of Port Pirie, and at this stage in the city's development its economic future depends primarily on the trends in these three areas unless some further significant areas of activity can be established. Of course, one of those is that which I have just noted, the pilot training program. The city's growth was most rapid in the late nineteenth century, and it continued to grow consistently until the late 1960s. Since then, it has demonstrated a slow decline in terms of both population and economic activity as a result of the change in direction by BHAS and the bypassing of the city as a major transport interchange.

Recently, some stability has been achieved in the economy, largely due to the forward planning of BHAS-Pasminco and its commitment to long-term future operations in the city of Port Pirie. Without such further commitment by that industry, times would be very hard for the city. It is now time to consolidate and build on the economic base Port Pirie currently has, and part of that building on requires, in my opinion, that the harbor be deepened to enable ships of higher tonnages to enter the city and to take out heavier loads of cargo.

The preliminary economic evaluation in July 1990 indicated that the only upgrading option for which the benefits were similar in scale to the costs was dredging of the channel and harbor, as I said before, by 1.5 metres to the 7.9 metres below Chart Datum, and re-evaluation incorporating changes to the input data to the economic model did not significantly change this outcome.

The Port Pirie Development Committee based its revised economic model on the dredging of the channel to that depth. Many cost estimates were made with regard to this and much work was done on a proposition that was well costed and well evaluated in order that everything was laid

on the table for consideration of the harbor deepening. I ask the House to support this motion, which is very important in terms of my electorate as well as that of the member for Custance.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise in total support of the motion moved today by the member for Stuart, although I argue whether it should concern the State Government as well as the Federal Government, since the State Government has chosen for many years to ignore this very important facility. However, the Federal Government now must have some input, as we know how cash strapped the State Government is.

I fully support the member for Stuart's remarks and do not wish to take the time of the House to spell out all the details again, as she has done that very well. Port Pirie is strategically a very important port for South Australia. It is at the top of the gulf, with no port of any size to the north of it. It is in the middle of Australia, and is connected with road, rail and most other transport infrastructure. The port has been established for many years. As I say, it is centre State and is the most central port for the lion's share of South Australia's grain and cereal lands.

Also, it is linked by the Princes Highway to the east and to the west so, in all ways, it can be said that this is the heartland of Australia. However, the whole development of this city and of this port has been hamstrung because there is not enough water in the harbor. Particularly in the past 10 or 15 years, we have seen technology leave this port and this city behind because of that one fact. We have not seen any major money spent at all in this area during such a vital period.

As the member for Stuart said, we have two or three major users of this port, particularly the largest lead smelter in the world, BHAS. I am sure that company would love to be using bigger ships to take out bigger loads, which would bring down its costs. I give credit to Pasmenco, which is basically trading at a loss at the moment because the overseas prices for metals are very much down. It continues to trade irrespectively, however, confident that the market will return and that prosperity will return to the lead industry at Port Pirie. It would be very happy to see this harbor deepened.

Co-operative Bulk Handling, the farmers' company and the largest company in South Australia, has a very large facility at Port Pirie and is the largest exporter of grain from that harbor. For many years it has wished the harbor to be deepened, which would save the two port loading costs and a lot of money to the farmers of South Australia. It would enable us to bring in to this harbor the next size of ship. Also, Mobil Australia and new industries would wish to use this port.

I have been encouraged in the past few days to see that the rare earths plant has been given the green light. Uranium from Roxby Downs should also be able to go through this port. The harbor is controlling the growth of Port Pirie, and I fully support the honourable member's motion that it be deepened. I pay tribute to the late Bill Jones, who had the great desire above all others for Port Pirie's future to see the harbor and its channel deepened. I have much pleasure in supporting this motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I should like to thank the member for Custance for his remarks and for his support of this motion which, without taking up any more of the time of the House, I urge members to support.

Motion carried.

UNITED STATES WHEAT SUBSIDIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House supports the action by the Australian Government over its strong criticism of the United States Government's decision to further undermine the viability of Australian wheat farmers by subsidising that country's wheat exports to China and the Yemen,

which Mr Lewis had moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'supports the action' and inserting the words:

of the Australian Government in advocating a 'fairer playing field' in world trade in the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations, and regrets the consequences of the trade war now being waged by the United States Government against European Economic Community and other subsidised agricultural export producers which has had a detrimental effect on the viability of Australian farmers by weakening the markets for their products, and calls on the Australian Government to abandon the 'high relative interest rate/high dollar' fiscal policy, allowing the Australian dollar to fall to its natural lower exchange rate, thereby restoring higher farm gate prices and viability to our farmers.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1670.)

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I support the principle behind the motion before the House today and convey my support for the amendment moved by the member for Murray-Mallee as I believe that it correctly restates the issues behind the original motion in an expanded format which I believe more correctly and properly puts the views that I would like to see this House adopt. However, I have some difficulty with the way in which the member for Murray-Mallee has phrased his amendment, particularly the latter half of it. It would be more appropriate for this House to confine its opinion to the first part with respect to the export of products and the way in which those markets are organised throughout the world. Accordingly, I will move an amendment to the amendment moved by the member for Murray-Mallee. I move:

Leave out all words in the amendment after the word 'products'.

This will improve the overall presentation of the motion. Given the time available today and the fact that these arguments have been thoroughly canvassed already, I ask the House to support my amendment to the amendment and subsequently the motion as amended.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier): As the mover of the original motion, I am happy to accept the further amendment put by the member for Elizabeth. He is quite correct. This motion is, in effect, critical of the United States and European Governments, as it should be, and we should not cloud the issue by introducing something to do with the monetary policy of the Federal Government, even though that can be dealt with. I urge the member for Bragg—after he has finished reading my book—to think about moving a motion condemning the Australian Federal Government's monetary policy, but I do not think he would be able to find anything wrong with that policy.

Whilst the members for Murray-Mallee and Custance canvassed the problems emanating from the European Community (and I was quite happy with that), I am prepared to accept the further amendment, as I feel that we have drifted from strong criticism of the European Community and the United States Government into regret. I am happy to accept that, and perhaps the motion should have been framed in a stronger way. However, the motion has been on the Notice Paper for far too long. It went on to the Notice Paper on 24 August and one would have thought that, with the plight of the rural community, we could have dispensed with it in a couple of sitting days. I am happy to go along with the member for Elizabeth as he

has brought it back to a fair motion and I urge all members to support it.

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried; motion as amended carried.

CONSUMPTION TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House condemns moves by the Liberal Party at both the Federal and State levels to bring in a broad-based consumption tax.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2201.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I am pleased to support the motion moved by my colleague the member for Playford. The motion is particularly pertinent at this time when the Liberal Party has come forward with its so-called tax policy. It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition in this place described the policy as the greatest tax policy ever. Perhaps it is the greatest tax policy ever for the highest paid and wealthiest members of our society, but it is certainly not the greatest tax policy ever for those on low incomes. I oppose the introduction of a consumption tax on economic grounds. That is perhaps the most important point that we need to make at this stage.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: I am happy to do that later in the debate, but first we should rebut some of the economic nonsense going around stating that we should have this tax. Many of us are aware of the regressive effects of any indirect tax. If we introduce a tax on basic goods such as household commodities and food, pensioners, the unemployed and those on low incomes will have to spend all of their income on those basic commodities. There is no way that they can avoid a 15 per cent tax on those goods.

What sort of goods do the wealthiest in our community buy? They buy French champagne, Mercedes Benz cars, and so on. With their high incomes, much of it is saved: they do not have to spend all of their income on goods and services but can invest it in all sorts of ways. The point is that the poor have no way of avoiding an indirect tax such as a goods and services tax. The very wealthy, on the other hand, will have the benefit of reduced prices for their luxury items.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: I am making the speech. The main concern with the Federal Coalition's policy is the \$4 billion gap—the cuts to public spending. The Federal Leader of the Opposition is trying to delude everyone that we will all be better off. He has tables of tax cuts, which we may or may not get in 1996, two years after the GST is introduced. That is another matter. The Federal Opposition is talking about cutting \$4 billion from basic services to the community, but, of course, it is not prepared to spell out where those cuts will fall. The Federal Opposition has cobbled together this package trying to make it look as attractive as possible, but it will not say where the cuts will be.

There is no question that those cuts will greatly reduce the quality of life of the poorest people in our community, the same people who will get belted by the goods and services tax. I turn now to the economic reasons against this tax. The head of the Reserve Bank (Bernie Fraser) summed up the craziness of introducing the goods and services tax as far as inflation is concerned.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: He did, because it will result in higher inflation. Mr Fraser's point is that it is absolutely absurd to introduce a consumption tax at a time when inflation is

falling. At great pain to the community, inflation is now down to very low figures. To introduce a goods and services tax would give inflation a boost that would destroy all the benefits of lower inflation that the people of Australia have suffered to achieve over recent years. It is crazy.

Another argument that has been used to justify this indirect taxation is that it will provide work incentives. What the Federal Leader of the Opposition is saying is that we need to give the wealthiest people more money so they will work harder. However, we need to give the poor a lot less so they will work harder. The wealthy will work harder if they have tax cuts of \$100 a week. For the poor, by cutting out the unemployment benefit after six months and under-compensating them for the effects of the goods and services tax, that will provide them with incentive to work harder. What a lot of nonsense. The proposed tax will be economically disastrous because of its effect on petrol prices. This is simply a crude vote chasing exercise by the Opposition. I will quote what Senator Peter Walsh said about this proposal, as follows:

Apparently, petrol used by farmers is to be exempt even from GST. Distillate used by farmers is already exempt from excise because it is a production input. But the amount of petrol used for agricultural production (as distinct from petrol used by farmers for private motoring) is negligible. This provision is a rort presumably included to buy off National Party opposition.

That really sums it up. This is the one part of the package that is supposed to be good as far as winning votes is concerned. However, it will result in disastrous effects on the economy, especially on our balance of payments. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of oil left in this country; our indigenous reserves are declining rapidly. When they run out, we will have to import large quantities of oil, and that will have a deleterious effect on our balance of payments. Why does the Federal Opposition want to encourage the consumption of petrol? As Peter Walsh points out in his article, there are a lot of negative effects related to the consumption of petrol. He states:

Cheap petrol may get cheap cheers, but sends out a message capable of doing substantial long-term harm unrelated to the suspect conclusions of greenhouse scaremongers. The most committed free-market economists acknowledge the negative externalities of petrol consumption and therefore of stimulating it.

Those negative externalities are traffic congestion in the cities, air pollution and so on. He continued:

Except for a brief period before the second oil price shock, petrol is cheaper now in real terms than it has ever been.

That is really the salient point: it makes no economic sense to do that—it is simply a cheap political bribe. The other economic effect of the GST is the change in prices. That in itself I think is an economic minus. What is the point in making goods such as luxury imported vehicles, jewellery and so on cheaper, and in making goods produced locally, such as the basic necessities of life—bread and other food—dearer? As any economist would know, that will lead to substitution effects, but in the wrong direction. How can it then be argued that we need these changes for economic reasons, that we need them to reform the economy of this country?

The other point we need to make is that the goods and services tax has failed elsewhere. There is no evidence that a goods and services tax has brought about an economic renaissance. In fact, it has been quite the opposite. One only has to look at New Zealand, which has had a package of measures, including a consumption tax, to see that it has been totally disastrous and of no benefit at all.

Mr Quirke: Ground zero.

Mr HOLLOWAY: That is correct: ground zero, as the member for Playford indicates. As I pointed out in a grievance debate the other day, the goods and services tax had

its origins in Argentina in 1935. I think that Argentina was once the wealthiest country in the world—not that its demise was all due to a consumption tax, but it certainly has not brought about an economic revolution in that country, although it might bring a political revolution because of the injustice of it.

The member for Custance interjected earlier and said, 'What are we going to do?' In my view it would be better to do absolutely nothing than to bring in a goods and services tax. For the reasons I have mentioned I believe the impact will be quite negative. There was a detailed economic argument by Professor John Head, one of the foremost public finance economists in this country, in the *Financial Review* of 26 November. He came to this conclusion:

It would be a ludicrous misconception to argue that the remedies for Australia's economic ills proposed in Dr Hewson's package had very much to do with economic rationalism properly interpreted.

They are simply cheap political stunts—a concoction of all sorts of policies to try to win a few votes to get the Opposition into Government. If the member for Custance wants a suggestion, I think we could further reform our income tax system to remove some of the deductions that have been exploited and abused over the years, and simplify that. In that way I think we could get some cuts in income tax by removing some of the rorts in the system without having to go through all the pain of introducing a quite unnecessary tax.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House expresses its dissatisfaction with the reply by the Minister of Family and Community Services which was given to the member for Morphett on Tuesday 8 October when he required a deferral of the plans for the proposed Youth Detention Centre at Cavan until after the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice has had an opportunity to address the subject and calls on the Government to withdraw the plans from the Public Works Standing Committee so as not to pre-empt any deliberations by the select committee.

(Continued from 31 October. Page 1666.)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Family and Community Services): I oppose the motion and I urge the House to reject it. However, in so doing I am prepared to give an undertaking to the House about the substance of the motion. Let us remember what we are doing here. The Government has had before the Public Works Standing Committee a proposition for the construction of a small secure centre at Cavan to replace the current South Australian Youth Training Centre. It is important that we proceed with this project because of the very substandard nature of the centre at Magill. It is not that it is lacking in security in any way, at least not in terms of the ease with which people can escape; but in terms of what we would understand by a modern facility for custodial care of youth it is very lacking indeed, and it is important that we proceed with the project.

There is a second project that the Government almost certainly will be putting before the Public Works Standing Committee and into the public arena, and that is the replacement of the second of our secure youth centres at

Enfield. That is a little down the track, but in fact it will proceed. What is the mover of the motion trying to get at here? The mover of the motion is aware that a select committee has been established to look at juvenile justice, and he believes that there should be some opportunity for the select committee, if it wants to do so, to examine this proposition and perhaps to give some advice on it.

I am not opposed to that but, when I was questioned in the House on the occasion to which the honourable member refers in his motion, the clear assumption was that the matter should not proceed until such time as the select committee had completed its deliberations. That is completely beyond my control. However, it is likely that the select committee will meet for about a year before it reports to this House. It is simply untenable that this project should be held up for that period.

Further, the motion calls on the Government to withdraw the plans from the Public Works Standing Committee. I am reliably informed that the Public Works Standing Committee will report to us this afternoon; I would have thought that would set at nullity at least that part of the motion. In rejecting the motion, I give this commitment: given that the Public Works Standing Committee will report this afternoon and given that the select committee had already received some evidence from my department in relation to this matter, I am prepared to continue to work with the select committee to ensure that it has every opportunity to examine this matter, provided that the select committee is prepared to schedule itself so that it gives early consideration to this matter and the hearings of the select committee are not put off until July, August or thereabouts next year.

I think this is a perfectly supportable situation. The Government would not proceed with the project, notwithstanding whatever recommendation comes down this afternoon from the select committee, until such time as there had been some reasonable examination of the matter by the select committee. However, at the same time, the Government would ask that the select committee be not unreasonable in the time that it allocates to this matter. I urge members to reject the motion.

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

BERRI BRIDGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House believes that the first priority for a bridge across the Murray River should be at Berri, in accordance with the undertaking of the Tonkin Government in 1981, and condemns the Premier in abandoning this commitment by diverting funds allocated for the Berri bridge to other projects and by committing funds to a bridge between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island, thus dishonouring his promise made on coming to Government that the next bridge to be built over the Murray River would be at Berri.

(Continued from 21 November. Page 2209.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): When I last spoke in this debate on 21 November, it is apparent from *Hansard* that I finished with the words 'the mind boggles'; a week has elapsed, and my mind is still boggled at this motion. Last week I expressed some sympathy for the member for Chaffey in regard to his wanting to have a bridge over the Murray at Berri. He put forward the argument that because the Tonkin Government had earmarked such a bridge which was to be built with bicentennial money, this was because it negotiated with developers to build a bridge to Hindmarsh Island, was reneging on a previous Government's commitment—one which we did follow through when we came

into Government, subject to bicentennial money being available. Therefore, he said that we were doing the wrong thing.

The bridge to Hindmarsh Island is to be built in conjunction with the private sector. However, the private sector has yet to indicate that it would support the Government in the construction of a bridge at Berri. The cost savings in relation to the operation of the ferry at Hindmarsh Island would be \$350 000 a year, but there would be only minimal savings at Berri. If we considered creating two bridges, involving the fancy \$30 million version, we would have—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: No, I am referring to two projects. That goes to show that the local member, who has been party to what the Department of Road Transport has on its books and knows more about the Murray River in relation to his constituency than I will ever know, chooses to act slightly foolishly. I have a bit more time for the member for Chaffey than that. The member for Murray-Mallee is stupid all the time, the member for Chaffey only occasionally. I will summarise briefly. At Goolwa, we are faced with an expenditure of \$3 million of taxpayers' money and it will save ferry operation expenses of \$350 000 per year for ever and a day. That on its own, irrespective of the many benefits of a bridge, represents excellent value and investment for this State. However, the same cannot be said for Berri, where the operating costs of the two ferries are of a minor proportion when compared with the capital cost of possibly \$20 million or \$30 million. This level of funding is simply not available in these difficult economic times.

Quite correctly, the Department of Road Transport must give its first priority to maintaining the State's road network assets, and only very limited funding is available for improvements. Construction of a bridge at Berri would require such a massive allocation of funds that many more urgent and economically justified projects now scheduled would have to be abandoned or delayed. No member of the House would want that. On behalf of the Government, I deeply regret that the Government is just not in a position to give any commitment towards a starting date of a bridge at Berri.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This motion calls on the Premier to honour the undertaking he gave on coming to government that the next bridge built across the Murray River would be built at Berri. What the member for Napier has said in relation to the cost benefit ratio concerning a bridge at Berri is absolute garbage. Information contained in the Highways Department report of 1981 clearly indicates that the cost benefit ratio, if the existing causeway were kept, would be 1.2:1, which is an extremely good cost benefit ratio. Not too many capital works programs have a cost benefit ratio such as that.

For the member for Napier to say last week, when referring to the Berri bridge proposal, that it would cost taxpayers \$30 million with no return at all is absolute garbage. It does not have to be built with a causeway. The existing causeway has been out of use for only 21 weeks in the past 25 years, so the business operations of the people of South Australia would have had the benefit of that bridge for 24.5 years out of the past 25 years. With respect to the cost benefit ratio alone, it is an extremely worthwhile project and one of immense economic value to South Australia. It is just unfortunate that the site does not happen to be in the metropolitan area. If it were, the bridge would have been built long ago.

I remind the House that the Premier gave an undertaking to local government and the people of the Riverland on coming to government, when he withdrew the funding from the Berri bridge project, that the next bridge over the Murray would be built at Berri. Part of the reason why South Australia is in the present economic mess is that priorities are not being based on the economic value to South Australia. The Riverland contributes an estimated \$500 million annually to the economy of South Australia.

That would be significantly enhanced by the construction of a bridge at Berri, and that is confirmed by the Highways Department report, which clearly indicates that, if the bridge were built using the existing causeway, there would be a cost benefit ratio of 1.2:1. On that basis alone, and in the interests of the economy of South Australia and the contribution that the Riverland is making to that economy, I urge all members to support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr D.S. Baker. **No**—Mr L.M.F. Arnold.

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

Amendment thus negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 1.1 to 2 p.m.]

PETITION: SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 105 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain surgical and obstetric services at the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

PETITION: BLACKWOOD AMBULANCE SERVICE

A petition signed by 153 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to close the Blackwood ambulance service and support volunteer involvement in the ambulance service was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING

A petition signed by 64 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: AGE OF CRIMINAL LIABILITY

A petition signed by seven residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to lower to

16 years the age at which in criminal matters a person is treated as an adult was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution was presented by the Hon. T.H. Hemmings.

Petition received.

PETITION: INGLE HEIGHTS CAMPUS

A petition signed by 49 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to amalgamate the North Ingle Primary School and the Ingle Heights School on the Ingle Heights campus was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUVENILE JUSTICE

A petition signed by 323 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the structure of the juvenile justice system and increase the penalties for juvenile crime was presented by Mr Such.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

POLICE RESOURCES

In reply to Mrs KOTZ (Newland) 19 November.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In reply to Mrs Kotz's question asked on 19 November 1991 concerning police resources, I offer the following information. A report was heard on commercial radio that there was to be a demonstration on the closing of the Modbury Hospital domiciliary care unit involving 700 people on 5 November 1991. Upon hearing of the report, the Officer-in-Charge of Tea Tree Gully subdivision caused one supervisory and a general patrol to be tasked to the hospital to assess the situation, at about 1100 hours on that date.

On arrival the patrols found 10 elderly demonstrators waiting whilst a petition with 700 signatures thereon was being presented to hospital administrators by the honourable member for Newland. The supervisor spoke briefly to the demonstrators and then both patrols resumed normal activities. Police presence at the minor incident had minimal impact on patrol resources as patrol members were in radio contact in case of priority redeployment, and another general patrol was available within the subdivision.

SECURITY INDUSTRY

In reply to Mr QUIRKE (Playford) 17 October.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In reply to the honourable member's question asked of the Minister representing the

Minister of Consumer Affairs on 17 October 1991 concerning the security industry, I offer the following information on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and myself as the Minister responsible for the South Australian Police Department. The Minister of Consumer Affairs has advised that the security industry is regulated by the Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986. There is provision under section 16 (1) of the Act to investigate complaints against a licensee to determine whether proper cause exists for disciplinary action against that person.

The company named by the honourable member is a registered business and one of the owners holds a licence under the Act with the endorsements of security agent and security alarm agent. The person named by the honourable member, Richard Flanagan, is licensed under the Act and it is understood he is employed by Intrepid Security. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will investigate the matter to determine whether grounds exist for disciplinary action to be taken in the Commercial Tribunal.

The South Australian Police Department has no reports of fraud regarding the issue of valueless cheques by Intrepid Security. As to the alleged assault on Mr Price, police have reported Richard Flanagan for common assault and the matter is currently undergoing adjudication at Port Adelaide prosecution branch.

NORTHERN DISTRICTS STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

In reply to Mrs KOTZ (Newland) 30 October.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In reply to Mrs D. Kotz's question asked on 30 October 1991 concerning the Northern Districts State Emergency Service, I offer the following information. The Northern Districts State Emergency Service (SES) unit provides services to the northern council areas of Salisbury, Gawler, Munno Para and Elizabeth. It is one of the largest State Emergency Service units in South Australia. The South Australian Police Department has been able to assist the Northern Districts SES unit with rent-free accommodation at the former Salisbury Police Station located in Ann Street, Salisbury, for some 10 years.

This arrangement has always been on the understanding that the unit's continued use of the facilities would be subject to Police Department requirements. For some time the unit has been aware that the need to relocate to other premises would be required. The South Australian Police Department is currently involved in the process of planning for a cooperative venture with the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education utilising the property owned by both departments between Ann Street, Mary Street and Wiltshire Street at Salisbury.

As part of the staging process for the new development works, there is a need for the use of the former Salisbury Police Station commencing in January 1992. The responsibility for the provision of accommodation for SES units rests with the relevant local council. (In the case of the Northern Districts SES, the four councils mentioned above are serviced by the unit). The State Government sponsors the State Emergency Service on a dollar for dollar basis to a maximum of \$5 000 per council. The Federal Government provides a limited amount of equipment through the Natural Disaster Organisation equipment support program and may also provide a subsidy to a maximum of \$20 000 in support of the establishment of an emergency service headquarters. This funding is, however, made available only with the support and under the umbrella of local government.

The assistance of the Northern Adelaide Development Board was sought by the councils in identifying new accommodation. In this regard, the Property Manager of the South Australian Police Department wrote to the Northern Adelaide Development Board on 27 August 1991 advising of the requirement for the Northern Districts State Emergency Service unit to vacate the former Salisbury Police Station property by 31 December 1991.

The Northern District State Emergency Service (formerly the Civil Defence Organisation) was established in the northern suburbs in 1966. It was established at the request of the local government authorities in that region. It is to be hoped that after many years of invaluable service to the northern districts both the local councils and the Northern Adelaide Development Board will continue to ensure that the support, so necessary for this important service, will continue to be provided.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On 8 August I advised the House of the Government's response to the recommendations of the Government Management Board report into the operations of the State Government Insurance Commission. I announced the formation of a working group to review and assess the recommendations of the report and to monitor their implementation. In relation to any matters that required amendment to the SGIC Act, I advised that the Government would move that the legislation be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Assembly. It is appropriate that I report to the House on the progress that has been made with these matters.

The working group was formed shortly after my statement to the House. The group's first task was to address concerns that had been raised by the Auditor-General with regard to the legal position of inter-fund transactions. The Government considered it highly undesirable that there should be continuing uncertainty about inter-fund dealings and transactions and about the manner in which the effects of those dealings and transactions might be dealt with in the future. Accordingly I:

wrote to the Auditor-General advising him of my intention to include in the proposed amendments to the SGIC Act a provision that would validate all past inter-fund transactions and dealings;

authorised the working group to investigate the consequences of past inter-fund transactions and dealings with a view to determining if any particular part of SGIC's operations had been materially disadvantaged.

The working group pointed out that it would be inconsistent with the concept of validating past inter-fund transactions and dealings subsequently to compensate one part of SGIC's operations at the expense of another. If investigations revealed that certain parts of SGIC's operations should be compensated for the effects of past inter-fund dealings and transactions any adjustment should take the form of an injection of capital by the Government. I accepted this advice and wrote to the Auditor-General on 21 August 1991 indicating the proposed action by the Government. Reference was made to my letter in the Auditor-General's Report on SGIC's accounts for 1990-91. The overall issue of the extent to which SGIC should be capitalised is subject to separate consideration and ongoing discussion between SGIC and the Treasury.

On 16 September I wrote to the members of the working group asking them to provide further advice on 14 of the recommendations of the Government Management Board review. I refer members to the attachment to my statement of 8 August for the particular matters to be addressed by the working group. In addition and as a first priority I asked the group to report on the consequences of inter-fund transactions and dealings (in accordance with my undertaking to the Auditor-General) and to comment on proposed amendments to the SGIC Act including those referred to in the Government Management Board review.

The working group considered a number of proposals prepared by Treasury and SGIC for amendments to the Act and work has commenced on the drafting of a Bill. In the opinion of Parliamentary Counsel, the proposed changes require a comprehensive reworking of the Act. The proposed legislation will introduce significant changes to the framework in which SGIC operates. The Government will therefore introduce the Bill when Parliament resumes in the new year. An opportunity needs to be provided for further consultation, which has been requested by the working group and other interested parties. When the legislation is introduced the Government intends to follow the procedure already announced by moving that it be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Assembly for further consideration.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia—Report, 1990.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Applications to Lease—13 November 1991.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenihan)—
Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust—Report, 1990-91.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In the Parliament last Thursday the member for Bright made serious allegations of criminal activities surrounding the conduct of this year's year 12 public examinations and asked me to investigate the evidence in his possession which had caused him to raise this matter. Further, he asked that 'I take action to ensure no honest students are disadvantaged'. I have received a report on this matter from the Director of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia who along with the police conducted investigations into this matter. The Director has interviewed the Registrar and the Chief Examiner in Mathematics and made other inquiries, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary is satisfied that there was no breach of security.

The Acting Police Commissioner has advised that statements were taken from the Registrar and the member for Bright. However, the police were unable to obtain a statement from any person whom the member for Bright alleged was concerned about this matter. The police are therefore unable to take any further action. It must be concluded that

the honourable member's allegations are without foundation. As I said in the House last week, the press was advised of this matter before it was raised in the House.

The public of South Australia deserve an explanation from the member for Bright and, in particular, the thousands of students, their parents and their teachers, and the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia who were distressed and maligned by the allegations of criminal behaviour in the conduct of the year 12 exams. To raise this issue in the middle of the examination period on the basis of the evidence that has now been revealed is irresponsible in the extreme and deserves condemnation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: On Tuesday of this week the member for Hayward raised allegations of theft by officers of the MFS from the site of a fire at the Hove Mitre 10 hardware store. The member for Hayward first raised these allegations privately, allowing the police to at least commence an investigation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am advised that the police interviewed a number of persons including the honourable member and subsequently advised him of the result of their investigation in that they could find no evidence to support his specific allegations thus far. Since answering the honourable member's question on Tuesday, the Deputy Commissioner of Police has informed me that further information has been received and that further investigations are now being conducted.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

COMPUTING SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park) laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Accounts, together with minutes of evidence:

Computing Systems Management.

Ordered that report be printed.

CAVAN JUVENILE SECURE CENTRE

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

Juvenile Secure Centre at Cavan.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier concede that his promise to schools that 'my Gov-

ernment has clearly stated that there will be no school closures which do not have the support of the local community', is not worth the paper it is written on? I have a copy of a letter the Premier wrote to students of Croydon Primary School on 3 October 1991 which made the promise of no school closures if local community support existed.

In recent weeks there has been sustained local community opposition against the Government decision to close Seaton North Primary School. Over 90 per cent of parents at the school withdrew their students for a one-day strike as a sign of opposition to the closure. Hundreds of parents and school supporters have signed petitions and attended protest meetings against the school closure. I also have a copy of a fax from parents to the member for Albert Park which informs him that a public meeting on Tuesday night passed a unanimous vote of no confidence in his ability to represent his local community.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader and the Deputy Leader are out of order. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the Leader for his question and for his rare interest in education and what is going on in schools in this State. The correspondence to which the honourable member refers contains words used not only in that correspondence but in a press release put out earlier this year by the Education Department about the reorganisation and renewal of schools in the western suburbs of Adelaide. The whole tenor of the Education Department's review of the schools in recent years has been community involvement in the decisions that are taken. With respect to the western suburbs, there has been an ongoing review involving school communities and the broader community for over 12 months. It is disappointing that, when a decision is finally taken, people who remained silent for all that time come out of the woodwork, including people who hold—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: —responsible positions in the community. The Leader's question confirms that there is a group of people who are trying to politicise these decisions rather than concentrating on the best opportunities that we can provide young people attending schools with declining enrolments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Chair cannot hear any of the Minister's reply. If Opposition members want to hear his answer, I suggest they remain silent.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The schools to which the honourable member refers have had a substantial decline in enrolment to the extent at which the department is concerned that it cannot continue to maintain an adequate curriculum standard. It is anticipated that next year one of the schools will have only 30 or 40 students. If the Leader, echoed by the member for Adelaide, is saying that that school should remain open for those 30 or 40 students, that is a very narrow view of what community support means.

The honourable member referred to strike action at a school. First, I think one must take into account the views of those families who have decided to go to other schools in the area and not attend that school, and also the views of the high school that adjoins this particular school where resounding decisions have been taken to close the primary school and amalgamate the campuses to provide enhanced opportunities for exactly that same student population. We are trying to improve the facilities and curriculum oppor-

tunities for that same group of children. There is no diminution of education effort in that school. There is no closure of a school facility. In fact, there is a reordering of that school facility.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. If the member for Adelaide and the Premier wish to continue their conversation, I suggest that they do not do it in the Chamber. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: One needs to look at the nature of community support and the consultation processes that have occurred, and the indications of support for the decisions that we are taking. They are responsible decisions taken in the best interests of students not just for now, next year or the year after but for the next decade or so. That is a fundamental responsibility from which we do not shirk, and it is certainly not deserving of the cheap politics the Opposition is playing in this matter.

RADIO STATION 5AA

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House of details about the current performance of the Totalizer Agency Board owned Radio Station 5AA? Over the years there has been considerable criticism about the way the station has operated.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to respond to the honourable member's question, particularly since the return which was part of the annual report of the TAB cites the successful year that Radio Station 5AA actually put in. As the honourable member said, there has been considerable criticism—certainly from the other side of the Chamber—about the overall performance of this radio station and whether or not the Government should recommend, through the TAB, that it be sold. The licence holder is Festival City Broadcasters, and it is very pleasing to announce that last year to 30 June 1991 it achieved an operating profit of \$130 000. That was a very successful year compared with the previous year's operations.

I have recently received advice about its anticipated returns for the current financial year, and it is expected that it will return an operating profit of about \$500 000 this financial year. I think that that is very pleasing. That is good news not only for the station and the TAB but for the community as a whole because it still continues to provide a very important and basic service for those people in the community who are interested in the racing codes. I think that fundamental service is part of the reason the racing codes have, to some degree, been able to stave off any adverse effects caused by the recession.

For the interest of members and for the record, a rating of 15 was achieved by 5AA, and that is exceptional when one considers that a little over three years ago the station was rating around 3.1 and 4. It is important to note that audience support is not only for the racing segments but goes right across the hours that the station is on the air. Ray Fewings deserves special mention. His important morning shift is the best rating program in Adelaide in that time slot. I pass on my congratulations to him, as I am sure other members will, for his success.

The 5AA Sports Show with Ken Cunningham and David Hookes continues to have a strong following and has a high rating, as does the late night program with Bob Francis. I think there is very significant support for all 5AA programs. We should not forget that 5AA, as its charter sets out, provides a racing program through Mark Parton on Saturday afternoon. Not only does he get the support of investors but also, it appears, many people listen to the program for

what it offers—entertainment. That is very significant. The member for Bragg, who on many occasions in past years has called on the Government to initiate a sale, should retract his statements and support 5AA and the service it provides, because I expect that it will continue to turn in a good profit, to perform and to provide the services that are so fundamental to our racing industry in this State.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer, as Minister responsible for the SGIC, give an assurance that no Commonwealth sales tax has been avoided in respect of SGIC employees who are provided with cars for their private use as a non-salary benefit? The sixty-sixth report of the Public Accounts Committee indicates that 161 cars are provided to SGIC employees as a non-salary benefit for their private use. The Crown Solicitor's advice to the committee was that, for SGIC to legally claim a sales tax exemption for such vehicles, they must be used significantly for official purposes. I have been informed that most do not meet this test, and that suggests that this is another example of a Government tax avoidance scam.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The usual gratuitous comment at the end of that question indicates that it was not asked for any serious purpose but just to try to do a little political point scoring, and it should be treated with contempt.

CERVICAL CANCER

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health inform the House whether he has any information on the national screening program for cervical cancer and on the progress of the program in South Australia? I understand that the Federal Health Minister yesterday launched a handbook to assist doctors in the prevention of cervical cancer.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is the case, and I have the booklet with me. Although under Standing Orders I cannot display it, I can make it available to any members who would like a copy. The feeling is that a good deal more can be done at the GP level for screening for this disease, which is responsible for an unacceptably high level of deaths in the community amongst women.

The booklet is aimed at encouraging general practitioners to stress to women the importance of regular pap smears, and I would hope that it would be widely read. It has been distributed to about 17 000 members of the profession, and I would imagine that it would get a good response indeed. It is part of an ongoing program in relation to specific forms of cancer, and members would be aware of the programs that have been launched in recent years in relation to melanomas and other forms of cancer. It also illustrates the importance of specific programs related to targeted populations, such as women. I am aware of some sort of campaign in some parts of Australia at present in opposition to a specific women's health thrust. I find that strange, particularly in view of the prevalence of a disease such as cervical cancer because, after all, we have not lost a bloke from it yet.

GOVERNMENT ASSETS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): What plans does the Treasurer have, for tax avoidance purposes, to sell to a third party trust and lease back State utilities such as reservoirs, street

stobie poles, school classrooms, public hospitals, Housing Trust houses, metropolitan gas mains, the Port Adelaide wharves, the Festival Theatre, State roads, the Supreme Court, the Bolivar treatment works and Colonel Light's statue? What reaction does he expect from the Australian Taxation Office and the Federal Treasurer when he enters into any of these arrangements?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a pretty pathetic question. It ignores the discussion that has been held in this House over the past couple of weeks. It ignores the practice of Governments and instrumentalities, both Commonwealth and State, for a number of years. It ignores the practice of a previous Liberal Government, of which a number of the honourable member's colleagues were members, and it ignores the law of the land. Any structured financing arrangements that will, within the law of the land, provide benefits to South Australians will be sought by this Government, and I would hope that any Government in the future would similarly seek such advantages on behalf of its citizens.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport request the Department of Road Transport to, first, install turn right arrows at the intersection of Bower Road and Bartley Terrace, Semaphore Park, for eastbound traffic turning into Bartley Terrace and, secondly, install guard rails in front of residents' units at this location? Last Friday I was approached by a Semaphore Park resident who is very concerned about the number of accidents that have occurred at this intersection. My constituent pointed out that three people were seriously injured at that intersection last Friday. My constituent is also fearful that a death may occur if turn right arrows are not installed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answer to the honourable member's question is 'No'. The Department of Road Transport has advised me that a turn light is not warranted for eastbound traffic turning right into Bartley Terrace, the reason being the very low number of right turn accidents—only six since the signals were installed on 29 September 1988. On any scale of priorities for our intersections given the number of accidents at them, I can assure the member for Albert Park that this one has a low priority compared with others. Also, there would be considerably increased delays for all vehicles using that intersection, and that, I am sure given the very low accident rate, would not endear a right turn light for eastbound traffic to those motorists. There would also have to be additional parking bans. The honourable member would know that, when implemented near commercial premises, parking bans inevitably bring a very strong reaction. Constant representations are made to me by members on both sides of the House to remove parking restrictions around commercial premises.

The second part of the honourable member's question related to guard rails. Guard railing is designed primarily for open road conditions and is effective only when struck at a low angle. It requires a considerable lean to develop its strength, and it is not usually effective around intersections in built-up areas. That is why we do not see any installed. In these conditions, a short length may be struck at a high angle with the risk of tearing and penetrating a vehicle. Guard rails are designed for a specific purpose on the open road and are not to be used as a crash barrier in the metropolitan area.

The Department of Road Transport will obviously maintain a watching brief on this intersection, as it does on all

intersections. I certainly understand the concern of the member for Albert Park and the representations he has had from his constituents. I trust that the honourable member will explain to his constituents the reasons why the Department of Road Transport at this stage, given the volume of traffic that uses that intersection, is not prepared to make modifications which will really not assist but will hinder the traffic without necessarily making the intersection one iota safer.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on further questions, I wish to advise that questions otherwise directed to the Minister of Agriculture will be taken by the Deputy Premier and any questions for the Minister of Technical and Further Education will be taken by the Minister of Education.

SHARK FISHING

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Minister of Marine and Harbors bring the House up to date on the program he has initiated to prevent shark fishing from metropolitan jetties and to deter the use of practices to attract sharks, which create a danger to swimming and recreational water sports in the gulf? I have noticed early reports of shark sightings this summer off our metropolitan beaches and, in particular, off the Somerton Park beach, in my electorate. Therefore, I was shocked to be told that four amateur fishermen have again been dumping large quantities of minced offal and blood from the Brighton jetty into the ocean to attract sharks. This report has come to me at a time of constant sightings of sharks, including the notorious white pointers, off Australia's metropolitan beaches. When this matter was last drawn to the Minister's attention, he promised to take action. If he did so, it seems at the very best to have been ineffectual.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the Minister, it appears to the Chair that that question would be better directed to the Minister of Fisheries, unless it is a matter of pollution of the ocean.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My question refers specifically to a matter concerning jetties and wharves, and I believe that is the rightful province of Marine and Harbors.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On behalf of my colleague the Minister of Fisheries, I think it is appropriate that I respond at this stage, because this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Fisheries. When I was Minister of Fisheries I introduced an additional limit with regard to burleying and also the limit, which I think from memory was three kilometres, within which professional fishermen could go inshore. I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Fisheries would be more than happy to respond to the honourable member's question, and that he will ask his inspectors to take up the matter immediately, if they have not already done so.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport reveal the impact of the GST on the racing industry?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to respond to the honourable member's question, because it is important

in terms of the impact that will occur on the racing industry. I note with interest that the member for Alexandra was at the races on Saturday handing out a leaflet to the community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: —indicating that the GST will have no impact at all on the industry. Having had a very close look at this matter, I would like to say that it will have a significant impact—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well you have never had problems with the truth, have you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is very important to note that the GST will have a very serious impact on the racing industry. Although Dr Hewson has proclaimed loudly that the GST will not have any impact on gambling investments, one must look behind what happens in the industry. It is important to look at the breeders and at the bloodstock industry as a whole because the GST will impact significantly on the bloodstock industry. It will be a major imposition on the whole industry. Let me run through those areas that will be affected.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, members opposite may not like this, but they are the ones who will have to go out and sell it. I will enjoy watching with interest—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Morphett is carrying on. He knows how it will impact, because he probably knows a little more about the racing industry than Dr Hewson, who appears to know very little indeed. Look at the battering that the racing industry is in for! Concerns have already been expressed to me by people involved in that industry. It is a very significant industry in this State; in fact, it is the third largest. The GST will impact on the racing industry in the following ways. For example, the GST will apply to training fees, veterinary fees, farriers fees, float fees, agistment fees, nomination fees, acceptance fees and all service fees. If we look at it from the point of view of the industry, that 15 per cent will place a massive impost on owners. How many owners will be able to survive that 15 per cent tax?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Leader laughs about this, Mr Speaker. I will be very interested to see a deputation of owners, trainers and jockeys come to see him about what this will mean to them as an industry and what impact it will have. They are very concerned about the implications of the GST. Many of these people are struggling—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You'll be waving goodbye, because you won't be getting many votes. You probably don't remember which electorate you come from.

It will be very serious and will push people out of the industry. If we add 15 per cent consumption tax on admittance fees for individuals; 15 per cent on membership fees; 15 per cent on subscriptions; 15 per cent on food and beverages on-course; 15 per cent on daily car parking, this impost on the industry will be so significant that it will force people out and force punters off the course. So, the industry is most concerned.

We are concerned, too, because the industry is significant in this State, although members may laugh. I note that they have laughed about this, but the laugh will be on them. When members opposite come to face the industry, the concern of members of that industry will be expressed in

many ways. I expect a significant backing down by members on the other side and by the Federal Opposition in relation to the impost of this tax on the industry.

STATE BANK

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Has the Treasurer held any discussions with the Federal Government concerning the possible need to sell the State Bank or to seek outside capital and, if so, why has he continued to oppose a rational debate on the privatisation of the bank in his public statements? The Treasurer has repeatedly opposed in public Liberal Party policy to privatise the State Bank by a share float designed to maximise the participation of employees and South Australians. All political Parties involved in the Federal banking inquiry have now supported a share float. I am informed that the Premier has been involved in high level discussions which canvassed the possible need to sell or inject outside capital into the bank.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The bank's priority at the moment is to get its affairs in order, to get back to profitability and to put itself into a strong position and start to repay some of the indemnity money provided by the State to support its operations. It does not need the distraction of talk of selling or of privatising in that environment. That was made quite clear by the Chairman of the bank. The honourable member embarrasses the Leader of the Opposition in raising this. He will recall that the Chairman of the bank made it quite clear that what I am saying is consistent with his views in the current climate.

As to the concept that all the problems of the bank can be miraculously solved by some sort of sale, in what way can that occur? Is it by leaving the non-performing assets or loans still on the public bill? Is that the sort of thing the honourable member is suggesting? It is really distracting, and it is irrelevant to the current task of the bank.

URBAN CONSOLIDATION

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate whether the Government will initiate additional urban consolidation projects, similar to the new Brompton housing exposition, on the former Rowley Park Speedway site?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his continued interest in the concept of re-urbanisation and similar programs. We have received from the Commonwealth Government, under the Housing Development Program for 1991-92, a grant of \$185 000, which will go towards a number of things. First, it will go towards three projects: two will be medium density projects and one will be a slightly higher density project looking at apartments. The idea is based upon the Bowden-Brompton model project.

It has been enormously successful in terms of the aims of the program, which were to take a site in an urban area that could be used much more effectively for medium density housing and to work with the private sector and private industry to provide an exhibition village for people to look at what medium density really means. If I had one small concern about the program it is that I would like to have seen some lower cost housing in the Bowden/Brompton program. I am very hopeful that the three programs to which I have referred, and for which the \$185 000 will go in part, will in fact concentrate on not only slightly more

upmarket medium density housing but also will look at more affordable and lower cost housing.

They are vitally important pilot programs, if we are to move forward as a community to meet the very important objective of reurbanisation of much of our areas that involve the electorates of almost every member of this House (probably with the exception of some of the country members). It is an important program. I am delighted to inform the Parliament that we have received this grant and that some of it will be spent in looking at the promotion of the Green Street joint venture—a Government industrial body looking at the whole concept of reurbanisation and creating better environments in which people can live.

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Treasurer give an assurance that there is no indication that the State Bank Group's losses could exceed \$2 200 million?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure what the question means as it has no explanation about what the member had in mind in phrasing the question. As far as the State Bank and its indemnity is concerned, the matter has been comprehensively covered in statements made by me, the Chairman and the board in its report, and the outlook has been canvassed in that context. I have nothing more to add to what has already been said.

ROAD TOLL CAMPAIGN

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Emergency Services indicate what action the police are contemplating to ensure, as far as possible, that the achievements in reducing the road toll this year are not reversed during the traditionally more risky Christmas/New Year holiday period?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. As members are probably aware, the police indicated a few days ago that they would be conducting a concerted road safety campaign over the next three weekends. The reason for such is that these pre-Christmas weekends are proven high risk periods for road fatalities and injuries. While all road laws will be vigorously policed, the main thrust of this campaign will be to deter and detect drink driving, excessive speed and failure to use seat belts or child restraints. Each of these weekend campaigns will start at 7 a.m. on the Friday and will continue until 7 a.m. on the following Monday.

Just in case there are still some cynics around who believe these campaigns have more to do with revenue-raising than road safety, let me remind them of the fatalities which have occurred on these weekends in the past six years. In the case of the forthcoming weekend, a total of 14 people have died on the corresponding weekends since 1985. In the case of the second weekend (6 to 8 December), 31 people have lost their lives since 1986. In the case of the third weekend (13 to 15 December), the death toll since 1985 totals 26. That's a grand total of 71 road deaths in this cluster of pre-Christmas weekends in just the past six years. I fully endorse the police call for road users to show commonsense by not driving if they have been drinking, to obey the speed limits and to ensure that they and their passengers are 'buckled up' before starting any journey.

These campaigns will be State-wide and will make full use of breath testing and speed detection equipment and additional special patrol units. The campaigns are not being

sprung on an unsuspecting public. The police have given ample warning and have been greatly assisted by the media in getting the message across. I will quote from a Channel 10 news item of a week or so ago which encapsulates it very well. It said:

Doctors at the Royal Adelaide Hospital say that motorists should never complain about the growing presence of speed cameras and breathalysers on our roads. They claim that the devices are not only saving lives but they are contributing to huge savings in our health budget. With South Australia heading towards its lowest road toll in years, hospitals are treating far fewer injuries.

As an honourable member opposite indicated, it also contributes to reductions in insurance, the need to buy second-hand parts, and so on. I hope all members will join with me in urging motorists to exercise extreme care during the next three weekends particularly and in the period leading up to Christmas.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Further to the Treasurer's statement earlier this afternoon, when will SGIC's official annual report be made available to members? Will it include estimates of the amount of capital the Government has been advised by the Heard committee may be needed to cover both illegal interfund transactions and ongoing holding costs of \$520 million at 333 Collins Street, Melbourne? On 17 October the Treasurer told the House that the document released with the budget papers with the title 'SGIC annual report for the financial year 1990-91' and which contained misleading and incomplete information on directorships was not really the official SGIC annual report. He also said that 'the official record is still under preparation and further material will be involved in it'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That remains the case. The honourable member refers to financial matters. The reports presented by SGIC in relation to the past financial year are those that were provided at the time of the budget. I put SGIC, the State Bank and other institutions under a lot of pressure to ensure that those financial statements were ready so we could get a comprehensive picture of the State's finances at that time, but it did not constitute the official report of SGIC, which I understand is still being printed. It is overdue. It should have appeared before this, but I am told that it is to be presented shortly.

REBECCA STOYEL

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Education forward a message of congratulations and best wishes to Rebecca Stoyel, a young gymnast training at the Ascot Park Focus School for Gymnastics for only three years, who has been selected in second place in an elite Australian team of four girl gymnasts competing in Hong Kong in the 1991 Junior Pacific Gymnastics Championships?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention and that of the House. I am very proud of the Ascot Park Primary School and what it has achieved in the three years that it has had a gymnastics focus. The cooperation that we have received from the Gymnastics Association of South Australia and the South Australian Sports Institute is remarkable and I know that the young people who attend that school and who are able to participate to the fullest extent in the pursuit of their favoured sport and maintain very vigorous training

programs are also able to participate fully in the life of the school and maintain access to a full curriculum. There is not a conflict between school and sporting opportunities, as we see so often for very talented young sportspersons.

The program provided at the school is very important. The school has undertaken this trial on behalf of the education system in South Australia and we are watching very closely to see whether that program can be emulated successfully in other schools with respect to other sports that make great demands on young people. In speaking to the Principal of that school recently I understand that the whole school has benefited from the program.

I understand that the participation of those students at that school in so many other aspects of the life of the school has improved markedly as a result of that special focus. Indeed, it has been welcomed and strongly supported by the whole school community. There is something in this concept, I am sure, for the whole of the school and the entire school community. I am particularly delighted to see the success of Rebecca, and I will be pleased to convey to her the congratulations not only of the Education Department but of all members.

TENDER PROCEDURES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Premier further investigate the circumstances in which a company part owned by SAFA has won a multimillion dollar E & WS Department contract? In June I wrote separately to the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources seeking information about the awarding of a contract by the E & WS Department for the installation of a distributed control system at the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works. My representations followed concerns expressed to me that this contract had been awarded to interests linked with Enterprise Investments Limited, which is fully owned by SAFA.

Finally I received advice from the Minister of Water Resources by letter dated 1 October—more than three months after my letter to the Minister—that the contract had been awarded to Automation and Process Control Services Pty Ltd. My reply from the Premier took even longer. I have now received a letter dated 12 November, but that letter suggests there is no link between the Enterprise group and this contract. However, independent company searches reveal that Enterprise Investments holds 40 per cent of the company's equity and has granted the company a \$300 000 loan facility. Private sector companies involved in the provision of computer-controlled systems are seeking assurances that this contract is not another example of SA Inc. in action.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What examples has the honourable member got in mind, I would ask, or was that last remark yet another gratuitous little flick in order to indicate that what she is asking is really politically motivated, as I would suggest, rather than on the issue. If that is not the case, I would have thought that it would be better for her to have refrained from that. At this stage I cannot add anything to the response I gave to the honourable member, and I do not know that the Minister of Water Resources would be able to add anything either.

The way in which contracts are let by Government and Government departments follows all the appropriate procedures. Unless there is something more that the honourable member can add or wishes to raise, I am not sure what I should do about it. The fact that a company has any kind of public financial institution equity in it gives it no particular or specific advantages in a commercial environment.

It is in fact the case that, for a number of Government contracts, Government departments or agencies bid against the private sector. This is done and required under Federal road grants, for instance, where our Department of Road Transport is able, on occasions, by a competitive bid, to actually get an award or contract.

All those procedures have to be very open, appropriate and go through the ordinary tender requirements. From the information that I received following the honourable member's inquiry, I do not know what else I can add. If she has some further information or anything of relevance, I would invite her to write to me again, because Parliament will not be sitting, and I undertake to get a response.

MURRAY RIVER

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Water Resources aware that the Opposition has issued a statement claiming that the Government is not taking adequate action to guarantee the safety of water in the Murray River in South Australia from toxic algal bloom in the Darling River; and is this correct?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am aware. I must say I was quite amazed to see the date on the top of the statement issued by the shadow Minister, the member for Heysen; in fact, the date is today's date. This totally erroneous statement is as follows:

Despite successive questions in State Parliament yesterday from the Opposition, Minister Lenehan refused—

I find this amazing—

to give any indication of the specific moves she would make to prevent the anabaena bloom from getting into our water supplies, should it reach the Murray.

This amazing statement—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —is an untruth, as my colleague says. The statement continues:

The Minister failed to respond to my suggestion that the reservoirs need to be topped up by the River Murray water while it remains fresh . . .

It is the last resort of a desperate person to engender fear and scare in the absence of any kind of constructive contribution to a debate. I remind the honourable member, who came up to me in the House after I had made a personal explanation at the end of the grievance debate (and I added to the explanation that I had already given in Question Time), of what I said in that personal explanation, just in case he still does not understand it after my making it and my discussing it with him. I made clear that the toxic algal bloom was not moving, that it was stationary. I made clear that, even in the worst scenario that it did move, the water which contained the bloom could be separated off and stored in Lake Weatherall. I explained that on current flows—

Mr Lewis: Which lake?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Lake Weatherall.

Mr Lewis: That is not in the Murray.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The member for Murray-Mallee is interrupting the Minister, and that is not allowed under Standing Orders, and I ask him to behave.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I also indicated that the flow of water into Lake Weatherall was such that we could isolate this algal bloom for up to five years. I then went on to explain to the honourable member that the Menindee Lakes system could be brought into play—and indeed this was happening—so that we could completely isolate the two systems. Regarding the concept of topping up the reservoirs.

I point out that the reservoirs that feed both the Onkaparinga and the Torrens systems are now about 87 per cent full, compared with 72 per cent last year.

Obviously, one does not have to be an Einstein to work out that everything I have said in this House on a number of occasions, that is that we had adopted an economic model for pumping and that we had started that pumping during the winter months when the water was fresh, has now come to fruition. We have a total storage capacity of 81 per cent, but in those two systems we have about 87 per cent. I would have thought that that certainly would be seen as topping up. I did not need the honourable member to raise this matter with me. The department has been doing this since the middle of this year.

It would be quite irresponsible to have the reservoirs 100 per cent full at the end of the winter before the spring rains, because we would then waste any rain that came during the spring period, and it would spill over the top of the reservoirs. Given that it is extremely expensive to pump water from the Murray, with our computer modelling we have ensured that we have pumped to minimise the cost of electricity to the community, while at the same time ensuring that we have enough water in our reservoir systems if those late spring rains do not come and, indeed, when they do come, we will have enough excess capacity to be able to store that water within the reservoir system.

As I said yesterday, if the honourable member had any kind of integrity in this matter and was genuinely concerned about the state of our system, he would recognise, as I have said on a number of occasions, that I share that concern. I want to put on the record that I was the Minister in the Murray-Darling Commission and Council who raised the issue of our looking at nutrients and toxic algal bloom. My colleagues upstream now share my concerns, because finally they have had to come to terms with the problem. It was some 12 to 18 months ago that I put this item on the public agenda. I certainly put it through a presentation I made to the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council, highlighting the need to develop ongoing strategies to minimise the amount of nutrients that are coming into the Murray-Darling system.

I take this matter very seriously, and I will be delighted to see whether the Opposition supports the kinds of decisions we will all have to make to protect our water supplies in the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment area. It will be very interesting to see where the Opposition sits at that point when we come to take the hard decisions about protecting our water supply, rather than trying to engender fear and scare into the community of South Australia. I will be looking for support from the Opposition and, in particular, from the member for Heysen in this matter.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister of Health investigate the potential health risks to television camera operators caused by the Minister for Environment and Planning's shrill and lengthy answers to questions? I have been handed a petition signed by five of Adelaide's leading political reporters—Randall Ashbourne of Channel 7, Tom Menzies of Channel 9, Ron Kandelaars of ABC television, John Parrington of Channel 10, and Rex Jory of the *Advertiser*. The petition states:

Members of the media find the Minister for Environment and Planning's shrill response to questions, while erudite, a tad long, and an occupational health hazard to cameramen's hearing.

Accordingly, they pray that the House:

Will not ask the Environment Minister, Ms Lenehan, a single question for the remainder of the parliamentary year.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the media for being so involved—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide that any Minister may respond to a question when they believe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! —they have responsibility for it. A question directed to one Minister may be responded to by another, and that is very often the practice. If the Minister for Environment and Planning wishes to respond, she is quite within the Standing Orders. The honourable Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would like to thank the media. I am quite delighted, as the only woman Minister in this Chamber and, indeed, the first Labor woman Minister in this Chamber, to receive so much attention from the media. I thank the member for Heysen. I think it is a wonderful end of term prank, and I am quite delighted that obviously I have explained in—I forget the actual wording of the motion—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —an erudite way, some of the most exciting initiatives this Government has undertaken in the past few years. I am delighted that the Opposition has asked me some 25 questions in the 1990-91 session, so members opposite must be quite satisfied with the way in which I am performing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If I am causing the cameramen some problems, I would hate to think what the Opposition's interjections would be doing for their hearing. As Minister for Environment and Planning, I guess I do have to be concerned. It is quite a compliment that people have taken the time in their very busy work lives to get together and present a petition which actually singles me out as one of the Ministers who I suspect performs very well in their role and function in this Chamber.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member does not want me to continue. I thought that I had six more minutes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the shadow Minister felt it important enough to ask the question, surely he believes it important enough to hear the response. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is a shame that the petition could not be tabled, because it would have made very good reading in future years to have been able to look at this petition and speculate about it. I can only assume that the petition was either politically motivated—and I do not believe that it was—or it is a covert expression of the media's admiration of me. I thank the media for their admiration. I believe that I have a very positive and good working relationship with the media. The honourable member is going to give me the petition, which I am quite delighted to receive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that that is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will keep it as an expression of his admiration. I am delighted that it has been provided to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will not display material in the Chamber. The member for Heysen is out of order by crossing the Chamber with a document. The Minister is

very close to completing her response, and I ask her to draw her remarks to a close.

Mr BECKER: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Minister will resume her seat.

Mr BECKER: I ask you to confirm that Ministers and members should address the Chair and not the gallery.

The SPEAKER: The Chair upholds the point of order and asks the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to address you, Mr Speaker. I conclude my remarks by wishing all members of the media who signed this petition, other members of the media and my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber a very happy Christmas.

BETTER CITIES PROGRAM

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of the effect of the Federal Liberal Coalition's proposal to scrap the Better Cities Program?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that the Opposition will not want to know much about this, because the Federal Opposition has announced another of its secret packages dressed up to try to adjust its financial costings and income cuts in connection with its GST package. This is very important, because what the Federal Liberal Government has proposed will have a major impact on our programs of urban development in this State, particularly as it proposes to scrap the Better Cities Program. Such a proposal will have a very significant impact on urban infill and fringe areas where we are endeavouring to provide a comprehensive package of services attached to proposed developments.

The Better Cities Program is designed to reduce urban development costs, to improve urban land use including the use of Commonwealth land, to reduce the costs associated with traffic congestion and pollution, to improve urban planning, and to increase housing choice and affordability. That is what Dr Hewson is proposing to scrap, and I think that lacks real foresight; so much so that the old toecutter, from the Fraser years, Reg Withers, came out of the woodwork yesterday and is reported in yesterday's *Australian* as calling on the Opposition to amend its goods and services tax package to retain Labor's Better Cities Program. The last person on earth one would expect to announce support for the Better Cities Program has done so. He also condemned the plan to scrap the \$816 million initiative as short-sighted and added that Dr Hewson should accept that the program was in the national interest and above Party politics.

It will be interesting to see what the Opposition does about this package. We see it as providing some exciting opportunities in the way of development of urban and outer fringe regional areas. One simply must recall the Fraser years, when Federal outlays in urban planning were cut by 86 per cent. We are looking at a total cut in the whole Better Cities Program of \$816 million that would be deleted from the Federal budget. That will impact on us to the tune of \$70 million to \$80 million and would reduce our capacity for the development of our urban areas.

That is a very serious package, which has not been brought forward by the media in either a Federal or a State context. It is incumbent on me, as Minister of Housing and Construction in this State, to spell out very clearly the loss that will be incurred by the community of South Australia if Dr Hewson goes ahead. I call on those people who are inter-

ested in better city development to stand up and ask for this package to be removed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: During Question Time this afternoon, the member for Playford (Mr Quirke) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport whether he would reveal the impact of the GST on the racing industry. Among other things, the Minister told the House the following—incidentally, in my momentary absence on other parliamentary business:

I am delighted to respond to the honourable member's question, because it is important in terms of the impact that will occur on the racing industry. I note with interest that the member for Alexandra was at the races on Saturday, handing out a leaflet to the community.

Interjections followed—which you, Sir, quite rightly pointed out were out of order, and that sort of thing. However, the Minister on this occasion has seriously misled the Parliament.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Sir, on previous occasions you have ruled it out of order for people to make reference to others misleading the House, which is a slur on another member and, furthermore, you have ruled that personal explanations are used for the member to personally explain how he or she has been misrepresented, and not to level accusations against anyone else.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the member for Walsh is aware, certain concessions are made to the member for Alexandra because of some physical problems he has, and I note that over the years some have been given in his explanations. I do, however, draw to the honourable member's attention that personal explanations are to be used for personal explanation and that one cannot impute improper motives to other people in this House. I ask him to keep that in mind when making his personal explanation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your advice and assistance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I appreciate the assistance being volunteered from 10 different directions around the Chamber at the same time. I have been here for longer than most of you, so I know the rules. I appreciate your support, Mr Speaker, so I will ignore those other interjections. While he was seriously misleading this House this afternoon, I was personally insulted by the Minister. He said that I was at the races on Saturday, and I was not. I know it is disappointing, and I know that I love to go to the races but, in this instance, my constituency interfered with my sport and I was on the south coast at Port Elliot for almost the whole of Saturday, missing out, therefore, on the opportunity of being at the races—where otherwise I would have been.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member has explained the situation. The allegation was made and has been denied. One cannot debate a personal explanation. Again, I ask the honourable member to comply with Standing Orders.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Not only is that a matter of fact, but another matter of fact that is in conflict with the allegation made by the Minister about me this afternoon

was this: he said that what I was allegedly circulating—when I was not even there—was a matter of the alleged impact of the GST on the racing industry. Now, Sir, I have never seen, other than in today's *Hansard* report that I have obtained on what the Minister said, any reference anywhere—not even in Dr Hewson's papers—to the impact on the racing industry. The point that offended me personally—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been here for a long time and knows the Standing Orders as well as anybody. He knows that he cannot debate a personal explanation: it must be factual and to the point.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The facts are that the Minister misled the House and, in so doing, personally reflected on my integrity.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now becoming repetitive. I am coming close to withdrawing leave.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I will not test your patience on that anymore, Sir. The reference to the GST made in relation to my involvement was the alleged impact of the GST on gambling and not on racing. Therefore, the Minister was wrong again. I am offended personally because the Minister has taken the opportunity in this House—

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MOBILONG PRISON

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure the Chair that it is a personal explanation?

Mrs KOTZ: Of course, Sir.

Leave granted.

Mrs KOTZ: Prior to Question Time in this House yesterday the Minister of Housing and Construction made a statement about a question asked by me, which he alleges was inaccurate. My question related to why an Australian tenderer for razor wire was not selected for the project at Mobilong Prison. The Minister yesterday stated:

Some of the honourable member's facts in her statement following that question were not accurate.

He went on to say that because of those inaccuracies he believed that a detailed reply was warranted. I totally reject the Minister's allegation and suggest that his statement yesterday was a total sham of inaccuracies. The Minister went on to say that there was an inference that an inferior product had been selected. I believe that the industry will argue that the 430 product accepted by this Government was inferior—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been some levity today and some looseness in the application of the rules. However, personal explanations are clearly provided for under Standing Orders. All members should be aware that a personal explanation must be to the point and on the personal side rather than a matter for debate as to the quality of a product or otherwise.

Mrs KOTZ: The Minister suggested in his statement that I made an incorrect inference, but the Minister sidestepped the major inference in this case which was important, namely, that the product 430 was not the product called for in the tender, and an American firm was chosen to supply a product not made in Australia and outside the tender specification.

The SPEAKER: I refer members to Standing Orders and the section on personal explanations. The honourable member has given her personal explanation and I call on the member for Hayward. In so doing I draw his attention to the Standing Orders.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I seek leave to try to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is flippant about it, he will not get the call.

Mr BRINDAL: I hope I was not, Sir.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: On Tuesday last I asked the Minister for Emergency Services a question about the Metropolitan Fire Service. In view of the persistence of Channel 10 and the *Advertiser* and with the Minister's statement in the House today, I claim to have been misrepresented. In answering the question the Minister stated that the question was, 'a dreadful slur on the honest people in both the Police Force and the Metropolitan Fire Service.' If members study my question as recorded in *Hansard*, they will see that I made no allegations in this place regarding the police, nor indeed against any honest employee of the Metropolitan Fire Service. In his statement today, the Minister said that the police had, 'subsequently advised him of the result of their investigations in that they could find no evidence to support his specific allegations thus far'. I believe that that statement misrepresents the truth as far as I am concerned, and I therefore seek to explain that statement to the House and explain how I was misrepresented in it.

My interview with officers of the Police Force was in my electorate office on the Saturday morning after I raised the matter with the Internal Investigations Branch. While I was advised at that interview that there were problems with the investigation at that time, the investigation was still very much alive and continuing and not concluded as the Minister has alleged in this House that I had been told. In the weeks since, further information has indeed been received—as the Minister said in his statement today—and it is regrettable that the Minister did not keep himself informed on a continuing basis—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is beginning to debate the issue.

Mr BRINDAL: No, Sir, because the Minister used his lack of knowledge in today's statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has explained. I call the member for Bright. I remind the honourable member that Standing Order 108 defines what is a personal explanation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

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

Leave granted.

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister of Education in a ministerial statement today regarding security of examination papers knowingly misled this Parliament in a manner that I found particularly offensive. After correctly stating that—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Sir, I refer to the same point to which I referred earlier, namely, that it is not appropriate for members to use the phrase

'misleading the House' or say that another member 'misled the House'. That sort of allegation is the sort of thing that forms the basis of a no-confidence motion and such reference should not be made except by way of substantive motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On recollection, I uphold the point of order. I recall ruling it out of order previously and I draw members' attention to the previous ruling and the practice of this House whereby the use of the word 'misleading' in the opinion of the Chair is unparliamentary and is not acceptable.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, I seek your ruling because of the obvious difficulty that I and other new members in this place are having with personal explanations. I believe that Standing Orders provide that members who claim to be misrepresented in statements of fact may correct those statements of fact. I do not understand how and when that is done, but I do not believe that it is by way of personal explanation. On behalf of some of the newer members in this place, I seek your guidance at a later date on the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The use of words is clearly laid down in *Erskine May*. All members should be aware that some words are absolutely unacceptable to the Parliament as laid down by custom, tradition and Standing Orders and are not to be used. If one wishes to imply something, that is one thing. However, the word 'misleading' has been ruled out of order in this Parliament as being unparliamentary and cannot be used. I have difficulty understanding what the honourable member is trying to get at. A personal explanation is very clearly outlined under Standing Order 108. The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: With your advice in mind, Mr Speaker, I will rephrase my previous remark and state that I was offended by comments made by the Minister during his statement to this House. The Minister stated:

The Acting Police Commissioner has advised that statements were taken from the Registrar and the member for Bright. However, police were unable to obtain a statement from any person who the member for Bright alleged was concerned about this matter.

That is correct. However, the Minister then incorrectly stated, 'It must be concluded that the honourable member's allegations are without foundation.' That is completely untrue. After I asked my question in Parliament on this serious issue—the alleged sale of a Maths 1 exam paper—the Minister of Education chose to make it appear that I was asking the question for self-seeking publicity purposes. That is incorrect. However, by trivialising the issue in this way, the Minister of Education caused distress to my year 12 constituent who witnessed the alleged sale of the exam paper. My constituent subsequently sought legal advice.

The SPEAKER: Order! Distress to your constituent is not the purpose of a personal explanation. As I explained the other week, it is a personal explanation of an honourable member, not a constituent or any other member.

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister said that police were unable to take any further action. This explanation is important to highlight that his statement is incorrect.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is an explanation of the honourable member about the way that he feels he has been misrepresented by another member of Parliament. It has nothing to do with his constituent. It is the member directly concerned.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Sir. After taking legal advice, my constituent was told that she was not compelled to make a statement to the police. Because of this, the Minister said today that the police were unable to take any further

action. I find that offensive because the Minister has implied that I asked a question that is not correct. He implied that I have given information that is unable to be followed up.

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

Mr MATTHEW: I seek leave for an extension of time.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

An honourable member: No!

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, leave is denied.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Twice this afternoon in Question Time, Mr Speaker, you have drawn the attention of members to Standing Order 108, which deals specifically with what a member may or may not do when making a personal explanation. Without recapping your references in any great detail, I point out that you have said twice this afternoon that you have previously given a ruling in this House that the term 'mislead' was inappropriate in your view and could not be used by members. I understand that on 10 April 1990 you made specific reference by way of explanation to this House to what you would and would not accept in relation to personal explanations given by members. At no time of which I am aware, nor that I recall, have you made any reference whatsoever to the term 'mislead'.

I recall clearly that on another occasion you informed the Chamber by way of a Speaker's statement that you would not tolerate the use of the word 'lie' or 'lied' in reference to the utterances of members. That is a long-standing ruling that was made by your predecessors. I respect that. I have heard the term 'untruths' being uttered in this House. But your ruling with respect to 'mislead' is recent and is not set by precedent. I ask for clarification because, unless one can identify what is clearly a misleading matter as a misleading matter, we are playing with matters of fact. This afternoon, along with other members, I uttered the word 'mislead'—not in any discriminatory or nasty way but because it was considered to be a matter of fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! The ruling is that the term 'misleading' will not be accepted in this House because it imputes improper motives of another member, which is also a Standing Order. One may not impute an improper motive of any member of this House. An accusation that a member is misleading the House is a direct imputation of improper motive, and that is the basis of today's ruling.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That is today's ruling. It is not set by precedent.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am of the opinion that I have made that ruling previously, but I do not have a direct reference to it. In the opinion of the Chair, other than by substantive motion, a direct and specific reference to a member's misleading the House is an imputation on that member. It was exercised in this House earlier this year when the same point was made. Allegations can be made by substantive motion but not by direct imputation of improper motive by a member.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on another point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are two points of order before the Chair. The member for Murray-Mallee may concede to the member for Alexandra, so he can conclude his point of order, or would the member for Murray-Mallee like to go first?

Mr LEWIS: I did not know that I was here to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will resume his seat. I call upon the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I will not be in this place much longer so it does not matter much to me personally, but you have raised an important point, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member comes to see me so that we can sort it out.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I would appreciate that opportunity, but I want this matter clarified publicly. As I understand it, Mr Speaker, what you have said this afternoon is that, having been granted leave by the Chair and the House, an honourable member cannot proceed to use in a personal explanation the terms that you, Sir, have ruled out of order, but members can do so by substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not the Chair's ruling. The substantive motion has been set by precedent of this Parliament. A personal explanation does not give an honourable member extra rights or privileges to do something that cannot be done under the normal rules of debate in this place. Therefore, a personal explanation does not allow an honourable member to impute improper motives, which is the ruling that I have given. Therefore, no concession has been given to a member making a personal explanation. In fact, the rules of debate are constrained by the Standing Orders relating to personal explanations, which have been agreed to by every member of this House.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a further point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe that the Chair has explained it fully.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I do not accept that.

The SPEAKER: I have undertaken to discuss the matter with the honourable member outside the Chamber. This is debating time, but we could be here all day debating my ruling. I call the member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I make it plain that I was not reflecting on you, Sir, or seeking to usurp the proper respect that all members should have for your high office when I answered you a short time ago. However, I seek information, as I was at that time—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is there a point of order?

Mr LEWIS: There is. In circumstances where a member or Minister makes an incorrect statement—

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me clarify the position. I think that the honourable member is asking for a general Solomon-like statement. The Chair is not in a position to do that. The Chair is here to apply the rules that have been set by the House and by the customs of Parliament, and generalisation is not within the scope of the Speaker, in my opinion.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Orders are written in the general case. May I ask how an honourable member indicates that another honourable member or a Minister has misrepresented that member's statement or impugned that member? How does that honourable member identify that fact so it can be explained?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his point. I must repeat that the Chair is not here to make general statements. As a result of particular incidents or statements in this place to which members take umbrage or offence, or when something is against the rules that we have laid down, the Chair can make a ruling. It is not for the Chair to make a general ruling.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Last Friday I received a letter addressed to me at my electorate office, and it states:

Dear Sir, In reference to *Hansard* dated 29 October 1991, I read an article relating to overtime payments for the State Transport Authority. In this article I noted that both my name and badge number had been printed. On further reading it stated that my hours worked and the amount paid had also been printed. I personally take this as an invasion on my private and personal life.

I contacted Jennifer Cashmore on this matter as she was the one responsible for the article. She stated that as I am paid from public money any information relating to wages was of public interest. As I stated to her, I felt that by publishing my badge number and name, that she had placed me in an embarrassing situation in as much as it personally identified me. I feel that if I had done something wrong I would expect to be named, not simply for doing overtime.

In future, I believe that if this is going to happen that only the department concerned plus overtime worked should be published, not, I repeat, either badge numbers or names be published. I request the member Jennifer Cashmore be asked this question. When she was asked to disclose her and her husband's earnings she stated that the information was confidential and that she would not reveal this information. If this is so, why wasn't my information treated with the same rules as applied to her? Yours sincerely, Philip Curnow.

Because I did not know what was going on at the time this matter was raised, as I am not in the House all the time, I looked at the *Hansard* of 29 October (page 1487) and found that the member for Coles had made a speech about overtime payments—and I have no problem with that whatsoever. It is the honourable member's job to do that, and I accept that.

However, in that speech the member for Coles referred to an internal memo that had obviously been leaked to her. I find that rather abhorrent, but that is the practice of these modern times and again I accept it. In the table inserted in *Hansard* during the honourable member's speech 77 names of State Transport Authority employees were identified with their badge numbers and the overtime worked. If the member for Coles had wanted to make a point about excessive overtime, I would have thought that she would have deleted the names and the badge numbers (which are the direct means of identification).

I am not trying to curry favour with the member for Coles, but I happen to have supported her stance when the pecuniary interest legislation came in although her stance was overruled. I can assure the honourable member and the House—and this is not a put-up job; this letter did come to my office—that this particular State Transport Authority operator does feel that he has been unfairly identified. For the member for Coles to say, as my constituent says in the letter, that because he is paid from public moneys the honourable member has every right to identify him in *Hansard*, I find hard to believe.

The damage has been done, but I would like to think that all members—and this is not only directed at the member for Coles—do take care, when information is given to them, not to malign other people. The day following this speech of the member for Coles I quoted an order number and an item number that the member for Bragg had used when ordering stationery, and I was accused of a breach of privilege. This is double standards from the Opposition. I say what is good for the goose is good for the gander. I have reluctantly raised this matter, because I have also identified the name of this STA employee. I think that all members, when dealing with public servants, before they do anything about it in the House, should consider whether or not they will upset someone. I would like to think that the practice will occur no more.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This afternoon I need to draw several matters to the attention of the House for the sake of the record and the public interest. I find it quite incredible that the Minister of Water Resources is unable to identify the difference between the Murray River in South Australia and the Darling River, no part of which is in this State. The Minister claims that the member for Heysen did not heed the answer she gave yesterday to a question in this place wherein she said that the management of the river, such as would be necessary to avoid any unfortunate consequences of toxic algal bloom finding its way into South Australia, would be satisfactorily averted by use of Weatherall Lake and the Menindee Lakes system in general.

That is all very well, but it may not be possible. Our specific concerns—indeed those of the member for Heysen in the course of the question that he put to the Minister yesterday—were in circumstances relevant to the situation that is likely to arise if there is a heavy downpour in the upper catchment area of the Darling wherein a slug of toxic water does come into the Murray River in South Australia. If that happens we need to know what contingency plan the Government has. Apparently there is none.

Let me now turn to another matter of concern to me and I am sure that all South Australians who rely on the Murray River for one thing or another. All of us acknowledge that the river is a multiple-user resource. We not only get our fresh water from it for towns as far away as Coober Pedy, Woomera, through the Iron Triangle, and the mid and upper North and Yorke Peninsula but also we rely on it very heavily for water supply to the greater metropolitan area and, in addition, all towns in the Lower Murray and along the Tailem Bend-Keith pipeline.

Moreover, the Murray is used both passively and actively for recreational activity. In this instance I am pleased that the Minister of Marine is in the House, because it is about the Minister's action or lack of it that I am concerned today, on this last day of sitting before we rise for the summer vacation, to seek from him information about what on earth he has done to provide safety for recreational users of the Murray. The Minister has given no specific directions to zone certain areas of the river to make them safe and secure for people who wish to pursue the variety of recreational activities along the river. The kinds of activities to which I refer are those that are incompatible with other recreational activities.

I have received a constant stream of complaints from visitors and local residents that someone else is unreasonably interfering with what they personally believe is their right to peacefully and safely enjoy their chosen recreational activity on or near the river. For example, fishermen have complained that birdwatchers or canoes disturb or occupy their spot, that water-skiers entangle, cut their lines or frighten their fish; birdwatchers have complained that skiers disturb the birds they are studying; and skiers have complained that somebody is thrusting branches or empty bottles in front of their power boats or stream of movement (that is, passage along the river). Any such incident could result in a fatality or certainly a very serious injury and extensive damage to property.

In addition to that, in one instance reported last year a powerboat was holed and sunk by a shot fired from a shotgun in the willows immediately adjacent to the main channel. That sank the powerboat in question and left the skier stranded in the main stream. Constantly, townspeople from Blanchetown through to Goolwa complain to me about the din in the early morning where their peace is disturbed. What is to be done about it?

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

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Many Liberal members opposite have taken great pride in referring to the goods and services tax, in telling this House of their working class or humble origins. In fact, several members were trying so hard to outdo each other in that regard that it sounded like a Monty Python script—particularly the member for Hayward. The honourable member would have us believe that, when he was young, his family was so poor that his mother cut holes in his pockets so that he would have something to play with. However, that background has not reduced in any way the support of members opposite for a goods and services tax, a tax that will hit hard the ordinary working class people in the community. The hardest hit part of a family's budget will be the food budget. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Prices Surveillance Authority and KPMG Peat Marwick, a basket of goods that the average consumer might buy would currently cost a family \$207.97 but under the GST it would cost \$228.39.

A family of four, consisting of a mother, father and two children, who earn \$40 000 per year, under the GST will have received an extra \$3 005 per year or \$58 per week—sounds good. But after calculating the impact that the 15 per cent consumption tax will have on the regular family shopping—nothing else (including groceries, meat, fruit and vegetables)—the increase in the pay packet will dwindle to a deficit. We should not be conned by the alleged 'generous' addition to the family allowance. In the case that I have just outlined, that is, a family earning \$40 000, the proposed generous addition to the family allowance in this case would amount to exactly \$1 extra per week per child. Some assistance! That example relates to middle income families, who mistakenly think that they would be better off under this proposal.

To con the public with the goods and services tax, the Liberals need to make cuts to Government spending. There will be a cut of \$90 million to Aboriginal affairs spending; a reduction of \$60 million in funding for arts, sport and heritage (and someone ought to tell the small business people who gain financially from the Festival of Arts or the Grand Prix how important that underpinning is to our community); and a net reduction of \$220 million in Federal spending on housing. Changes to the social security area will result in sole parents and the disabled and their families being amongst the hardest hit. The families of disabled pensioners will be affected by a plan to abolish pensions for thousands of wives aged under 50 years who provide part-time care for their disabled spouses.

The damage does not stop there; the con job does not stop there. It has been stated that, unlike in relation to virtually any other investment, the GST will not be applied to the final sale price of new homes. However, in the case of housing, the worst impact of the GST will be on the materials used to construct new homes, to develop land, to renovate, to repair and/or to maintain homes. In the case of a new home worth roughly \$120 000, the home buyer will be looking at an increased cost of between \$3 000 and \$5 000.

This scheme has been tried in New Zealand and, as a result, spending in the retail area has dropped by about \$1 billion per year. The Liberal Party is setting out once again to con the people of Australia. I can recall the Fraser years of the fistful of dollars—Clint Eastwood was more entertaining and more believable. The people were conned then, and the current thinking of members of the Liberal Party

is that they can get away with it again. That is where they will make their mistake. As one headline of an article on the GST pointed out in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of Friday 22 November, 'Careful, there's a tax inside that bribe.'

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What a debacle we have witnessed in this Chamber today. We have seen four members of the Opposition having to stand in their place and defend themselves against allegations that have been made by Government Ministers. I was denied the opportunity to complete my personal explanation earlier today, and I will do so with some of the time I have available to me now. I was explaining why my constituent, a year 12 student, felt unable to proceed with her statement to the police about the alleged sale she had witnessed of a year 12 maths exam paper. As a result of statements made in this Parliament by the Minister of Education, my constituent felt sufficiently intimidated to the extent that she was not prepared to proceed with her statement. To that end, she took legal advice and was advised by her lawyer that she would not have to do that. Had the Minister of Education answered my question in a more responsible manner—

The Hon. G.J. Cramer interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education is out of order. My advice is not to continue in that vein.

Mr MATTHEW: —and not sought to intimidate my constituent, she would have proceeded. My constituent is a year 12 student who has just completed her exams, and she felt that the Minister could interfere with her exam results if she continued. While I assured her that that would not happen, nonetheless she still felt intimidated and did not proceed. In future, I hope that the Minister will be aware that, if he answers questions in that manner, he will intimidate people. In this instance, he has intimidated someone who was going to lodge a complaint about a criminal activity she had witnessed. That was the result of the Minister's statement. For him to carry on and make the statement in this House that he made today is nothing more than a disgrace, and a slur not only on me but on this Parliament.

I want to address another matter in the time available to me today, which relates to another issue that I raised in this House: I made allegations about Chinese tee-shirts that were labelled 'Made in Australia'. We have not heard the Premier respond to that allegation, and there is a very good reason for that. Imagine my disgust when, after raising this issue on 13 November 1991 and being told by the Premier that he would have it investigated, I found that the investigating officer was not asked to investigate until one week later. One week later, on 20 November, he was asked to investigate my allegations of 13 November. There is a good reason for that—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Kavel says—it is a cover-up. The Premier knew that, if he asked late enough, the investigation results would not be before him. Unfortunately for the Premier, I am aware of at least part of the results of that investigation, because I have been advised by the Office of Fair Trading that my allegations, as I knew they were, are correct. The Office of Fair Trading has taken a statement from the Managing Director of Goodsports, who has said that his company labelled Chinese tee-shirts 'Made in Australia'. In his statement, he said that his company had made an honest mistake in doing so. It is not for me to judge whether that is the case.

The fact of the matter is that tee-shirts that were made in China were labelled 'Made in Australia' and sold through

the Goodsports company. The Goodsports company, which is owned by the Grand Prix office, is a 50 per cent Government-owned company. A 50 per cent South Australian, Government-owned company has been selling Chinese tee-shirts at the Australian Grand Prix in Adelaide marked 'Made in Australia'. That is against the law, and this company now potentially faces a \$100 000 fine for breaches of the South Australian Trades Standards Act.

I raise this matter today, because I do not want to see it covered up. I do not want that company to be let off in a manner that might not happen with other companies. If it has breached this Act to the extent that I have been advised, it would appear there is a good chance it should face that fine, and I do not want to see the Premier, without very careful justification, let that company off the hook with a warning. I am glad to see the Premier is here to hear this. I look forward to hearing his statement in this Parliament, perhaps in the February, about the activities of this 50 per cent Government-owned company. It has not only been selling Grand Prix tee-shirts here in this way but also, I have been advised, it has been selling tee-shirts for the Sydney Motor Cycle Grand Prix in that manner, too.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): School closures are not pleasant for anyone. Nevertheless, over many years, school closures have occurred. One of the things that the Opposition has failed to recognise is that this was a local area in which there were a number of key issues, which have been addressed by the people involved. Those key issues are the limited curriculum, enrolment trends in the total catchment area, student population distribution and location of the three schools with respect to these matters. I emphasise that three schools are involved in this issue.

In April this year, when I was asked to address the Seaton North Primary School parents, and with respect to the West Lakes High School and my involvement in trying to keep that school open for so many years, I indicated that I believed they would have great difficulty in keeping that school open. No bull with me: it was straight up. I told those parents to their face. There is no running away from the issues.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: If the member for Adelaide is concerned about the welfare of students in the future, we as a Government have to address those problems, and it is interesting that other school communities have approached me and given their support in these issues. They are the facts of the matter. There are people who want to politicise this issue. As late as 4.30 yesterday afternoon, I received a telephone call from the principal of a school who told me to hang in there because—

Mr Brindal: Which school?

Mr HAMILTON: That is the sort of thing we expect from the Opposition. Members opposite want to polarise the community. The reality is that I am concerned, quite properly, with the whole of education in that area. Consultation has taken place. All interested groups were invited to become involved in this matter. The facts are that enrolments have declined from 345 students in 1980 to a maximum of 132 projected for next February. That is the crux of the matter. There are other matters which I will not put on the record in this Parliament but which have contributed to the decline in the number of students in that area. I know that school intimately, because I live adjacent to it. My three children went there, so I have a vested interest in it in many ways.

The reality is that, as I indicated, there are other matters of a very sensitive nature which I will not put on the public record in this Parliament but which have contributed to the

decline in the number of students at that school. Many parents of students at that school know them. It is interesting that I have received only one telephone call from a parent, although I have heard from two of the representatives of the school council. Other interested people want to become involved, and I have been briefed on what took place at the school council meeting on that particular night. I am aware of the person who drew up the proposition.

If people want to say to me that politics are not involved, they just ought to have a good look at the situation. The reality is that three schools are involved. Unfortunately, one school has to close. I have looked at this long and hard and, based on all the information provided to me, I believe that the decision to close the school was the correct one. It gives me no great pleasure to say that, but I will not walk away from the issue, as unpleasant as it may be. People can demonstrate outside my office, and quite properly so. I would support them fully in their right to do that. I invite them into my office. If they want to talk to me at any time, I will do so.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I wish to address a matter in the health area which is of great concern to me and which ought to be of great concern to all members of the House. That matter concerns waiting lists and the denial of health services in South Australia. However, I am not talking specifically about the well-known problem of more than 9 000 people who are waiting to have operations in hospitals, although that is bad enough. I wish to address today the problem of people who have children who need developmental assessment and therapy, which can be absolutely urgent but who, unfortunately, are forced to wait.

This can be absolutely vital, particularly if it entails a wait of many months. That is the case with one of the examples I will cite. There is a delay at what is a critical time in remedial treatment. The problems which result from developmental delay are multifactorial and, in many instances, it takes children years to recover from those problems, if indeed they ever do. They certainly will not recover without treatment, and treatment in many cases is absolutely urgent.

The case I wish to draw to the attention of the House is that of a twin who was first noted to be of some concern in July 1990, when her kindergarten teacher noticed she was not doing as well as she might have. On 14 March this year she went to kindergarten screaming, and it was noted at that stage that she was not only below her expected level for her age but also performing below the developmental age of her twin sister.

She was referred to a paediatrician and was seen on 10 July, whereupon it was felt that she had a number of problems. Indeed, there were thought to be three areas of specific learning difficulties, and she was referred immediately to the developmental paediatric unit at the Lyell McEwin Hospital to see the occupational therapist. At this stage, the paediatrician indicated that she would try to have her seen as soon as possible, but failed to mention that there was a waiting list. This is now this child's third term at school. The problem was first noted on 14 March this year, but nothing has been done at an absolutely crucial time. I will cite a letter to the mother's local member of Parliament. It states:

She is now 5 years and 7 months old and I help at the school everyday but she is getting worse—she is withdrawn, upset and frustrated as she acknowledges her school mates and her sister achieving. She has lost interest, lacks confidence and motivation and is developing poor self esteem. I am prepared to do what I

can but I'm not an expert and even the teacher doesn't know how to handle the problem—we need expert help now!!

Those sentiments are reflected throughout South Australia where parents have children who need help; they need it urgently so that these problems do not become ingrained in the children.

It is quite clear that the facilities provided by this Government to overcome these types of problem are inadequate. I call upon the Minister to address these problems urgently so that the developmental delays that I have detailed can be addressed at source and worked upon immediately so that children can overcome their feelings of inferiority and poor self-esteem and so that, hopefully, we as a caring society can help them.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I wish to explain the circumstances under which I tabled a State Transport Authority document in the House of Assembly on 29 October without realising that details contained in that document could be damaging to some State Transport Authority employees named in it. On that day, I asked the Minister of Transport a question about State Transport Authority overtime, the answer to which I considered to be unsatisfactory. On the basis of an internal memo that had been given to me I chose to speak for the first time in the new grievance debate created under the new sessional orders.

When more than half way through my five-minute speech, having referred to the substance of the memo but not to the names of anyone contained in it, I realised it would be difficult for me in the time allotted—five minutes being for most of us an uncommonly short speaking time compared with what we are used to—to conclude my speech. I responded spontaneously to what I am certain was a spontaneous interjection from the member for Alexandra, who said, 'Are you able to incorporate the figures?' My answer was, 'I could do that.'

I had been given the document only a short while before I asked the question in Parliament, and I had not had time to study the full implications of a column of figures on its left-hand side. I was certainly not aware that those figures were, in fact, payroll numbers of employees named in the document. When I examined those figures I assumed they were work numbers that we were accustomed to seeing on the uniforms of State Transport Authority employees. So, I tabled a document, which I had no original intention of tabling, quite unaware of the implications inherent in the numbers in the left-hand column.

On Monday of this week, 25 November, I received from the President of the Association of Railway Professional Officers of Australia a letter dated 22 November, in which he said that the concern of his members, who comprise seven of the 77 individual employees, was that their positions, payroll numbers and names had been published. The letter continues:

The information being made public is bad enough; however, any anonymous person can ring STA payroll section and obtain personal financial information regarding a particular employee by merely quoting the name and payroll number.

The disturbing fact of this is that some unscrupulous person could call with this information and possibly extract account numbers for Visa or Bankcard, etc., which could be used to get

money or goods. The employee's address could also be obtained and his home burgled, etc.

I want to make it abundantly clear to the House that it was not my intention when I tabled that document that any employee should be disadvantaged in any way. On 25 November, I wrote back to the President, with whom I have subsequently had a discussion, saying:

I would like you to know that my speech on STA overtime was in no way intended to cause distress to any employee, but rather to call the Government to account for its failure to respond to recommendations of the Auditor-General in respect of overtime. If, in doing so, I have unwittingly caused distress to any employee, I very much regret it.

I stress that I tabled that document without being aware of the nature and import of the numbers contained within it. Obviously, I stand by my intention of calling the Government to account for failing to exercise proper authority over STA overtime, but I am certainly happy to apologise publicly to any employee who has been distressed by my unwitting exposure of payroll numbers. I intend to write to the members of the Association of Railway Professional Officers of Australia, whose President, Mr Gary Sharpe, raised this matter with me.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 11 February 1992 at 2 p.m.

Speaking to this motion provides the traditional opportunity for me as Leader of the House not only to wish all members a very merry Christmas and a relaxing but no doubt productive break before we return to this place but also to place on record our collective gratitude to the very many people who ensure the relatively smooth running of this place, and I shall do so without unduly taking up the time of the House.

First, Mr Deputy Speaker, through you may I commend the Speaker for the strenuous way in which he has endeavoured to ensure the smooth running of the House, the proper application of Standing Orders and the administrative role that he undertakes in this place, and to you, Sir, as his Deputy and as Chairman of Committees, for the way in which you have admirably complemented that role. I say to the staff of the House of Assembly, the table clerks, the attendants, the people who look after us in relation to the Library, the refreshment and catering facilities, and the back-up staff in relation to security, air-conditioning and electrical appliances, that we are grateful for the way in which this place runs very efficiently indeed.

The community does not always appreciate the size and complexity of the tasks that are performed in this building, whether it be for the House of Assembly or for the Parliament as a whole. In some ways, it is similar to a small department in the public sector and sometimes it is subjected to some of the regimes and disciplines that characterise such departments, but of course it also has a very important life of its own because of its unique position as the legislature of this State and the control that it exercises on Executive Government under our tenets of responsible government that we have acquired from Britain.

Although the session is not completed and we have some weeks to go in the new year, we can say that it has been productive. I do not have before me the statistics of the number of measures that have passed the Parliament, but there has been a large number and, for the most part, they have been dealt with expeditiously. In this respect, I also commend to members the efforts of the Deputy Leader of

the Opposition, who has always been very frank and honest with me in the negotiations that we have had to have concerning the tabling of the business of the House. The fact that we seem to be able to be so much more productive these days without having to sit into the wee small hours of the morning is, in part, a tribute to the judgment that the honourable member and I exhibit in determining the business that we will put before the Assembly. However, it is also a tribute to members and the way in which they, for the most part, address themselves to the necessity to expedite these matters.

There are times when the honourable member and I would be tempted to feel that members are conspiring against us but, on the other hand, there are also times when we perhaps feel that we are getting that necessary cooperation to ensure that the business is done without interfering in any way with the traditional rights and privileges of members to address themselves properly to the legislation.

I take this opportunity to wish members a very happy Christmas, and suggest that they take the best possible advantage of the break. It is a short break, and members have a number of responsibilities in their electorate, which means that it will hardly be a holiday. Nonetheless, there are those days immediately after Christmas on which there is that opportunity.

When talking about Christmas and, therefore, about presents, I place on record the fact that two members of this place, the member for Coles and the member for Napier, have gone into print during this session, and I commend them both for that initiative and point out to members and to the people of South Australia that, if they are short of a Christmas present here or there, here are a couple of publications they may be able to pick up at a not unreasonable price. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal Opposition, I join with the Deputy Premier in thanking all the people who have made the smooth working of Parliament possible. The Deputy Premier has outlined the marvellous support we get from everyone within this establishment. Without dwelling too much on the subject, I should like to reflect that it would be nice to sort out the long-term accommodation needs of the Parliament. It is near and dear to my heart and to the heart of most members that we reach some agreement on improving the facilities and accommodation in the Parliament.

It is also not too much to ask that we could assist our librarians, who do such a sterling job under very difficult circumstances, and I should like to thank them. We can do a great favour to those people to assist our cause in the longer term, of course, to provide the sort of service they would wish to give members of Parliament. We have very fine support within the Parliament, and that includes the librarians, the attendants, the telephonists, the refreshment staff, *Hansard*, the caretakers and the police—those people who are protecting our interests, although we have had no recent incidents on which to report.

Reflecting briefly on the past year, we now have a new set of sessional orders in which the rules have changed. Members now have a great deal more time to express points of view to the Parliament, which has been a bonus for democracy and for this Parliament. It is still taking members some time to sort themselves out and get used to the system.

The new committee system is all but in place. It will be determined next year but, again, some goodwill needs to be shown and those committees should direct themselves far more searchingly to some issues than has occurred in the

past. I hope that the committees will function in the best interests of the Parliament. I note that there have been times when the Deputy Premier and I have agreed on an approximate finishing time and have been found very much wanting. That is due to the very vigorous debates that have taken place in this Parliament on issues of importance to members, and I should like to think that, for all the little rules and agreements we make, democracy has prevailed and all those people who wished to speak have had the opportunity to do so.

I turn now to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Speaker of this Parliament. I read with interest an article by the New South Wales Speaker in the latest issue of *The Parliamentarian*. He reflected on the great bonus for all Parliaments in having independent Speakers. I also believe that that would be in the best long-term interests of this Parliament, because I know that we have gained from the stewardship shown by you and by the Speaker of this Parliament in a very unbiased fashion.

I also thank the clerks, who have put up with us and given us advice which, invariably, has been very good. Collectively, I thank everyone who has made the Parliament possible. Generally, it has been a hard-working Parliament, and we have considered a great deal of legislation. The challenges of 1992 loom large, and I trust that we will be even more productive next year. On behalf of the Liberal Opposition, I wish everyone a very healthy and happy Christmas and productive 1992.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to add my support to the Deputy Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for their words at this time. I should like to thank all members of the supporting staff and, while not wishing to go through a long list of those who provide support for us as members of Parliament in the conduct of these proceedings, I thank each of those persons for the support they have given me. I trust that I, too, have been able to help them in some small way.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the new sessional orders. There have been changes to the House as a result of that, much of which has been for the best, and significant improvement has occurred. However, I recognise that there are some areas in which further improvement could be made, although much of that will rest on the shoulders of individual members of the House by their ensuring that the opportunities now afforded them will be taken up and used responsibly. As the festive season approaches, I wish all members the compliments of the season. I trust that health and happiness are with them at this time, knowing full well that, if they have such health and happiness, they have the wealth that really matters.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before putting the motion on behalf of Mr Speaker, I should like to indicate his and my thanks for the kind remarks that have been expressed to us, to share with all members who have spoken the best wishes for all members of the Parliament and of the staff and to compliment them on the work they have put in during the session. I know that Mr Speaker and I work very closely with the members of staff of this place, and we know how very much the Parliament is dependent on their efforts to ensure that the building functions efficiently and that the paperwork all comes together in the form of legislation that benefits the people of South Australia. I thank honourable members for those remarks. I am sure that the staff appreciate the sentiments that have been expressed and, on behalf of Mr Speaker and myself, I should like to wish all con-

cerned a merry Christmas and the compliments of the season.

Motion carried.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the development and promotion of the MFP development project; to establish the MFP Development Corporation and define its functions and powers; to repeal the Technology Development Corporation Act 1982; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Throughout the history of South Australia there have been many occasions on which the Parliament has been asked to provide a legislative framework on which to build projects of vision for the benefit of the State. In the last decade alone, members of this Parliament have considered legislation which has advanced the Adelaide Station Redevelopment, the Olympic Dam mine, the Technology Development Corporation, and the Golden Grove Urban Development Project. The MFP project certainly ranks as highly as any of these important developments. It is a project of national and international significance which will focus the attention of our neighbours and our trading partners on our State. It will not only provide a means of enhancing investment in our State but will also serve as a model within Australia for urban and industrial development, and in particular the use of advanced science and technology to serve our community.

The Bill provides the legislative structure to enable the continued development and promotion of the MFP project. It establishes the MFP Corporation and in doing so builds on the structure which has seen the successful development of the Technology Development Corporation. The Bill provides for the repeal of the Technology Development Corporation Act on a date to be set by proclamation, thus ensuring that the Technology Development Corporation will remain in place until effective integration with the MFP Development Corporation is achieved. The Bill also incorporates many of the objectives, functions, powers, financial provisions and regulation-making powers of the Technology Development Corporation Act which itself is an extension of legislation passed through the Parliament in 1982 by the previous Tonkin Liberal Government.

Members will recall that in 1988 the Government amended the Technology Park Adelaide Act, thereby establishing the Technology Development Corporation and extending its activities to Science Park Adelaide, established on the Sturt Triangle adjacent to Flinders University. Both of these Bills received bipartisan support. Technology Park Adelaide and Science Park Adelaide are important foundations for the development of the MFP project. Their strengths, and the impetus for their development, will be maintained and strengthened by the MFP Development Corporation.

The legislation provides that the membership of the MFP Development Corporation will be drawn from a number of areas which are considered to be important for the ultimate success of the project, and thus ensures that the corporation has access to wide-ranging expertise. It is also the intention of both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government that appointments from outside Australia be made to the corporation. We believe that this is appropriate given the international significance of the project. In addition to the normal functions of a statutory body of this

kind, the Bill also sets out objectives for the legislation as a whole which are visionary and broad-ranging. They are:

- to create a rational focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance;
- to create leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts;
- to create a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies;
- to create a model of interaction between industries, research and development centres, educational institutions and community activities and of the use of advanced information and communication systems for that purpose;
- to create an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development and in the use of advanced science and technology to serve the community; and
- to create a model of conservation of the natural environment and resource management and equitable social and economic development in an urban context.

While the objectives set out in the Bill are designed to sustain the Development Corporation well into the future, the form of the legislation will, however, be familiar to the House. It is essentially enabling legislation and, as I have indicated, it is based in large part on an existing Act. Furthermore, in relation to the physical development of the site, all of the existing procedures of the Planning Act concerning the environmental impact statement and supplementary development plan will apply.

As members will be aware, the MFP project involves all levels of government in Australia. In particular, it is a joint exercise between the State and Commonwealth Governments. Consequently, the Act includes a definition of the Commonwealth Minister and refers specifically to the role of the Minister in relation to the composition of the corporation. This provision highlights the national significance of the MFP project. The Government also recognises that local government in South Australia has a vital role to play in ensuring the successful development of MFP Australia. It is envisaged that local government will carry out its functions in relation to the MFP through the establishment of a joint councils authority as provided for in section 200 of the Local Government Act. The Government believes that this is not only appropriate but also represents a major step forward in establishing cooperative arrangements between the State Government and a group of local government bodies, which may indeed act as a model for future developments.

The role of the wider community is also of great significance. In recognition of that, the Bill establishes an MFP community advisory committee whose function is to advise the development corporation on:

- programs that are being, or should be, undertaken to ensure the appropriate infrastructure for community development in the MFP development centres;
- means of ensuring appropriate levels of community involvement in the development of the MFP development centres;
- social issues raised by the development of the MFP development centres.

The Act provides that membership of the committee must include persons who will provide expertise in local government, education, community services, industry, employee bodies, and local communities in the area of or adjacent to the core site.

The MFP project was recently renamed MFP Australia to reflect its national importance. We have a unique oppor-

tunity to establish within our State a vehicle for joint international efforts to address the opportunities and challenges of the twenty-first century in a practical way, with particular focus on the themes of people, technology and the environment. At the same time we can create an urban and community development, a centre for research and education, and a focus for international business investment in new and emerging technologies. I am aware that many members will be keen to study the legislation, as will many groups in the community. Consequently, the Government is introducing the Bill at this stage to take advantage of the Christmas recess to enable the process of consultation to focus on the proposed legislation. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

The genesis of this Bill goes back to 1988 when a joint steering committee was established by the Australian and Japanese Governments to oversee a major study investigating the feasibility of the MFP concept. The committee recommended in 1990 that the MFP Adelaide proposal be further explored, that additional work be undertaken to establish the project's viability, that the project's national and international objectives continue to be pursued and that resources be provided for public awareness and discussion of the issues. The MFP Adelaide Management Board was established in August 1990 to manage the next stage of the project, involving:

- a detailed assessment of the Gillman/Dry Creek site;
- estimating the infrastructure costs of the project and the method of financing;
- further development of the urban design features of MFP Adelaide;
- identification of business opportunities;
- assessing the impact of MFP Adelaide on the social fabric of Adelaide and South Australia; and
- advising on the future management of the project.

The final report of the management board was released in May 1991 and was supported by 10 reports prepared on behalf of the management board. The board stated that most of the core site could be made suitable for urban development. It stated that the key ingredients of the May 1990 design concept could be maintained while responding to environmental, engineering and commercial concerns and that the site could be developed on a commercial basis given the assumptions made in the commercial analysis. The board recognised the need to secure Government commitment and to ensure that the project was structured to attract private investment.

The board concluded that the project had the potential to generate substantial benefits to the South Australian economy. On 31 July 1991 the Federal and State Governments announced the go-ahead for the MFP as a national and international project based in Adelaide. The announcement cleared the way for the establishment of a development corporation to oversee the project and an international and national marketing campaign to attract investment to the MFP.

The Report of the MFP community consultation panel released in August 1991 indicated that 'broadly, community views support the national concept of an MFP focused on the enhancement of Australia's international competitiveness and the promotion of an innovative culture appropriate to a 'clever country', and the particular concept of MFP

Adelaide as an urban development with vital environmental and social opportunities'. International awareness of the MFP is being promoted by the international advisory board, a committee of outstanding people from business or academic communities of 12 countries. Members come from Sweden, Thailand, Japan, the United States of America, Germany, France, Taiwan, Korea, the United Kingdom and Australia. An environmental impact assessment is currently being undertaken and a supplementary development plan is being prepared for the MFP core site to meet the requirements of section 41 of the Planning Act.

A new urban development is an important component of MFP AUSTRALIA. The physical setting for the development will not be a single discrete development site on which all activities will be concentrated. Rather, it will comprise a mosaic of interconnecting villages, set in a landscape of parks, urban forests, lakes and gardens. Some of these villages will be located on the core site at Gillman; others will be sited on the crescent of land and waterways extending from LeFevre Peninsula through Port Adelaide and Gillman to Technology Park Adelaide at the north-western edge of the metropolitan area. The design and operation of the villages is aimed at demonstrating the use of alternative energy, recycling of stormwater and wastewater, and improvement of the management of waste in general. The villages would demonstrate new design features which could be applied throughout Adelaide. There will also be significant physical benefits to the site and the surrounding areas. The design of the villages is also intended to make a positive contribution to the existing natural environment.

The Government's aim is to develop information technology and telecommunications so that in the first decade of the twenty-first century Adelaide will be known worldwide as:

- a city with advanced communication systems and services based on a national telecommunications infrastructure that leads the world in functionality, efficiency and cost effectiveness;
- a key site within Australia for the location of software and services firms that will exploit the national talent base in the information technology and telecommunications industry to serve the fast growing Asia-Pacific markets and the demands of global firms for software products that are compatible with their systems;
- an information engineering centre of Asia-Pacific regional significance that combines advanced technical education, research and competence: firms with advanced design and engineering skills in systems (especially software); and access to leading users in Australia and the region;
- a city that is an important Asia-Pacific centre for the trial of prototype information technology projects, particularly those used by the individual and in the home. One facet of such activities would be research into and development of multi-language, automatic translation projects to help bridge the Asian-English language gap.

An environmental management centre will be established at Gillman and will comprise a cluster of private and public agencies and companies. MFP Australia will prove the focus for national and international activities in this area. The centre will encourage cooperation between Australian companies seeking to develop export markets and will force a link between environmental strategies and standards set by governments, and innovation and environmental improvement by the private sector and research agencies.

The R & D component of the Commonwealth environmental protection agency will be co-located with the envi-

ronmental management centre at Gillman. Discussions are now in progress regarding the establishment of the National Environmental Agency in South Australia. Environmental instrumentation has been identified as an area in which Australia can play a major role. The global market is currently \$A8-10 billion, and it is estimated that this market will grow to more than \$A20 billion by the year 2000. It is proposed that the establishment of a cluster of environmental instrumentation industries be established. Other aspects of environmental management industries that are currently being assessed include:

- a distributed water and wastewater treatment plant;
- a Centre for Environmental Law;
- a Centre for Aquatic Toxicology.

Education is a critical factor in the success of MFP Australia. In the future education will be a key determinant of the quality of personal and social life, the means by which new knowledge is generated and the necessary high levels of skills maintained and a major export industry in its own right. At the centre of the education function of MFP Australia will be an institution with the current working title of the 'MFP Academy'. This will be a collaborative venture between industry, the South Australian higher education sector, and universities in Australia, the Asia-Pacific region and other parts of the world, focusing on excellence in research and short courses, and using new technologies to distribute educational materials throughout the region. The MFP Academy will include an Institute for Environmental Management, including a Centre for Research in Urban Environmental Management, which will use the MFP villages as prototypes for urban development. Other institutes may include an International Management Institute, a Learning Systems Institute, including an Advanced Learning Systems Research Centre which will have close links with a Distributed Education Service, an Information Technology and Telecommunications Institute and an Asia-Pacific Institute of Language and Culture.

The Commonwealth Government and this Government are firmly committed to this vital national project. The foundations are already well entrenched. Adelaide is a university city whose existing institutions have a strong history of innovation and research. Adelaide is already a 'systems city' with the linking of government, business and community through low-cost communications and computing technology. The MFP will expand those links to the rest of the world, and, in particular, the Asian and Pacific regions as Australia enlarges its role as a bridge between western and eastern countries. At Technology Park Adelaide and the Software Export Centre, South Australians have been working with advanced information and communications technology for many years. The Australian Space Centre for Signal Processing, the only one of its kind in the Australasian region and the largest digital signal processing resource outside the United States and Europe, is now under construction at Technology Park Adelaide.

Science Park Adelaide, which opened this year, will continue its focus on biological sciences and medical technology research in association with Flinders University and the Flinders Medical Centre. The University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide are two more valuable resources with wide reputations. Another important existing link is the Waite Agricultural Research Park, which incorporates the water and soils division of the CSIRO, the University of Adelaide's Waite Institute and the State Department of Agriculture's research and development facilities. It is being planned to offer future residents of the urban development at the core site at Gillman advanced communications systems, a high degree of environmental

sustainability, access to advanced research and educational institutions and proximity to high technology industries in an environment of marinas and canals, private gardens, parks and public leisure areas. It is projected that the MFP will create considerable employment over the next 30 years. If building construction, land preparation, housing construction and employment related to activities other than the core MFP industries are included, many thousands more jobs could be generated in association with the MFP as the project comes to maturity.

Clause 1 is formal.

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

Clause 3 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. For the purposes of conciseness and certainty, 'industry' is defined as including commerce and services. 'MFP development centre' is defined as the urban and industrial development to be established at the MFP core site and any development established at a development area outside the MFP core site. 'MFP core site' is defined as the areas shown in Schedule 1 within boundaries delineated in bold and more particularly described in Schedule 2, and, where such an area is altered by proclamation, the area as so altered. 'Development area' is defined as the MFP core site or any other area declared by proclamation under subclause (2) to be a development area. Under subclause (2), the Governor is empowered to make proclamations altering a development area or establishing and assigning a name to new development areas. Subclause (3) provides that only land not granted in fee simple by the Crown or land of the MFP Development Corporation may be declared to be or brought within a development area by proclamation under subclause (2).

Clause 4 provides for the repeal of the Technology Development Corporation Act 1982 on a day to be fixed by proclamation. The clause provides for the transfer of all staff, property, rights and liabilities of the Technology Development Corporation to the proposed MFP Development Corporation to coincide with the repeal of the Technology Development Corporation Act.

Part 2 (comprising clause 5) sets out the objects of the measure. These are to secure the creation or establishment of:

- (a) a national focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance;
- (b) leading centres of innovation in science, technology, education and the arts;
- (c) a focus for international investment in new and emerging technologies;
- (d) a model of productive interaction between industries and research and development, educational, community and other organisations and of the use of advanced information and communication systems for that purpose;
- (e) an international centre of innovation and excellence in urban development and in the use of advanced science and technology to serve the community;
- (f) a model of conservation of the natural environment and resource management and equitable social and economic development in an urban context.

Part 3 (comprising clauses 6 to 21) provides for the establishment of the proposed MFP Development Corporation and its functions and powers.

Clause 6 constitutes the proposed new body as a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal and the capacity to sue or be sued in its corporate name. Subclause (3) declares that the body is to be an instrumentality

of the Crown and is to hold its property on behalf of the Crown.

Clause 7 provides that the corporation is subject to direction by the Minister.

Clause 8 sets out the functions of the MFP Development Corporation. These are:

- (a) to plan and develop and manage the MFP development centres in accordance with the objects set out in Part 2;
 - (b) to attract and encourage international and Australian investment and developments in the MFP development centres and elsewhere in the State, and (in consultation with the relevant Commonwealth authorities) elsewhere in Australia, with particular emphasis on industries and activities involving new or emerging technologies;
 - (c) to promote and assist scientific and technological research and development;
 - (d) to promote and facilitate productive interaction between industries and research and development, educational, community and other organisations in the MFP development centres together with industries and organisations elsewhere in Australia or overseas;
 - (e) to promote and assist in the establishment of advanced information and communication systems linking industries, organisations and persons in the MFP development centres and elsewhere in Australia or overseas;
 - (f) to promote the MFP development centres and the operations of the corporation in Australia and internationally;
 - (g) to encourage community involvement in the development of the MFP development centres;
 - (h) to promote, assist and coordinate economic, social and cultural development of the MFP development centres;
- and
- (i) to carry out any other operations and activities to give effect to the objects of this measure.

Subclause (2) provides that the corporation must, in carrying out its operations, consult with and draw on expertise of administrative units and other instrumentalities of the State with responsibilities in areas related to or affected by those operations.

Clause 9 confers on the corporation all the powers of a natural person at law and lists the following by way of example:

- (a) power to acquire, hold, lease and otherwise deal with and dispose of real and personal property;
- (b) power to divide and develop land and carry out works;
- (c) power to engage agents and employees;
- (d) power to enter into partnerships and joint venture arrangements;
- (e) power to provide services and make charges for the services;
- (f) power to form, or acquire, deal with and dispose of interests in companies and other entities;
- (g) power to enter into any other contract or arrangement or acquire or incur any other rights or liabilities.

Under subclause (2) the corporation may, with the consent of the State Minister, make use of the services of persons employed by the State.

Subclause (3) provides that the corporation may, with the consent of the Commonwealth Minister, make use of the services of persons employed by the Commonwealth.

Clause 10 provides for the appointment by the corporation of a chief executive officer of the corporation.

Clause 11 provides for the statutory vesting in the corporation of all land within the MFP core site that has not been granted in fee simple by the Crown or is owned by an instrumentality of the Crown.

Clause 12 empowers the corporation to acquire land by compulsory process. Subclause (2) provides that where land acquired compulsorily by the corporation is within the MFP core site or brought within the MFP core site by proclamation, the value of the land must be assessed for the purpose of determining the compensation payable in respect of the acquisition as if the MFP core site were not subject to development under this measure.

Clause 13 confers a power of delegation on the corporation and prohibits a delegate from acting in a manner in which the delegate has a direct or indirect private interest.

Clause 14 provides for the composition of the corporation. Under the clause the corporation is to consist of up to 12 members appointed by the Governor, of whom one is to be the chief executive officer of the corporation and the remainder are to be persons nominated by the State Minister after consultation with the Commonwealth Minister. Subclause (2) requires that there be persons included in the corporation's membership who will provide expertise in the following areas:

- (a) urban development;
- (b) financial management;
- (c) the industrial applications of technology;
- (d) the management of international projects;
- (e) community development;
- and
- (f) environmental management.

One member of the corporation is to be appointed by the Governor to chair the corporation. The remaining provisions of the clause fix members' terms of office (not exceeding three years), provide for deputies of members, and provide for removal from, or vacation of, office as a member.

Clause 15 deals with the procedures at meetings of the corporation. The clause fixes a simple majority as a quorum for meetings of the corporation, and provides for the chairing of meetings and voting by members. Subclause (5) provides for meetings by telephone or audio-visual hook-up. Subclause (6) provides for round-robin resolutions. Subclause (8) requires the commission to provide for the keeping of accurate minutes of its proceedings.

Clause 16 provides that an act of the corporation is not to be invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

Clause 17 provides that a member of the corporation is not to incur any liability for an honest act done in the performance or purported performance of official functions or duties. Any liability that would, but for this provision, attach to a member is to attach instead to the Crown.

Clause 18 provides that a member of the corporation is to be entitled to such remuneration, allowances and expenses as may be determined by the Governor.

Clause 19 deals with conflicts of interest in relation to members of the corporation.

Clause 20 provides for the execution of documents by the corporation by the affixing of the corporation's common seal or by the signature of a person in accordance with an authority conferred by the corporation under its common seal.

Clause 21 is designed to protect persons dealing with the corporation from the consequences of any deficiencies of power or authority or procedural irregularities on the part

of the corporation and from the need to make exhaustive inquiries to ensure the validity of transactions with the corporation. Under the clause, a transaction to which the corporation is a party or apparently a party (whether made or apparently made under the corporation's common seal or by a person with authority to bind the corporation) is not to be invalid because of:

- (a) any deficiency of power on the part of the corporation;
- (b) any deficiency in the authority of a member, employee or agent of the corporation;
- or
- (c) any procedural irregularity on the part of the corporation or a member, employee or agent of the corporation or any procedural irregularity affecting the appointment of a member, employee or agent of the commission.

Subclause (2), however, provides that this is not to validate a transaction in favour of a party who enters into the transaction with the corporation with actual notice of the deficiency or irregularity.

Part 4 (comprising clauses 22 to 26) provides for a Community Advisory Committee, and its functions, composition and procedures.

Clause 22 provides for the establishment of the MFP Community Advisory Committee.

Clause 23 sets out the functions of the committee. Under the clause, the committee is to advise the corporation either on its own initiative or at the request of the corporation on:

- (a) programs that are being, or should be, undertaken to ensure the appropriate infrastructure for community development in the MFP development centres;
- (b) means of ensuring appropriate levels of community involvement in the development of the MFP development centres;
- and
- (c) social issues raised by the development of the MFP development centres.

Clause 24 provides that the committee is to consist of up to 12 members appointed by the State Minister.

Under subclause (2), the committee is to include:

- (a) persons who will, in the opinion of the State Minister, provide expertise in matters relating to:
 - (i) local government;
 - (ii) education;
 - (iii) community services;
 - and
 - (iv) industry;
- and
- (b) persons who may, in the opinion of the State Minister, appropriately represent the interests of:
 - (i) employee bodies;
 - and
 - (ii) local communities in the area of or adjacent to the MFP core site.

The remaining provisions of the clause provide for the term of office of members and removal from or vacation of office as a member.

Clause 25 provides for the procedures at meetings of the MFP Community Advisory Committee.

Clause 26 provides for the remuneration of members of the committees. Part 5 (comprising clauses 27 to 30) deals with financial matters.

Clause 27 empowers the corporation to establish and operate banking accounts and to invest money not imme-

diately required for its operations in a manner approved by the Treasurer.

Clause 28 provides for borrowing by the corporation and for an automatic guarantee by the Treasurer.

Clause 29 provides for the keeping of accounts by the corporation and the auditing of those accounts.

Clause 30 provides that the corporation is exempt from rates and taxes under any law of the State. Under the clause, regulations may be made imposing liability for any particular rates or taxes either in the normal way or with modifications. Part 6 (comprising clauses 31 to 33) deals with miscellaneous matters.

Clause 31 requires the corporation to present an annual report on its operations to the Minister. The report is to incorporate the audited accounts of the corporation for the period to which the report relates. The Minister is required to lay a copy of the report before each House of Parliament within 12 sitting days after receipt of the report.

Clause 32 provides that offences under the measure are to be summary offences.

Clause 33 provides for the making of regulations. Under the clause, regulations may be made relating to construction, design, siting and maintenance of buildings and structures in a development area, landscaping and the use of land in such an area and requiring the authority of the corporation for the acquisition or occupation of land in such an area. The regulations may confer the discretionary powers on the corporation, a local government body, or a planning authority with respect to matters that may be regulated under the clause. The clause provides that a District Court may grant an injunction requiring a person to modify a development within a development area to bring it into conformity with the regulations. Subclause (6) declares that any such regulations are to be in addition to and not in derogation of any other law. Schedules 1 and 2 contain a plan of the MFP core site and a more precise description of the boundaries of the site.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK REPORT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): Out of an abundance of caution, I seek leave to amend my notice of motion as it appears on the Notice Paper by inserting the words 'and authorise' after 'enable'.

Leave granted; proposed motion amended.

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

That Standing Orders 202, 203 and 204 be and remain so far suspended as to enable and authorise:

- (a) the Speaker, on receipt of the report of the Auditor-General made pursuant to the instrument of Appointment of the Auditor-General under section 25 of the State Bank of South Australia Act dated 28 March 1991, to distribute copies of the report to members;
- (b) the report to be made public; and
- (c) the report to be printed.

The words will make clear that the Speaker is not only enabled to distribute the Auditor's Report but is in fact directed to do so. The Auditor-General's Report has been long awaited and the Government felt that it was important that there be a procedure whereby it is put into the public arena as soon as it is available, notwithstanding that Parliament would not be sitting at that time. I am advised that this is the mechanism to enable that to happen. No doubt members will await the publication of the report with a great deal of interest. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Motion carried.

PORT PIRIE LABORATORY SITE ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Port Pirie Laboratory Site Act 1922. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Port Pirie Laboratory Site Act 1922 was enacted to authorise the Commonwealth of Australia to occupy and use a portion of parklands at Port Pirie for the purpose of the creation and maintenance of a laboratory. The site was chosen after consultation between the Commonwealth and the Port Pirie Municipal Council, and an agreement was reached. However, the council had no power under the Municipal Corporation Act 1890 to grant the land to the Commonwealth and so the only way for the transfer to take place was by means of a special Act of Parliament. The Port Pirie Laboratory Site Act 1922 was the result. The laboratory was established to provide facilities for the diagnosis of infectious diseases such as typhoid and diphtheria. It also carried out original work and investigations in connection with industrial diseases such as lead poisoning in the local silver and lead smelting works.

In September 1984 ownership, operation and control of the Port Pirie Laboratory was transferred from the Commonwealth's Department of Health to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science pursuant to an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. The Minister of Lands has agreed it is appropriate that the land be rededicated as a reserve for laboratory purposes under the care, control and management of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Since the land is no longer occupied or controlled by the Commonwealth, the Port Pirie Laboratory Site Act 1922 is redundant, and it is appropriate that it be repealed. Both the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science have been consulted and are agreeable to this course of action.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals the Port Pirie Laboratory Site Act 1922.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

URBAN LAND TRUST (URBAN CONSOLIDATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Urban Land Trust Act 1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

1. Proposed Amendment

This Bill seeks to amend the Urban Land Trust Act 1981 to permit the Urban Land Trust to participate in urban consolidation in existing urban areas.

2. Background

The South Australian Urban Land Trust (the trust) was formed in 1981 following the termination of the South Australian Land Commission which had been established in 1973. As a 'land banker', the principal focus of the trust has been to ensure an adequate supply of land for residential purposes on the Adelaide fringe so as to promote housing affordability and ensure coordinated development. The trust has no powers to develop land in its own right and initially had no power to compulsorily acquire land for future urban use.

In 1984, the Act was amended to enable the trust, with the approval of the Minister, to undertake development on a joint venture basis. In 1985 the Act was amended to enable the trust to replenish its land bank through compulsory acquisition pursuant to the Land Acquisition Act. However this power was restricted in that the trust could not compulsorily acquire a principal place of residence or commercial or industrial premises. The Act currently limits the trust to purchasing, holding or generally being active in 'new urban areas', which effectively precludes the trust from involvement in existing urban areas which are the major focus for urban consolidation initiatives.

3. Urban Consolidation Policy

Urban consolidation is a major initiative within the metropolitan planning framework. The objectives of the Government's urban consolidation policy initiated in April 1987 are to promote equity, efficiency and accessibility by:

- providing a more diversified housing stock in existing areas to cater for changing household needs and preferences.
- providing housing in locations with better access to work and services than is available on the urban fringe.
- utilising spare capacity in existing public utilities and services.
- limiting growth on the urban fringe.
- revitalising suburbs through the redevelopment of under-utilised sites.

Urban consolidation thus means development directed towards the better utilisation of urban land and existing public utilities and services.

4. Support for the Urban Land Trust Role

There is general support for the trust having a role in urban consolidation because the trust has:

- financial capacity in terms of asset backing and cash resources.
- a proven ability to deliver Government's housing and social policies.
- an operational structure which ensures that the board and management take a commercially sound approach.
- experienced and professional staff.

The private sector has indicated support for the trust's role being extended to enable participation in urban consolidation. For example, the February 1991 policy update of the Urban Development Institute of Australia (SA Division) indicates support for the trust having a 'packaging' role in urban consolidation projects, to coordinate State Government and local government and private interests.

5. Proposed Role of the Urban Land Trust

It is intended that the role of the trust in urban consolidation will be generally limited to the assembly and disposal

of sites for subsequent development by other parties. More specifically this would include:

- (i) project identification and feasibility assessment.
- (ii) site assembly
- (iii) clean-up if required
- (iv) establishment of development criteria where appropriate (densities, access, infrastructure provision, human service and public housing requirement etc.) in consultation with State Government, local government, the development industry, local residents and other relevant bodies.
- (v) rezoning if required.
- (vi) land parcelisation if necessary.
- (vii) disposal to private sector developers, possibly subject to some form of development agreement relating to planning, housing and community objectives.

6. Conclusion

I commend this Bill to the House as it offers a major opportunity to further the implementation of urban consolidation policy.

Clause 1 is formal

Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act which contains definitions of terms used in the Act. The clause inserts a new definition defining the term 'urban consolidation' as development directed towards the better utilisation of urban land and existing public utilities and services.

Clause 3 amends section 14 of the principal Act which sets out the functions of the South Australian Urban Land Trust. Under the section in its present form, the functions of the trust are to hold land and, as prevailing circumstances require, to make land available for, and otherwise assist in, the orderly establishment and development of new urban areas. The clause amends the section so that the trust also has the function of holding land and making land available for, and otherwise assisting in, urban consolidation in existing urban areas.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Tuesday, 11 February 1992.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CRIMES CONFISCATION AND RESTITUTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 November. Page 2423.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports this Bill. We recognise that agreement has been reached by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Additional money will be made available to be paid into the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund for profits forfeited or obtained from the realisation of assets under the State Acts. Money or property forfeited under a registered interstate order is to be retained in the jurisdiction in which the forfeiture has occurred and is not to be repatriated to the jurisdiction in which the forfeiture order was made. In addition, money received from the Commonwealth under the Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act of the Commonwealth, when assets are repatriated from overseas, will be paid into and

out of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund as part of an equitable sharing program.

The Bill also seeks to clarify the jurisdiction of a court in South Australia to make a restraining order before a person is convicted of a criminal offence in order that assets may not be dissipated prior to conviction. The offence of money laundering is created in order for South Australian law to comply with the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances prior to Australian ratification of the convention. This offence has already been created in Queensland and New South Wales. Legislation is currently being considered in all other States. The penalty for an individual is a fine of \$200 000 or imprisonment for 20 years. The fine for a corporate body is a maximum of \$600 000. As far as the Opposition is concerned, in supporting the Government, it is desirable that this Bill passes as soon as possible to match up with interstate legislation.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I will make a few remarks on this Bill because it draws to the attention of the House the remarkable run of legislation relating to law and order that has been introduced into this place in the latter half of this year. This is another law and order issue. As I said, it adds to the very long list of law and order legislation that has been passed by Parliament over the past 12 months, and particularly in the latter half of this year. From time to time, members opposite criticise the Government for an alleged lack of action with respect to law and order. I am told that Opposition backbenchers have formed a little committee to produce press releases for the media, criticising the attitude of the Government to law and order.

Mr S.J. Baker: The proof of the pudding is in the eating and the statistics are not good.

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am not sure who is making this speech—the Deputy Leader or I.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is quite certain who is making it. It is the member for Henley Beach. He should continue with it.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Sir. I will attempt to give the Deputy Leader the same help with his contribution. The point that I was making is that this is another Bill in a long list of legislation that has been produced by this Government to assist in the process of law and order. It is probably overdue because, as we know, crime is becoming international. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that money which resulted from criminal activities overseas is being used in South Australia.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Indeed, these people should be behind bars and it is to be hoped that the legislation before us will make sure that more people who are engaged in criminal activities will be put behind bars. The profits of crime should be confiscated from those people who it is proved have acted illegally. Allegations have been made in this Parliament that money is laundered in places such as the Adelaide Casino and on the racetracks of South Australia, although none of those allegations has been substantiated. However, where it is proved that someone is laundering money from the proceeds of crime, it is beyond doubt that that money should be taken away from that person and put in a fund as provided for in this legislation.

When similar legislation was introduced in this place some time ago, members received complaints from people who suggested that money that had been made illegally should be left to the dependents of the gaoled criminals and utilised by them because they have no other means of support. I have never advocated that position. I am sure

that all members have heard from their constituents that they want to get tough on crime. I certainly receive such representations on a regular basis and I note that the member for Bragg indicates that he has received similar representations from people in his electorate. I cannot brook that suggestion.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I also thank the Deputy Leader for the assistance that he is giving me. I make no apologies for the wide-ranging nature of this legislation. It is unequivocal and states that all money that is made from crime should be taken away and placed in this fund, and I support that. Indeed, I believe that all my colleagues on this side of the House support it.

There have been suggestions that we are going too far, but I do not give credence to those suggestions. This must have been the motivating factor of the Attorneys-General when they met to discuss the matter, because they made no provision for other people and stated boldly that all the money should be taken. I hope that when this legislation is passed it will provide for that to happen. I remember the newspaper articles when there was similar legislation in other areas wherein it was suggested that Parliament was being too tough, but I am afraid that I do not accept that view.

All members know that drugs have no barriers, and that drugs are smuggled both into and out of Australia. Indeed, some South Australians have been involved from time to time in drug smuggling and the transfer of drugs. I completely support the legislation so far as it comes down against trafficking in narcotics and other drugs; I have no hesitation in supporting those provisions of the Bill. I think the legislation is good legislation. I know that it has the support of the Opposition. It is necessary to make sure that we have a national approach to these matters because, as I said, drug smuggling does not stop at the borders. It is with great pleasure that I support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I do not wish to delay the House, but I want to add my support to the legislation. As my colleague the member for Henley Beach so correctly pointed out, this is another approach by the Government to promote law and order and attack those people who in the past may have been able to benefit from the profits of crime. One of the criticisms that one hears in the community from time to time is about the penalties handed down by the courts. There have been many criticisms of the inadequacy of penalties handed down by the courts, particularly in relation to matters where people have benefited from the proceeds of criminal activity. I am sure that every thinking person would agree that no-one should benefit from crime. As far as I am concerned, they can make the penalty as tough as they like on drug smugglers because they really are the scum of the earth.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I take the point of the member for Bragg. I think we all detest those persons who pray on innocent people, particularly young children, who later grow up and have to rely on criminal activity to maintain their drug habit. Time and again police officers refer to the link between drugs and crimes such as breaking and entering. There is no doubt about that link. I would give no charity to those who sell drugs to young people and profit from it, although I think I am a reasonably charitable person.

Time and again, particularly in this Parliament, the Government has said how tough it is prepared to get on those

who break the law, and this is another illustration of this approach. I believe also that people who take native birds out of this country and want to benefit from that crime should be hard hit. As I said, I do not want to delay the House, but I will indicate the importance of a national approach, as my colleague said. It is critical that the profits and fines that result from criminal activity be placed in a fund to help fight crime in South Australia. This gives notice that the Government will continue to introduce legislation that will benefit the people of South Australia, and that it will use every tool possible to crack down on crime.

We hear from members opposite about the incidence of crime in South Australia, and I believe that every member of this House is genuinely concerned about it. However, the increase in criminal activity in other States should also be noted, as should the nature of the reporting of crimes in South Australia *vis-a-vis* the procedure that is adopted in other States. That matter has not been picked up by some sections of the media, and particularly by members opposite who make great play about the incidence of crime. It is reported here, and quite properly so, but nevertheless the procedures adopted in other States are somewhat different. It may well be that in future Attorneys-General and Police Commissioners will look at a national approach to the way in which crime is reported, to make the procedures uniform right across Australia. If that were to occur we could get a proper perspective on the differences between the States, and that is when we could get a true picture of what is really taking place. I support the Bill and wish it a speedy passage.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I had already indicated to the Minister that I would be taking part in this debate.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I forgot.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I accept his apology. Mr Deputy Speaker, while you might feel that what I am about to say is not relevant to the Bill, it is. I said to my colleague the member for Henley Beach that I would make a couple of phone calls and be back in about 20 minutes. I made my phone calls, turned on the speaker box and heard my colleague speaking, and that told me that very little had been said by members opposite. I am not saying that to in any way goad members opposite into partaking in this debate—I understand that the member for Bragg spoke for two minutes and 50 seconds—but it does indicate that the Opposition wants to talk big about the so-called deficiencies in the Government's law and order policies until the Government wants to do something about it, when it becomes one big yawn for members opposite and they want to get out of this place as quickly as possible.

Normally on a Thursday afternoon there would be an argument for that, but you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I know, that we will be here until about 1 a.m. tomorrow. One would have thought that that gives members opposite and members on this side—and my criticism is of members on this side as well—enough time to fully examine this legislation and say whether we think it is deficient or that we should give it the full support that it deserves. One of the problems of the criminal classes over the years, and it is a trait which was developed in the United States and which has been developed to a fine art, is money laundering. Our Australian cousins have become very adept at this process over the years. One of our biggest problems is that we have not been able to make money laundering a criminal offence. If anything, that is what this Bill will do.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Bragg is obviously suffering a bit of conscience: perhaps he thinks he should have stretched out his contribution to at least 3 minutes 50 seconds rather than 2 minutes 50 seconds. He obviously agrees with me. One of the requirements of the ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Trafficking in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances in February 1989 was that ratification had to occur. This Bill does make money laundering a criminal offence. The criminal classes have become very good at taking money from drugs and cleaning it; it then emerges somewhere in the corporate sector, completely clean and untouchable. I know that, within the drug enforcement agencies, at both State and Federal level, there has been frustration in many cases because the agency knows where the money has come from and it knows where it will ultimately end up; however, when the case comes before the courts, the agency has no chance of achieving a conviction.

I congratulate the Attorney, through the Minister on the front bench, that at last this kind of legislation has been introduced in this House. That provision is already contained in the Commonwealth Proceeds of Crimes Act, in the Queensland Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act and the New South Wales Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act. I understand that Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania are currently preparing money laundering legislation in accordance with the Commonwealth request. So this Bill is a step in the right direction. Once again South Australia has picked up its responsibilities in this area. If what we are doing today makes money laundering that little bit harder for those drug criminals in the community, we should fully support this Bill. The penalties are enough to make any criminal seriously reconsider money laundering. There is a penalty of a \$200 000 fine or 20 years imprisonment, or both, when the offender is a natural person and \$600 000 when the offender is a body corporate. No-one in the community can say that this Government is going soft on crime: it is being exceedingly tough. Does the Opposition really realise how tough we are being in this legislation? I urge all members to support the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): There is very little left for me to say about this measure.

Mr S.J. Baker: It's all been said.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes, it has all been said, and it has all been said very well. I thank those members who have contributed to the debate this afternoon. This Bill brings about a number of improvements to this legislation which have arisen as a result of agreements reached between Australian Attorneys-General. It also provides for a number of other matters that will improve the operations of this very important piece of legislation. I agree with the member for Bragg: the sooner the legislation is passed, the better for the well-being of the people of South Australia.

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

CORPORATIONS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 November. Page 2425.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports this Bill vigorously. It follows amendments to the Federal corporations legislation and complementary legislation is necessary in the various States and the Northern Territory. As

members will be aware, about 12 months ago we rushed through this House complementary corporations legislation, and criticism was levelled at the short time members were given by the Attorney to deal with such complicated legislation. I note that in this instance we do not have the same time constraints, and I commend the Attorney for giving us that extra time.

Basically, the amendments are technical and of a drafting nature. The Bill provides that regulations under the various Commonwealth administrative laws are also incorporated as the law of South Australia for the purposes of corporations laws. Secondly, it restores the Family Court of Australia and the Family Court of Western Australia to those courts that can exercise jurisdiction under the corporations law. But, in respect of these two courts, jurisdiction is only to the extent that it is ancillary to the exercise of the respective courts jurisdiction. I am advised that this amendment will be very important in terms of the functioning of the Family Court. Unfortunately, this court is being used more and more in our society, and I say, 'unfortunately' because it is a tragedy that so many families are breaking up, because of Federal laws and having an opportunity to opt out more easily and more quickly. This amendment will help in this area.

Thirdly, the amendments basically give the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions the same enforcement powers in relation to the old cooperative companies and securities scheme as the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions has in relation to the new corporations laws. Again, this amendment will enable the functions of corporations law to proceed more smoothly at both State and Commonwealth level, and we support that. Fourthly, the Bill abolishes the national Companies and Securities Commission but provides for audited accounts to be laid before both State Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days of the State Attorney-General's having received copies of it.

The lawyers and accountants who have looked at this Bill see no difficulty with it, except in relation to the jurisdiction of the Family Court, where it appears that the drafting might allow a significant commercial proceeding to be taken in the Family Court. The other place has noted that and the Bill has been amended accordingly. The only other matter is whether 12 sitting days after the Attorney-General receives the National Companies and Securities Commission report is too long. In my opinion, the Attorney-General should make the report available to Parliament as soon as possible, in other words, within 24 hours. The Opposition supports these very important amendments and hopes that they are introduced as soon as is practicable.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier): I congratulate the member for Bragg for his grasp of corporate law and it is pleasing to see that he is still in his wet mood regarding the rights of people in the community. I may perhaps sound dramatic and theatrical but, as far as corporate law is concerned, I would say that there was a dramatic leap forward on 29 July 1990. That was the watershed at Alice Springs when all the States and the Commonwealth reached agreement, resulting in the Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990, which was introduced into this Parliament on 20 November 1990. That set the stage for agreement by the States—and we are talking in particular about this State—to apply the corporations law and the Australian Securities Commission law as the law in South Australia in such a way as to ensure that any further amendments to the corporations law or the ASC law would automatically apply in South Australia. Not only in the area of corporate law but

also in other areas where there is sometimes conflict between the individual States or with the Federal Government, that will ensure uniformity. I well remember watching it on television that night and feeling quite misty-eyed because of this step forward.

Obviously, recent amendments made by the Federal Government cannot apply in South Australia. Therefore, as the member for Bragg said, we have this technical machinery to ensure that we are in line with the Commonwealth Government. This will be to the benefit of all concerned. I was quite intrigued—and perhaps in Committee I will ask the Minister some in-depth, searching questions—by the reform of insider trading. I have always felt that some fortunate few in the business community, because of inside knowledge, make vast sums of money, whereas if you or I, Sir, invested a few of our hard-earned dollars in BHP, Esso, or some of the banks or financial institutions, we would have to rely on our own initiative—

Mrs Hutchison: And judgment.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: And judgment, as the member for Stuart says, and I am sure that she will have a contribution to make to this debate. Our savings rise and fall in line with the market, and so it should be. However, there are some people with inside knowledge who can make massive profits to the detriment of ordinary shareholders and, ultimately, the State and Federal Governments, because they make excessive profits and pay very little tax. I will not keep the House too long. I urge support for this legislation and congratulate the member for Bragg for his well-researched speech on this matter.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is with a tinge of sadness that I support this amending legislation. Over 12 months ago the South Australian Parliament virtually lost its jurisdiction in the area of corporate law, because we acceded most, but not all, of our powers in this area to Canberra. Now, 12 months later, as is the way these things go, we find that we are now amending this legislation. I have no doubt that this time next year, and as time goes by, we will be facing further amendments to this legislation.

I say I support this legislation with a tinge of sadness because South Australian business now has the problem of lining up with all other businesses and having to go to Canberra. I am a centralist, and I have always believed in Australia rather than the concept of six States, but I am aware also of the bureaucracy that one encompasses when travelling to Canberra to attend to these matters. I am sure that, to some extent, South Australian businesses feel poorer by the fact that we lost jurisdiction over these matters, and some of them probably have to support agencies to go to Canberra to look after their affairs.

I will not refer to the specific amendments that relate to corporations: I refer to the reform of insider trading. We need only go back less than five years to realise that insider trading throughout Australia was rife and that the situation was probably no different in South Australia. It was amazing for those people who followed the stock exchange—and some of us have a small interest in the stock exchange, while others in this place have a much larger interest—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: The member for Bragg.

Mr FERGUSON: Probably the member for Bragg, but it was mysterious to see all of a sudden, the price of shares in certain companies jumping by considerable amounts prior to the announcement of bonus issues or share issues. It would appear that people inside companies knew that these things were on and were able to take advantage of them, to the detriment of the general public who did not have inside information. They were able to make hundreds of thousands

of dollars by the use of insider trading. It is very important that this matter be tackled by legislation, although I would be curious to know how legislation could be so constructed as to try to cover the problem of insider trading, particularly within the big companies in Australia.

We had to ensure that this legislation applied nationally because of the corporate collapses that were occurring in Australia and the skulduggery that was going on. Although to my knowledge there have been no big corporate collapses in South Australia, and I hope that that remains the case, we have seen companies lose millions and millions of dollars due to the inept way in which people were managing those companies and because of the laxity of our laws.

It was well known that this skulduggery was going on; however, our laws were too inadequate to do much about it. We can attack the problem of corporate law only on a national basis. Who could forget the collapse of the Bond Corporation, and the millions of dollars that small shareholders lost in that company? There has been no redress as far as the directors of that company are concerned, because they are living in luxury. Yet, small shareholders and pensioners who invested their life savings in these companies—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Have been wiped out.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, they have been absolutely wiped out. One only has to think of Mr Skase, who is living in 'poor' circumstances in Spain: he is living in one villa and his wife in another.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: And he has a crook back.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, I understand that he has a bad back. He is down to his last \$200 000. I cannot understand why his bank account should be so low, when he is still living in that four-storey hovel in Spain, where he seems to be doing reasonably well. He cannot even scrape together the fare to come back to Australia to face his creditors. I feel sorry for him! Because of Mr Skase and other paper shufflers, we have seen the disgraceful way in which ordinary, honest Australians have been fleeced. One reason that has happened is that because our laws have been too inadequate to apprehend these people.

I regret having to support this proposal, but the fact is that we have lost our jurisdiction in South Australia. Generally speaking, South Australia's position has been satisfactory. It has not had problems like the mortgage estates in Victoria. We have not had the huge crashes that they had in that State. We have been able through the administration of our laws to make sure that this has not happened to the extent that it has happened in other States. Nevertheless, I understand why we have to bring down this legislation: to make sure that this matter is tackled on a national basis.

When South Australians and others go to Canberra they seem to get an extra bit of wisdom. Once they have been in that place with all the power and the back-up of the Public Service in Canberra, they seem to be able to take on an extra dimension and are able to tackle these problems. I refer to people such as Senator Olsen who have served in this jurisdiction and who have gone on to bigger things in Canberra. They seem to have taken on a wider and larger dimension and are able to tackle these problems in a better way.

From time to time, I put forward arguments to slow down the process to ensure that much of the power did not leave this jurisdiction so that South Australian business people could be better serviced, because we can produce laws and changes quicker than on a national basis. I have weighed this up against taking a national perspective on this issue and, on balance, with a tinge of sadness, I have decided to

support the Bill. I urge all members of this House to do the same.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I want to speak briefly to this Bill. I believe, as others have indicated, that there is a need for a national approach to this issue. One thing that saddens me—and, I think, every member of this Parliament—is seeing constituents coming into our electorate offices saying that they have been ripped off by these bandits. That is all they are—bandits—and that is being kind to them. People's life savings have been torn away from them. Many of these people are in dire straits. Many have invested their life savings, then a collapse occurs, and what do they get out of it: a lot of pain and anguish and, in many cases, it destroys their retirement. When one sees these people's retirement being torn to shreds, one can see why they are so angry.

When one sees, as my colleague has indicated, the likes of Skase and his ilk being able seemingly to get away with robbing people of their life savings, obviously the need to improve corporate law in this country becomes critically important. As I indicated, I do not want to delay the House, but I wanted to add my remarks in support of this Bill because of some of the tragedies I have seen over the years in my electorate office. I believe that this legislation will improve the corporate law.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate. They have enlightened the House no end on the quality of the legislation that we are currently considering. The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990 to ensure that various amendments to the corporations law and other ancillary legislation contained in the Commonwealth Corporations Legislation Amendment Act 1991 can apply as law in South Australia. By this means, the complementary legislation in this country can provide an adequate legislative framework for the proper administration and policing of corporations.

The Bill forms parts of the legislative scheme that involves the enactment of similar Bills in other States and in the Northern Territory. Those jurisdictions have either legislated or are in the process of legislating similar amendments. For that reason, I commend this measure to the House.

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

FISHERIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION (PRIVATE HOSPITAL BEDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STATE HERITAGE CONSERVATION ORDERS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SELF-DEFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1—Page 1, lines 19 and 20 (clause 2)—Leave out ‘has a genuine belief that the force is reasonably necessary to defend himself, herself or another’ and insert:

‘believes that the force is necessary and reasonable:

(i) to defend himself, herself or another;

or

(ii) to prevent or terminate the unlawful imprisonment of himself, herself or another;’.

No. 2—Page 1, lines 22 to 25 (clause 2)—Leave out ‘by using force, not amounting to the intentional or reckless infliction of death or grievous bodily harm against another if that person has a genuine belief that the force is reasonably necessary’ and substitute ‘if that person, without intending to cause death or being reckless as to whether death is caused, uses force against another believing that the force is necessary and reasonable’.

No. 3—Page 2, lines 1 to 6 (clause 2)—Leave out this subsection and substitute:

‘(2) Where—

(a) a person causes death by using force against another believing that the force is necessary and reasonable for a purpose stated in subsection (1);

(b) that person’s belief as to the nature or extent of the necessary force is grossly unreasonable (judged by reference to the circumstances as he or she believed them to be); and

(c) that person, if acting for a purpose stated in subsection (1) (b), does not intend to cause death and is not reckless as to whether death is caused,

that person may not be convicted of murder but may if he or she acted with criminal negligence be convicted of manslaughter.’

No. 4—Page 2, lines 8 to 11 (clause 2)—Leave out paragraph (a) and the word ‘and’ following that paragraph.

No. 5—Page 2 (clause 2)—After line 14 insert:

‘and

(c) a person commits a criminal trespass if that person trespasses on land or premises:

(i) with the intention of committing an offence against the person or an offence against property (or both);

or

(ii) in circumstances where the trespass itself constitutes an offence.’

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

DISTRICT COURT BILL

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

MAGISTRATES COURT BILL

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

STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (COURTS) BILL

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

JUSTICES AMENDMENT BILL

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

[*Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 8.30 p.m.*]

WINE GRAPES INDUSTRY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SELF-DEFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

As Amendment No. 1:

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

That this amendment, to which the House previously disagreed, now be agreed to with the following amendment:

Before the word ‘believes’ insert ‘genuinely’.

Motion carried.

As Amendment No. 2:

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

That this amendment, to which the House previously disagreed, now be agreed to with the following amendment:

Before the word ‘believing’ insert ‘genuinely’.

Motion carried.

As Amendment No. 3:

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

That this amendment, to which the House previously disagreed, now be agreed to with the following amendments:

Before the word ‘believing’ insert ‘genuinely’.

Before the word ‘believed’ insert ‘genuinely’.

Motion carried.

As Amendments Nos 4 and 5:

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

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its amendments.

Motion carried.

STAMP DUTIES (ASSESSMENTS AND FORMS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 15 to 22 (clause 3)—Leave out the clause.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 26 and 27 (clause 4)—Leave out ‘in a manner and form approved by the Commissioner a statement’ and substitute ‘a statement in the prescribed form’.

No. 3. Page 2—After line 6 insert new clause as follows: ‘Matter not to be included in statement

5a. Section 31*i* of the principal Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (a) the following paragraph:

(b) the sale of any goods (other than where there is an agreement, arrangement or understanding that the person to whom the goods are sold may, at a later time, sell the goods back to the registered person);’

No. 4. Page 2, line 31 (clause 6)—Leave out ‘twice the amount specified in the notice’ and substitute ‘an amount equal to twice the amount of the Commissioner’s assessment under subsection (1)’.

No. 5. Page 3, lines 11 to 13 (clause 10)—Leave out the clause.

No. 6. Page 4, line 4 (clause 12)—Leave out ‘twice the amount specified in the notice’ and substitute ‘an amount equal to twice the amount of the Commissioner’s assessment under subsection (1)’.

No. 7. Page 4, lines 17 to 25 (clause 14)—Leave out the clause.

No. 8. Page 4, lines 26 to 28 (clause 15)—Leave out the clause. Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I have not been handling this matter: the Minister of Finance has had carriage of it. This Bill is aimed at closing a number of loopholes in the Stamp Duties Act, and the amendments presented here do not in any way interfere with the purpose of the Bill in that respect. I am advised by the Taxation Commissioner that they reimpose a number of formal requirements on the Taxation Office that were got rid of in the name of deregulation, some under the Tonkin Government, although for some reason, members in another place—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Anything the honourable member has done has been torn up by his current Leader and revisited. I am just making the point that apparently these forms and other requirements were done away with as part of an industry deregulation. They did not affect in any way the industry's understanding of the matter, nor the requirements as laid down. It simply meant that certain formalities could be dispensed with. Now for some reason it is being insisted that they be resumed. Whilst there is a bit of head scratching and bewilderment about this apparent reversal of policy and it does impose some obligations on the Tax Office and therefore on industry which really are unnecessary, nonetheless, in the interests of getting this measure through, I move that the amendments be accepted.

Mr. S.J. BAKER: I am delighted that the Premier will accept them and I suppose it is interesting to reflect that when someone cannot look forward they look back. In this case it is 10 years and I would imagine that is the substance of what the Premier said; he has nothing to look forward to and he wants to go back to when the State had a chance. Addressing the amendments before us, I am pleased with the outcome—genuinely pleased—

Members interjecting:

Mr. S.J. BAKER: The member for Hartley seems to think that everything should be prefaced with 'genuine', so I thought I would keep the debate in the same vein. With respect to stamp duties, we attempted to move a number of changes in this House. We moved them and we failed. In its wisdom the other place proved its value and indeed sustained the arguments advanced in this place. We now have been able to focus the attention of the Commissioner of Stamps on items of hire rather than including the whole rental business which was left open to interpretation and which could have been subject to the interpretation of the Commissioner.

So, to that extent, whilst I may be disappointed that there are still items concerning which I believe there are genuine discounts on rental and hire business, at least we have focused the Bill correctly on the rental and hire business, not on the sale of goods associated with or ancillary to that business. I am also pleased to say that we have stopped the rot; we have stopped the bureaucrats from determining the future of businesses and we have returned that part of it to Parliament. I am also pleased to say that we will not have a sixfold penalty which could have been imposed under this Act and, while I would have been happier had we been able to introduce—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The problem is that listening to the member for Hartley all the time, we do get ourselves bogged down. I would have been happier had we been able to provide that the rental and hire business be permitted those deductions from their operations which are genuine service

costs, but that has not been possible. Overall, I think the legislation is far better for the scrutiny it has received from both Houses, and I am sure that many people in the industry would be somewhat relieved with the changes that will now apply. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SELF-DEFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Atkinson, Crafter, Groom and Inger-son and Mrs Kotz.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 11.15 p.m.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 11.13 p.m. to 1.2 a.m.]

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SELF-DEFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

At 1.2 a.m. the following recommendation of the conference was reported to the House:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the House of Assembly to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 3.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendation of the conference.

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

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to.

I thank those members of the House who participated in the conference of managers. The wishes of this House were carried into effect. I believe that we have a Bill that can be enacted to serve well the people of South Australia.

Mr INGERSON: Opposition members, in their participation in the conference, were concerned about the general wording. Our concern relates to the flippancy with which the whole process has been managed. What concerns the Opposition is that, despite looking at all the alternatives that were put forward, the wording that has finally been agreed to adds nothing to the meaning of the Bill. I put that on record to show the Opposition's concern about the result of the conference.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 February 1992 at 2 p.m.