

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

**Fifth Session of the Forty-Seventh Parliament
(1993)**

Parliament, which adjourned on 6 May, was prorogued by proclamation dated 6 June. By Proclamation dated 6 June, it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 3 August, and the fifth session began on that date.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 August 1993

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. N.T. Peterson) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.14 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of Her Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.50 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

LAUCKE, HON. SIR CONDOR, DEATH

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Condor Louis Laucke, a former member of this House for the seat of Barossa, former Senator for South Australia and former Lieutenant Governor of South Australia, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service.

In moving this way, I know that all members of this place, all members of the South Australian Parliament and South Australians generally will have been deeply saddened to hear of the death of Sir Condor last week. Sir Condor played a significant and distinguished role in South Australia. He did so in politics at the State and Federal Government levels and then as Lieutenant Governor of this State. He served first as the member of the House of Assembly for the Barossa district from 1956 to 1965 and during that time served on the Land Settlement Committee from 1959 to 1965 and as Government Whip from 1962 to 1965.

He then left the South Australian House of Assembly and in 1967 was elected to the Senate as one of South Australia's Senators in the Federal Parliament. He served there from 1967 to 1981 and served as President of the Senate from 1976

to 1981. Upon leaving the Senate he looked forward to an active retirement out of the field of politics. However, fortunately, he was called to serve South Australia yet again. In 1982 he was appointed Lieutenant Governor and served in that capacity until 1992. He was made a Knight Commander of the most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George in 1979.

Sir Condor was born in 1914, and was educated at Greenock Primary School, Nuriootpa Higher Primary School, Immanuel College and the South Australian School of Mines. He became Director and General Manager of his family's flour milling business based at Greenock. His hobbies included making his own wine. I refer to a comment that was made in the *Advertiser* in June 1982, as follows:

... Sir Condor, according to those who knew him throughout his political career, has always been himself, neither position nor money changing an unassuming man who (got) as much if not more delight from a frosty Barossa Valley morning as he did from an invigorating parliamentary debate.

While it was not my pleasure to serve with him in his capacity as a member of Parliament, certainly it was my pleasure to have the experience of him as Lieutenant Governor of this State and on a number of occasions when in that capacity he served as administrator of the State and presided over Executive Council meetings. We found him in Executive Council to be a charming gentleman, who was concerned about the well-being of this State and concerned about the well-being of each individual within it.

He did indeed have a very unassuming manner that was very warm and open to all. He brought respect to his office by virtue of his personality, his temperament and his work. He brought to the various offices he held on behalf of South Australians a deep interest in the people of South Australia and in the development of our State. On behalf of the Government, I wish to convey our condolences to his wife Rose and to his children, Condor Jnr and Rosemary.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Premier in passing on our condolences to the Laucke family. Sir Condor Laucke was a long-serving member of the Liberal Party, both in this Parliament and in the Federal Senate. First, he had an outstanding period in this House from 1956 to 1965. The Premier referred to the fact that he was Whip from 1962 to 1965. It was a very difficult period, because that was the last term of office of the Playford Government. As Whip, because they did not have a majority in the House, Condor Laucke had some very interesting stories to tell of that period about mustering the numbers when at times it was very difficult to do so. But he did it and did it with distinction. I can recall a number of the members of the House at that time noting how well Sir Condor performed his duties as Whip.

From 1967 until 1981, he was a member of the Senate, for six years being President of the Senate—a very distinguished career, to say the least. It was interesting to read the *Hansards* of the Senate on his retirement as President. A wide number of tributes were paid to Sir Condor from both sides of the House: in summary, members basically said that he was courteous, always fair and always impartial. Of course, that is the Sir Condor Laucke that so many of us know. I regard him as a person who was always a gentleman, who stood up for the rights of people and therefore who had great respect for his fellow members of Parliament and fellow human beings. It is interesting to read what he said when retiring from the Senate on 12 June 1981 following the tributes which he received:

I consider myself a most fortunate man to have sought to serve in this place with you all. It has been a magnificent experience with a magnificent body of men and women.

I think that clearly expresses the way that Sir Condor Laucke always looked at whatever issue came up. He saw it from other people's perspectives and gave praise to everyone else but never to himself, even though he was a man who deserved significant praise.

Of course, he was a very special son of the Barossa Valley. He developed the flour mills in the Barossa Valley and then in other areas of rural South Australia, and he developed through that so many job opportunities for people in the Barossa. I know how widely he was respected as an employer and as an industrialist in the Barossa Valley.

I can recall on one occasion going through one of his flour mills with Sir Condor. He knew the christian name of every worker in that place and would stop to talk to them about some of the issues that were coming up on a local basis and their own personal problems, lives and experiences. He really understood people and devoted his life to others.

I join with the Premier, on behalf of the Liberal Party, in passing on our condolences in particular to Lady Rose. Lady Rose always stood alongside Sir Condor and served him in as magnificent a manner as he served South Australia. I know our hearts go out not only to Lady Rose for the dedication and service she too has given to South Australians but also to his family—to his son and daughter and his grandchildren. I join with the Premier and other members of the House in expressing our condolences regarding a South Australian who has served this State in this nation extremely well.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): I rise to pay tribute to the late Sir Condor Laucke. It is a sad loss to the State of one of its finest citizens. His career has already been adequately detailed but, as the person who occupied the Premier's office for most of the time during which Sir

Condor was Lieutenant Governor, I would like to say a few words about him. Whilst it is certainly true that he was a member of both State and Federal Parliaments as a loyal and committed member of the Liberal Party, there is no question that, when he assumed the Presidency of the Senate, his reputation as a fair minded and impartial Chair was certainly strongly reinforced and, as has been mentioned, tributes were paid to him from both sides when he retired.

Therefore, it was with no concern at all that we regarded his appointment to the position of Lieutenant Governor of this State. Sir Condor brought to that position the perfect qualities of a man of affairs, someone with balance and judgment and someone who in that position understood that he was there not to play a partisan role but to look at the broader interests of the State and the community. The fact that soon after he achieved that office a Labor Government came into power and in fact occupied that position throughout his term in no whit detracted from or affected his role as Lieutenant Governor.

On the contrary, I believe that his counsel from his perspective was indeed valuable to the Government and to me personally on a number of occasions. He was a speaker of the old oratorical style; he was a perfect gentleman. In many ways he epitomised a certain strand of South Australian tradition and history and in that, of course, the German tradition of the Barossa Valley. His role as a representative and a man of public affairs did not detract from or inhibit his role as a man of business and industry of the highest ethics, again epitomising a certain strand and tradition in South Australia.

He saw commitment in whatever he did and he was committed to those who worked for him; he was committed to those he served in the State. That was never more clearly demonstrated than in the final months of his occupancy of the Lieutenant Governorship when he came to me and asked whether he could step down from that post because of the recurring problems he had had, particularly with acute asthma; he said that, nonetheless, he would be prepared to remain for the transition period when a new Governor was to be appointed. Indeed, he did just that, at some personal cost and with the support of his wife and family, for which I think the State should be most grateful.

Therefore, it is an occasion both to mourn the passing of a great South Australian and also to toast his life. I certainly intend to crack a bottle of his Bunawunda red, which I have carefully preserved. I think that that would be the way that Sir Condor would finally like to be remembered. We mourn his passing and we pass our condolences to his great comfort, helpmate and supporter, Rose, whose company my wife and I enjoyed at so many functions and occasions. I hope that she will be able to accommodate life with such a large gap left in it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It is with some sorrow, yet happiness, that I respond to this motion. I am sorry about the loss of a person who was a dear friend over many years, long before he went into Parliament and, indeed, subsequent to his having left Parliament. Sir Condor was a constituent of mine throughout the total of my parliamentary career and on occasion was a fellow Presiding Officer when I was Speaker of this House and he was the President of the Senate.

Sir Condor was not only a friend but a client. He was a person who was very much aware of the interests of his beloved Barossa Valley. He was particularly supportive of

those issues that were a traditional part of the culture of the Valley, involving bands, agricultural shows, the agricultural bureau, and so on. Indeed, while his health lasted, he was constantly a patron and a physically present member of those various organisations. Sir Condor was an instigator of the Barons of the Barossa, a fraternity that has played a significant role for the benefit of this State over a number of years in bringing to the attention of people here, interstate and overseas the importance of the Barossa Valley and its wine (as well as wine produced elsewhere). In that regard, he was constantly supporting the wine industry, about which he knew a great deal, even though his own forte was directly associated with flour milling and stock food production.

The Valley, indeed the whole of South Australia, has lost a great friend in his passing. Lady Rose, who is a sister of a former member of this House (who was in fact a member for Light), her children and grandchildren, have my respect and sympathy and that of the community that they have so ably represented through the years. I support the motion.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I will be very brief, Mr Speaker. Something that I had in common with Sir Condor Laucke was that over the years we both filled the positions of Presiding Officer and Government Whip. Despite our different Party backgrounds, I found him a most amiable person who was always willing to swap anecdotes about those two parliamentary positions. Sir Condor was a gentleman who was also a gentle man, although that gentleness did not inhibit him in pursuing those goals that he considered worth pursuing. His kindly nature will make his absence even more conspicuous. I hope that Rose and her family will take comfort from the high regard in which Sir Condor was held by Parliamentarians, both State and Federal, regardless of their political background.

The SPEAKER: I ask members to support the motion by standing in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

HUDSON, HON. HUGH, DEATH

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Hugh Richard Hudson, a former member of this House for the seats of Glenelg and Brighton, and a former Deputy Premier of this State, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service.

Mr Speaker, it is indeed with great regret that we have noted the death of Hugh Hudson in Canberra on 20 May this year at the age of 62, after a long illness. Hugh Hudson had been a member of this Parliament for the electorate of Glenelg from 1965 to 1970 and then, following a redistribution, member for Brighton from 1970 to September 1979. He was elected to Cabinet in March 1968, and upon the return of the Labor Government in 1970 was re-elected to Cabinet, holding the portfolios of Minister of Education from 1970 to 1975 and Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister for Planning from 1975 to 1979. From March to September 1979 he was Deputy Premier.

Hugh Hudson was born in Wollongong, New South Wales, on 12 December 1930. Before entering Parliament he was an economics lecturer at the University of Adelaide. In his role in Parliament he served with great distinction and leadership, leading in his portfolio areas and finally in his capacity as Deputy Premier. As Education Minister he earned

repute for himself, his work and his ideas, not only in South Australia but indeed right around Australia. He was instrumental in many expansions and developments of the education system of this State that were watched with great interest in other States.

Hugh Hudson oversaw the establishment of specialist music schools that later led to the establishment of specialist schools in a number of areas. It was under him, as Minister of Education, that the then Director-General of Education issued the Freedom in Authority memorandum which gave teachers greater freedom to comment on educational issues and which was a key document in terms of the educational debates of the 1970s. The Karmel report, which established new benchmarks for education in South Australia, came during Hugh Hudson's time as Education Minister, and he actively pursued the achievement of the recommendations of that report.

When he was moved to the portfolio areas of Mines and Energy and Planning, he served those portfolio areas with equal distinction and enthusiasm. He brought new verve to mines and energy issues and to planning in this State. Indeed, in 1979 he was instrumental in key legislation that protected South Australian gasfields. His work in that legislation can clearly be seen in hindsight to have been very valuable for South Australia.

In his parliamentary performance, of course, he had some very special styles that have been noted. I did not have the pleasure to serve in the Parliament at the same time, but sometimes coming into the Parliament and watching from the Speaker's Gallery I saw his way of performing. He is said to have dominated many a session in this Chamber. Indeed, I know that while some seek to attribute titles for longevity in answering questions, none could hold a candle to Hugh Hudson. I am told that the dreaded movement of the hand to the back pocket halfway through answering a question indicated that there was a lot more to come in the answering of that question, and something of a sigh was heard on Opposition benches as a result.

Upon leaving the Parliament in 1979, Hugh Hudson continued to serve Australians in various ways: first, simply by his own intellect that he committed to so many different subjects, and he would always be available for advice and opinion in both State and national arenas. In 1982 he was made Chair of the South Australian Pipelines Authority, and in 1984 he was named full-time Chair of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. It was in that capacity that I had the opportunity to serve with him. As the then Minister of Education, I would interact with him at Australian Education Council meetings where he was working with Susan Ryan, the then Federal Minister.

Hugh Hudson has served this State and nation with great distinction. He was an amiable person, a great and colourful personality, and a man of outstanding intellect. His intellect was shared with others in the very best of spirits. He never sought to dominate by it; he sought to use it for the good of his country.

It is with great regret that we note Hugh Hudson's passing. We mourn his passing and express our condolences to his wife Ainslie and to his son and two daughters and extended members of his family.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I join the Premier in expressing our regret at the untimely loss of Hugh Hudson. I had the chance to serve in this House with Hugh Hudson from 1973

to 1979, and in my estimation he was the Minister of that era for whom I had by far the greatest respect, and there were some fairly strong Ministers during that period. As the Premier said, Hugh Hudson had the portfolios of Education, Planning, and Mines and Energy. I can remember that under planning he had the responsibility for Monarto in its dying days in 1978 and 1979.

I can also remember having some very fierce debates both in this Chamber and in the lounge next door. One day it continued on a very friendly but fierce basis for more than half an hour, during which time I was trying to point out that he was supporting a dead duck. It was always interesting that, despite those fierce clashes in this House—and he had an ability to be one of the best, and certainly one of the most dominating debaters I have ever seen in this Parliament—the moment one went outside the Chamber, he was willing to sit down and talk as a friend.

I always admired what he contributed to the Labor Party and to this State through his intellect and his ability to administer, because he was a very good administrator as a Minister, and that is not always the case.

I happened to sit on the Cooper Basin indenture agreement select committee through a very difficult period. I can say now that it was touch and go as to whether or not the companies would survive. Hugh gave great leadership to that select committee and in fact to that whole process, and I think it was due to his drive and energy that we got through that difficult period without the collapse of the companies involved, and in fact achieved that final resolution. Hugh wrote to me just over 12 months ago when I came back to Parliament.

I had a nickname for Hugh and he knew it. I often referred to him, because of my rural background, as a Brahman bull because of his big frame and big features. Hugh wrote to me and said this:

Dear Dean, I was amazed by Ted Chapman's remark that 'if you bring a good animal to market you get a good price!' Did he bring a Brahman bull? And how much life is left in the 'old fellow'? Government is not getting easier particularly in a State with a manufacturing base like South Australia. So, good luck!
Regards, Hugh Hudson.

I will not read out my reply, but I did say that I thought that he brought a thoroughbred. I think that highlights the sense of humour that Hugh had at all times. In fact, he had the ability to sit down and talk to both sides of the House and to see the broader picture for South Australia. On behalf of the Liberal Party I express our condolences, particularly to his wife Ainslie and his children David, Catherine and Julie. We note the valuable contribution that Hugh made to this State as a member of Parliament, particularly in relation to the long-term energy needs of South Australia for which I and many other South Australians will be eternally grateful.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): It is with great sadness and personal loss that I rise to support this motion. Hugh Hudson was my mentor and friend. I was active in his campaigns in 1965 and 1968 to win the old seat of Glenelg. It was he who talked me into throwing my hat in the ring in 1969 for the newly carved out seat of Mawson. I had joint electoral meetings with him in my first election campaign in 1970, and I followed him into the education portfolio in 1975.

Education was one of Hugh's great achievements. It was he as much as anybody else who placed it centre stage in political debate. When he left the portfolio there was a sense in which he never did, in that he tried to ensure that it remained very high on the agenda of the South Australian

Government. In fact, I can recall one other Minister, who will remain nameless, grumbling perhaps fairly good-naturedly—perhaps not—that the Cabinet seemed to have three Ministers of Education: Hopgood, Hudson and, even more to the point, Dunstan.

Hugh had an enormous capacity for absorbing information, analysing and acting on it. He should have been a dream to brief. Public servants often tend to rank Ministers according to how quickly they catch on to what they are being told. He was not a dream to brief because he almost certainly knew it all before the departmental head went in to see him. I can recall on one occasion, and this was not a short answer in the House, when for a short time he was acting Minister of Water Resources. There were some problems with the Warren reservoir. Hugh stood up with his hand in his hip pocket and went on about so many megalitres here and so many megalitres there. He had been in the acting portfolio for about a week. Jack Wright asked me whether Hugh was making it all up, and I said that if he was no-one would know. I am sure he was not making it up.

I am sure he knew because I heard him on the Conlon show when the Government brought him back for some consulting work to do with water in the past few years. Within a day of receiving his brief, it was all coming out again. It was all there despite the time he had been away from this House and away from those sorts of responsibilities. I would say that, of all the outstanding people whom I have known in this place in my time, he was second to none in terms of his capacity to get a grip on very complex problems.

We had little contact in later years as he shifted away from the State. The Premier has already spoken of that broader field in which Hugh operated. I was shocked by the news of his death. I could not attend the funeral. I rang Ainslie and expressed my condolences. She said that Hugh had long known that the end was near. For someone who in public life had shown such ferocious energy, who had always had so many irons in the fire, he accepted the end with peace, serenity and resignation. He took each day as it came, determined to make the very best of it. The nation is poorer for his passing.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I knew Hugh Hudson as a lecturer: he lectured me in economics before he joined the Parliament. I knew him as an employer when he was a Minister. On the lighter side, I must say that I was stunned, after being lectured in economics by Hugh, when he joined the Labor Party and the Parliament and stated that he did not realise that parliamentarians were so poorly paid. I think some members here can remember that statement. He was genuinely a highly competent person, whether lecturing or as a Minister.

The one tribute I will pay to Hugh, given what has already been said—and I agree with every comment that has been made to date—is that one of his great attributes was his capacity to get on particularly well with people and know what they were doing. Once a week he would wander down the floors of his department and he would know what was going on. He would talk to the people concerned and would relay back information about the project that person was involved in, and be genuinely interested in the results that were coming forth.

He was a person I regard as larger than life. I believe that he was a great South Australian, a person of whom we can all be proud, a person who graced this Parliament with a great deal of vigour and who created a tremendous amount of

respect for his abilities. I also wish to express my condolences and regret at his passing.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Hugh Hudson was one of the three or four great Labor parliamentary figures of the 1960s and 1970s. Much has already been said about that, and I want to put on record one remark to which I want everyone to pay close attention. It was Hugh Hudson who saved our energy supplies from the control of Alan Bond.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish briefly to record one or two matters. I support all that has been said in support of the Hon. Hugh Hudson and the work that he did for the State, with the close connection that he had with his family. The House should have on record that he came to me at the time we changed the system here, when the Whips no longer managed the House. The practice was that the Whips managed the House, and he came to me and said, 'I do not know whether it is a good change or not but we are going for it. I appreciate the work you have put in and you should be proud of what you have done in the job as manager of the House as well as Whip.'

I appreciated those comments: they meant something to me. He never broke his word to me in any dealings we had over schools or other portfolio matters in all the years he was a Minister. I won only one argument with him, where he refused something and I took up the challenge, and that was in relation to the Eden Hills Primary School. A house was for sale next door and he told the department not to buy it, so I signed the contract in my name 'or nominee' and went to him with the contract. He then changed his mind, and Eden Hills Primary School now has a great area for a playground.

He expressed an Australian slang word to me when I did it, and I appreciated that. But that was the only time I got on top of him, because he had strong control of his portfolio. His family and those who are associated with him should be proud of the contribution he made to this State.

I am sure that the National Party member would also like me to say that he, as a member of the Opposition, appreciates the contribution that was made, as do all of us on this side of the House and, I am sure, all his colleagues. May his family live with the knowledge that his efforts are appreciated. In particular, he is respected as a man who contributed to the State.

The SPEAKER: I thank members for their comments and ask all members to support the motion by standing.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That as a mark of respect for their memory the sitting of the House be suspended until 2.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 1.25 to 2.30 p.m.]

SUPPLY BILL

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

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 259 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow a referendum on the question of the reintroduction of the death penalty was presented by Mr Atkinson.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 85 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow the electors to pass judgment on the losses of the State Bank by calling a general election was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

TRANSIT LINK

A petition signed by 271 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to relocate the Henley Beach Road transit link bus stop was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

GOOLWA PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 317 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to commence the planning for the construction of a new Goolwa primary school immediately was presented by the Hon. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

SHOPPING HOURS

A petition signed by 2 750 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to further deregulate shopping hours was presented by Mr Ferguson.

Petition received.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses held today for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. R.J. Ritson and to which vacancy Mrs Caroline Veronica Schaefer was elected.

STATE BANK

The SPEAKER laid on the table the second report of the Auditor-General on an investigation into the State Bank of

South Australia pursuant to section 25 of the State Bank of South Australia Act 1983 (as amended), which has been distributed in accordance with the resolution of the House on 6 May 1993.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports of committees which have been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act:

Seventh report of the Economic and Finance Committee on an Inquiry into the Use of External Consultants by Government Departments and Statutory Authorities.

Second report of the Social Development Committee on Ministerial Responses to the Report of the Social Development Committee on the Social Implications of Population Change in South Australia.

MABO

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I rise to advise members of developments in relation to the decision of the High Court on 3 June last year in the matter of Eddie Mabo and others versus the State of Queensland. As members would be aware, the decision established native title in Australia. In so doing, it has raised a number of complex issues which must be addressed by Commonwealth and State Governments. These issues have been of great interest among all sections of the community, but particularly among Aboriginal people and the mining and pastoral industries. In recognition of that interest, the Government determined that early in the life of this session it would inform the Parliament and the public of its intentions in dealing with the Mabo decision. Due to the uninformed nature of much of the public comment on Mabo, it is necessary to point out what the High Court actually decided:

- The High Court rejected the application of the doctrine of *terra nullius*, whereby Aboriginal people had been thought to lack sufficient social organisation to possess any rights or interests in land.
- It held that, while Aboriginal people did hold interests in land at the time of European settlement, those interests may have been wholly or partially extinguished by legislative or executive action inconsistent with native title.
- The court determined that native title may still exist where it has not been so extinguished and where Aboriginal people can demonstrate a continuing traditional association to particular land.
- However, it made it absolutely clear that the grant of freehold interests in land will have extinguished native title. Claims cannot successfully be made over backyards, farms, towns and railway lines.

The Government has consistently adhered to several fundamental principles in its response to Mabo. These are:

- That the Government accepts and welcomes the High Court's decision as providing an important statement about the rights and aspirations of Australia's indigenous peoples.
- That any doubts as to the security of existing interests in land must be removed and such titles protected.
- That procedures must be implemented to allow future dealings in land potentially subject to native title to

continue where possible without prejudicing the interests of native title holders.

- That there must be implemented a fair and efficient means of determining the validity of claims to native title and assessing any compensation payable for its extinguishment.
- A cooperative national approach to native title is highly desirable to minimise possible confusion, particularly among foreign investors, and wide differences between how States might deal with native title. However, that approach must be sufficiently flexible to recognise that circumstances vary between the States.

I yesterday received a letter from the Prime Minister informing the Government of decisions which set the baselines for draft legislation the Commonwealth intends to introduce during the budget session of Federal Parliament.

The Prime Minister has indicated the Commonwealth's view that freehold grants and residential, pastoral and tourist leases have extinguished native title except where it has continued to exist as a result of reservations having been made.

However, the Commonwealth proposes that native title may revive after the expiration of mining leases. This would accord with the existing position in general Australian law, under which a mining lease over most of Australia does not extinguish freehold title.

The Commonwealth is proposing the establishment of a tribunal system to make judgments on native title matters.

The Commonwealth has decided that, where development such as mining activity is proposed over native title land, native title holders should have the right to be consulted about the proposal. If agreement is not reached between the proponents and the native title holders within a specified period—probably three months—there should be provision for the native title tribunal to arbitrate on the matter, again within a specified time frame. Governments should have the right to override a decision of the tribunal concerning such a development proposal if they consider it to be in the national interests to do so.

The Prime Minister has indicated that, if a State or Territory Government fails to establish mechanisms for the determination of native title claims that satisfy national principles, it will be the Commonwealth tribunal, and not the State or Territory tribunal, that will operate in that State or Territory. The Commonwealth also supports the validation of grants of interest in land made before 1 July this year which may be invalid as a result of the interaction of the Mabo decision with the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act 1975. The Prime Minister says that assistance from the Commonwealth to the States and Territories for the validation process will depend on their willingness to cooperate responsibly with the Commonwealth in a coherent national response. Final details of the Commonwealth's proposed legislation are still to be finalised.

Mr Speaker, as I have indicated, my Government believes that it is important that there be complementary action between the Commonwealth and the States in dealing with the Mabo decision. My Government is keen to ensure that this State retains to the greatest extent possible the power to determine land management and development issues within its own borders. We also wish to ensure that the State receives the support of Commonwealth legislation assisting the validation of titles already granted in South Australia. To that end, we are continuing discussions with the Common-

wealth on the implications of the Mabo decision. In the light of these ongoing discussions, it would be unwise to finalise at this stage legislation that will need to be introduced in this Parliament.

In relation to removing any doubt about existing titles, it should be clearly understood that there is a presumption of the validity of those titles at law; that is, the validity of titles granted since 1975 will be presumed to continue unless proved otherwise by a claimant asserting native title. There is no indication of any such determination being imminent in South Australia. However, my Government stands ready to introduce legislation to remove any doubt about existing titles. I would hope that this House would support my Government's aim of securing the important Commonwealth assistance that will be given in this area if our legislation is drafted in conjunction with a national approach.

Mr Speaker, in ensuring that any native title in South Australia is taken into account and treated fairly in future dealings with land, there will need to be amendment to some existing legislation and possibly new legislation in some areas. Again, this Government is ready to enact such measures in this session of Parliament. Consideration is also being given by my Government on the need for a specialist native title court or tribunal in this State and the form that such a court or tribunal would take. As I have indicated, the Government will seek to ensure that this State retains control over Mabo land matters by having any such body endorsed by the Commonwealth as the appropriate mechanism to consider native title matters. I undertake to keep members informed as matters progress on this important issue and look forward to support from this House for the legislation this Government will need to enact.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

South Australian Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report on, 1988-92

Friendly Societies Act—Amendments to General Laws—Mutual Community Friendly Society

Regulations under the following Acts—

Debits Tax Act—Federal Institutions Duty—Exemptions

Financial Institutions Duty Act—Non-dutiable Credits

Offshore Banking Units/Treasury Products

Lottery and Gaming Act—Major Lotteries

Gaming Machines—Exhibit Exemptions

Superannuation Act—State Scheme—

Bordertown Hospital

Kingston Soldiers' Hospital

Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act—Exemptions

By the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Mining Act—Regulations—Fees and Charges

Mines and Works Inspection Act—Regulations—Fees and Charges

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

South Australian Planning Commission and the Advisory Committee on Planning—Report on the Administration of the Planning Act, 1991-92

Judges of the Supreme Court of South Australia—Report, 1992

Planning Act—Crown Development Report on Land Division at Craighburn

Public Parks Act—Disposal of Parklands—Leicester Street, Parkside; Killicoat Street, Unley and Fern Avenue, Fullarton

Rules of Court—

District Court—District Court Act 1991—Caseflow Management

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—Cashflow Management—ADR

Corporations Rules

Summary Offences Act—Road Block Establishment and Disaster Area Declarations—Returns, 20 January 1993 to 19 April 1993

Regulations under the following Acts—

Associations Incorporation Act—Associations—Various

Building Act—Various

Business Names Act—Fees

City of Adelaide Development Control—Heritage Items—Register

Classification of Publications Act—Exemptions

Courts Administration Act—Contractual Liability—Participating Courts

Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act—Court Fees

Co-operatives Act—Fees

District Court Act—Court and Transcript Fees

Electoral Act—Procedures and Forms

Local Government Act—Superannuation Board—Northern Territory

Local Government Finance Authority Act—Prescribed Bodies

Magistrates Court Act—Court and Transcript Fees

Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act—Returns Forms

Planning Act—Development Control—Buildings

Sheriff's Act—Court Fees

South Australian Local Government Grants

Commission Act—Outback Areas Trust

Summary Offences Act—Traffic Expiation Fees

Supreme Court Act—

Court and Transcript Fees

Court Fees—Probate

Corporation By-laws—

Glenelg—No. 20—Moveable Signboards

Happy Valley—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Council Land

No. 3—Caravans and Camping

No. 4—Inflammable Undergrowth

No. 6—Bees

No. 7—Dogs

No. 8—Animals and Birds

Kensington and Norwood—

No. 1—Repeal of By-laws

No. 2—Bees

No. 3—Height of Fences

No. 4—Traffic

No. 5—Prohibition of Traffic

No. 6—Dogs

No. 7—Streets and Footways

No. 8—Tents

No. 9—Lodging Houses

No. 10—Animals

No. 11—Poultry

No. 12—Street Traders

No. 13—Inflammable Undergrowth

Mitcham—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 10—Moveable Signs

District Council By-laws—

Beachport—No. 5—Dogs

East Torrens—No. 3—Bees

Hallett—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Streets and Roads

No. 3—Animals and Birds

No. 4—Bees

Mallala—No. 2—Streets and Public Places

Millicent—No. 10—Foreshore.

Stirling—No. 38—Animals and Birds

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Racing Act—Rules—

- Bookmakers Licensing Board Rules—On-course
Telephone Betting
Greyhound Racing Board—Officials and Definitions
Harness Racing Board—
Board Membership Numbers
Handicapping
Wet Weather Meetings
Totalisator Racing Board—On-course Betting
- By the Minister of Environment and Land Management
(Hon. M.K. Mayes)—
Riverland Cultural Trust—Report, 1991-92
Regulations under the following Acts—
Beverage Container Act—Glass Containers—
Exemptions
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act—Fees
and Charges
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act—General
Builders Licensing Act—Fees and Charges
Clean Air Act—Domestic Burning
Commercial and Private Agents Act—Fees and
Charges
Commercial Tribunal Act—
Constitution
Fees and Charges
Consumer Credit Act—Fees and Charges
Consumer Transactions Act—Fees and Charges
Cremation Act—Fees and Charges
Fair Trading Act—Fees and Charges
Fees Regulation Act—Places and Public
Entertainment—Fees and Charges
Goods Securities Act—Fees and Charges
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act—Fees and
Charges
Landlord and Tenant Act—Commercial Tenancies—
Fees and Charges
Liquor Licensing Act—Dry Areas—
Brighton Beach
West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park
Places of Public Entertainment Act—Fees and Charges
Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act—Fees and Charges
Trade Measurements Act—Fees and Charges
Travel Agents Act—Fees and Charges
Valuation of Land Act—Fees
- By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. M.K.
Mayes)—
Firearms Act—Regulations—General
- By the Minister of Education, Employment and Training
(Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—
Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—
Report—Amended Appendix VIII
University of South Australia—Review, 1992
- By the Minister of Public Infrastructure (Hon. J.H.C.
Klunder)—
Murray Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1991-92
ETSA/E&WS Merger—Strategic—Savings Potential
- By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational
Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Industrial Relations Act (SA)—Industrial Proceedings
Rules—Procedural Changes—
Federal Services—General
Regulations under the following Acts—
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act—
Administrative Control
Fees
Dangerous Substances Act—
Director—Department of Lands
Fees
Explosives Act—
Administrative Control
Fees
Government Management and Employment Act—
Various
Lifts and Cranes Act—
Administrative Control
Fees
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act—
Asbestos—Fees
- Commercial Safety—Administrative Control
Construction Safety—
Administrative Control
Fees
Industrial Safety—Administrative Control
Registration of Employers—Fees
Safe Handling of Pesticides—Administrative
Control
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act—
Claims and Registration—Review Officer
Crown Agencies
General—Recovery Rights/Exempt Employers
Recovery of Payments
Reviews and Appeals—Schedules/Prescribed
Forms
- By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. R.J.
Gregory)—
Correctional Services Act—Regulation—Northfield
Complex—Admittance Times
- By the Minister of Business and Regional Development
(Hon. M.D. Rann)—
Economic Development Action Plan—Regaining
Prosperity
Regulations under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles Act—
Accident Towing Roster Scheme Fees and Charges
Fees and Charges
Wrecked and Written-off Vehicles
Wheelchair Exemptions
Road Traffic Act—
Fees—Inspecting Primary Producers' Vehicles
Photographic Detection Devices
- By the Minister of Health, Family and Community
Services (Hon. M.J. Evans)—
Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 1991-92
Loxton Hospital Complex—By-laws—General
Noarlunga Health Services—By-laws—General
Regulations under the following Acts—
Clean Air Act—Burning of Refuse—Campbelltown
Controlled Substances Act—
Distribution of Syringes/Needles
Drugs of Dependence
Drugs Act—Fees, Licences and Permits
Optometrists Act—Optometrists and Optical
Dispensers—Reinstatement
Physiotherapists Act—Fees and Charges
Public and Environmental Health Act—Notifiable
Diseases—Report Fee
South Australian Health Commission Act—Fees
Hospitals/Health Centres
- By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R.
Groom)—
Australian Fisheries Council—Resolutions of 22nd
Meeting
South Australian Meat Corporation—Triennial Review,
1989-92
South Australian Egg Board—
Report, 1990-91
Report, 1991-May 1992
Regulations under the following Acts—
Barley Marketing Act—Election of Australian Barley
Board
Dairy Industry Act—Licences
Fisheries Act—
Abalone Fisheries—Licence Fees
Fish Processors Registration Fee
General—Expiable Offences
Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Fees
Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Licence Fees
Miscellaneous Fishery—Licence Fees
Prawn Fisheries—Licence Fees
River Fishery—Licence Fees
Rock Lobster Fisheries—Licence Fees
Transfer Provisions—Marine Scalefish Fishery.
- The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*
The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the member for
Heysen wants to be here for the rest of the day. We are going

to start this session correctly, and I advise the honourable member to watch his manners.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, I do not mind when a Minister cannot say what he is trying to tell the House, but I cannot hear what the Minister is saying, because he is not speaking in English.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order. Frivolous points of order will be taken very seriously. We are in a session now where pressure will be on everyone in this House, and that is a frivolous point of order because, as the honourable member is well aware, there is nothing in the Standing Orders about being able to understand what anyone says.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Murray-Mallee wishes to cite the appropriate point of order, the Chair will be pleased to uphold it. I take the silence to mean that there is no point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will refrain from continuing in Dutch.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Economic Development Board, which was established by Parliament following the release of the Arthur D. Little report last year, has developed a discussion paper outlining a plan for the growth and sustainable development of the State economy and the growth of sustainable employment. The board, which is chaired by the Chief Executive of the Economic Development Authority (Mr Robyn Marrett) and which includes leading figures from South Australian industry, commerce and the public sector, has set down a framework for a three year plan to be developed in consultation with business, Government and a range of relevant interest groups.

The draft plan will be released shortly for broad business and community consultation, including with members of Parliament. The Economic Development Board will take into consideration the submissions it receives in producing the final plan. This will then be submitted to the Government for endorsement later this year. Central to the plan, and highlighted in this discussion document, is the need to achieve an annual gross State product growth of 4 per cent, and an annual employment growth of 2 per cent to achieve a sustainable and vibrant State economy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Obviously, members opposite do not believe in the industrialists on the EDB. The EDB believes this goal can be achieved by exploring and developing specific strategies and programs and setting priorities for action. In April this year the Government released its Meeting the Challenge economic statement, which provided an invaluable kick-start for restructuring and rebuilding the South Australian economy. The Premier's statement laid down the challenge for an ongoing process of reform to stimulate business and encourage investment.

This discussion paper picks up that challenge. The EDB's Economic Development Action Plan, when finalised, will provide a valuable planning tool for the South Australian Government, for the business community and the community

at large. I have pleasure in tabling this discussion paper for the information of members.

ENVIRONMENT RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I bring up the fifth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, being the annual report of the committee, February 1992 to June 1993, and move:

That the report be received.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government immediately ask the Criminal Prosecutions Task Force established to consider possible charges against individuals arising out of the State Bank Group losses to investigate whether the former Premier and any other Ministers and senior ministerial officers were involved in a conspiracy to conceal illegal activity by executives of Beneficial Finance Corporation?

The second Auditor-General's report has recommended that three former executives of Beneficial Finance Corporation be further investigated for illegal or improper conduct arising out of loans they obtained from Beneficial to invest in a failed \$2.5 million property development in Victoria. Two of those to be further investigated are Mr John Baker, former Managing Director of Beneficial, and the company's second most senior executive, Mr Erich Reichert, who loaned themselves \$100 000 each in 1989 to participate in this development. These two executives left Beneficial suddenly on 3 August 1990—three years ago today—soon after the former Chairman, Mr Simmons, became aware of these loans.

In a series of meetings immediately before their dismissal, the former Premier, his Executive Assistant, Mr Geoff Anderson, and the Economics Adviser to the former and present Premiers, Mr Ray Garrard, were informed that illegal loans were involved which were likely to result in criminal charges being laid. However, the Government took no action to ensure that the police were immediately advised and an investigation initiated.

When the Liberal Party questioned reasons for the dismissals in this House on 7 August 1990, the former Premier denied Messrs Baker and Reichert had been fired. He said they had left because of a difference of opinion with Beneficial's board over the direction of the company and no more than that. The Royal Commissioner found in his first report that the former Premier gave this answer knowing it was untrue.

While Mr Baker received a severance payment on his dismissal of almost \$200 000 on top of the \$1.4 million he was paid in his last three years at Beneficial, and Mr Reichert received more than \$100 000 as a severance payment in addition to a salary of more than \$800 000 in the same period, no investigation of their activities was started until more than six months after their dismissal—and then only after the Liberal Party forced a full inquiry. The Liberal Party has received advice that the Government's knowledge of the real reasons for their dismissal, and its failure to ensure an

immediate investigation, amounts to a conspiracy to cover up illegal conduct.

The SPEAKER: I notice that the Liberal Party's policy with respect to Question Time has been modified. One of the problems in this House in Question Time is the length of questions and answers. I might point out that that was a very long question. If members ask long questions, they will get long answers. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: You let him stay there.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Murray-Mallee have a problem or a point of order?

Mr Lewis: No, Sir.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I notice that in one of the notices of motion put forward today by the member for Goyder there was this accolade of approval for the Leader, and reference was made to a change for the better. What intrigues me is that members opposite have let him stay after the winter recess. They have decided they will still give him a go; they will not go for a change for the better but will let him stay. We have this same effort at rewriting events, rewriting history, taking supposed facts, putting them together in odd sorts of ways and hoping they can come out with a different kind of conclusion—the innuendo effect that tries to create findings that simply are not there.

Then we have the Leader himself deciding he is quite capable of saying one thing on one day and another thing on another day and regarding that as a consistent approach to his role as Leader of the Opposition. On one day he is busy saying we should take action to the fullest extent possible; we should haul these people before the courts and if possible prosecute them. I do not know how we can haul people before the courts unless we are charging them before the courts. Nevertheless, he said that. Then when the Auditor-General's report came out he said we should go to the fullest extent possible to make sure that action can be taken and damages can be sought. What did we do? We announced the process that we will take on the Auditor-General's recommendations, and the first thing he says is that this seems to be a waste of money, this is going too far. He says that we seem to be going through an endless spiral of legal procedures, all at taxpayers' expense. He cannot have it both ways.

We want to do this job properly and thoroughly. Nobody could criticise the way we have handled this job in terms of putting these task forces in place, to pursue to every possible corner what action may be able to be taken and the thoroughness with which we have done it, yet he decides he will challenge that; that he will not have that. The process we have set in place has all the body of evidence available to it, and I might say that not only has it all the body of evidence available to it but most pertinently of all it has the findings of the Royal Commissioner and the Auditor-General available to it.

The Leader made some reference to statements in the Royal Commissioner's report, but again by the most selective of quoting he made reference to that. We come back to the actual findings. What were the recommendations in the second Auditor-General's Report with respect to the losses that have been sustained and the responsibility for those losses? He chooses not to mention any of the damning indictments and findings that have been made by the Auditor-General about a series of people; he makes vague reference to their names and that is about it. The reality is that, on the basis of all the evidence (and you yourself, Sir, had the

Auditor-General's second report on your desk a few moments ago; you were not displaying it, but you had it there), we know how big that second report was (as was the first report), so we know how much effort and work went into bringing down the findings of these reports, yet the findings do not seem to suit the Leader.

The Leader was hoping that there would be a recommendation 3.1: grab the whole Government and throw it into court. Even with the fact that the Opposition had its own taxpayer-funded QC before the royal commission to try to do what he could to get as much evidence out as possible, he could not get the recommendation he really wanted. The Leader thought that here in the parliamentary process he would try to rake over those same sorts of innuendo through selective quoting from documentation and adding a heavy body of hint, suggestion and mud. The other thing he said was that the Liberal Party had forced a full inquiry.

I believe the announcement was made on a Sunday in February 1991, and if I recall correctly the royal commission was announced two days later on the following Tuesday. If you look at other States where royal commissions have been appointed by Governments, there was a deal of time before the Government in those States decided to make such an appointment. So I really do not think that 48 hours from an announcement to a parliamentary sitting day is extensive, and there is certainly nothing on the record to show that the Liberals forced that royal commission. This Government was willing to see that happen, because we knew it was in the best interests to do so.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: They laugh, because there is another—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There is another suggestion that we do not want to see this process finished, that we want to cut it short. I reject that. I believe there should be the fullest inquiry possible; I have always supported that. In fact, there has been the fullest inquiry possible, and the recommendations have been followed up accordingly by a thorough process, which the Leader himself attacks. He is saying he does not want this process; he has attacked this process, and now, just to take advantage of the parliamentary forum and a bit of political shilly-shallying he is now saying, 'Forget what I said about that, but instead now use this same process to do something other than what it was being laid out to do'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will bring his response to a close.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The process is there, and it will be thorough, and the reports are there. I assure the honourable member that we will follow through every recommendation in the reports.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order. The member for Napier.

DEPARTMENTAL MERGER

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Premier advise the House how the merger of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Electricity Trust of South Australia relates to achieving the debt reduction target set out in his April economic statement entitled 'Meeting the Challenge'; and what alternatives are available to the Government to meet the savings target set out in Meeting the

Challenge if the Leader of the Opposition achieves his objective of blocking the merger?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Meeting the Challenge statement that I made in April was very significant. It certainly does have an impact on debt reduction targets; and it certainly does have an impact on cost reductions in the broader area of Government. It offers a real body of savings, from which the community can benefit and which will enable the Government's financial affairs—their financial affairs, because it is taxpayers' money we are talking about here—to be used to best possible effect. Given that significant savings are to be had from this, if they are not taken up they will have to be found from somewhere else.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks, 'Where are the figures?' I can assure the Deputy Leader that when this matter comes before Parliament there will be a full detailing of the figures.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is again out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When the Deputy Leader heard about this idea he thought about it for a long time. In fact, he sat there cogitating for some months, working up this issue. Finally he said, 'I do not like this, I will say 'No'. He then said he would say 'No'. He has not even seen the information; he rushed to a judgment before he saw any information, but he said 'No'. I give full credit to the Deputy Leader, because he said, 'Where are the figures?' I have said we will have those figures in the Parliament when the Bill comes before us. Obviously, he will make a judgment on the information we provide to the Parliament. He will listen to the figures by which he will be very edified, and he will then decide which way he will vote, whereas the Leader was not even prepared to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is really quite amazing the way the Leader chooses to operate on these sorts of things. In fact, I was really taken by a comment that was made on air last week, when someone on one of the radio stations said, 'Sometimes I worry a bit about Dean Brown, and I worry a bit about whether he's up to the job, and I'm quite sure that the people in his Party do too.'

Mr BRINDAL: My understanding is that Standing Orders preclude debate in the answer to a question, and I ask you to rule on whether the Premier is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to bring his response to a close quickly.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will make a very short series of statements that will close my answer. First, if you have 40 locations or nearby collocations of ETSA and E&WS facilities and you can go to one instead of two at each of those 40 locations, does that or does that not save money? If you have the opportunity to rationalise workshops and have one set of workshops and not two sets of workshops, is that going to be cheaper or dearer? If you have one and not two sets of meter reading systems in place, one set of account systems, one set of payroll systems and information technology systems—and in so many other areas—is that dearer or cheaper? If we can get the savings from this, which I am confident the Parliament will deliver, that stops having to do things in other areas that I know South Australians do not want to see happen, but the Leader clearly does not care about that.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Soon after Messrs Baker and Reichert were dismissed from Beneficial Finance for involvement in illegal loans, will he—

The SPEAKER: That is an unusual way to phrase a question; but go ahead, I am listening.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will repeat it, Sir, so that you can get the full flavour. Soon after Messrs Baker and Reichert were dismissed from Beneficial Finance for involvement in illegal loans, will the Premier confirm that the former Premier informed him and other Ministers of the true reasons for these dismissals, and he might like to answer the previous question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Now the honourable member is debating.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park has been spoken to once.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader is deciding he is going to try some sort of fishing expedition. I would simply refer him to all the evidence that has been given before the royal commission by all relevant parties in this matter, including the member for Ross Smith, me and other parties. I ask him to read through that evidence very carefully to see what was said to whom, by whom and what issues were dealt with.

LAKE EYRE BASIN

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Can the Minister inform the House what progress has been made in the establishment of a task force to investigate the environmental and economic values of the Lake Eyre Basin and also to establish a management plan for the area based on the principles of ecologically sustainable development?

I note that the Leader of the Opposition has issued a press release that appears to be supporting the initiative of this Government in establishing a task force to examine the management of the Lake Eyre Basin. However, the Leader of the Opposition seems to be claiming the implementation of a study into the Lake Eyre Basin as his own initiative and has alleged that this Government has taken no action to resolve uncertainties that various interest groups may have about this proposal.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Stuart for raising this issue, because I too had the opportunity to hear the Leader of the Opposition yesterday announcing with great flourish that this was to be a new initiative and that it had not been seen by the Government. Let me correct the Leader of the Opposition: in fact, it was this Government that initiated that concept, and it has already been in extensive consultation not only with pastoral interests, as the member for Stuart knows, but with the Aboriginal community and the mining communities of this State. There have also been extensive discussions with the Federal Government. I will briefly quote from the Leader of the Opposition's press release:

Despite the serious ramifications of our mining, pastoral and tourism industries Premier Arnold has refused to act to protect the interests of South Australia. Mr Arnold has allowed the uncertainty over a quarter of our State to continue without any attempt to tackle his Federal colleagues over this issue.

Wrong on both counts, because in fact the Premier has made very clear statements about this position and it goes back to

his statement of 9 March 1993, where he indicated that this Government's position was that it would have an economic and environmental study of the Lake Eyre region. In fact, the Premier said the following in his press statement:

There is no doubt that the Lake Eyre region is an important economic—

I underline 'economic'—

and environmental asset for South Australia.

He went on to say:

The State Environment Minister, Kym Mayes, told Parliament last month that the State Government had decided to look at the protection and scientific study of the region taking into account economic development as well as environmental protection and preservation.

Quite clearly, the Leader of the Opposition was somewhere else. He did not hear that. We have negotiated. The second point on which the Leader criticises the Premier is again quite wrong, because it was this Government that actually went to the Federal Government and convinced the Federal Government to entertain a task force. In a press release of 26 May, I indicated that to the public. I quote briefly from that press release headed 'Joint Task Force to Investigate Lake Eyre Basin':

The Federal Government will join forces with the South Australian Government to undertake a joint survey of the environmental values of the Lake Eyre Basin within South Australia. The formation of a task force to coordinate the survey program was today jointly announced by the Federal Environment Minister, Ros Kelly, and her South Australian counterpart, Kym Mayes. The task force will consist of Federal and State officers with experience and expertise in arid zone ecology and management, as well as other experts as required. It will undertake a comprehensive survey of the key conservation values of the Lake Eyre Basin and will develop and propose options for the conservation and sustainable development of the region.

Quite clearly, we have taken initiative in this area. We have been in consultation. I have met with pastoralists—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will repeat the statement in the press release, as follows:

... and will develop and propose options for the conservation and sustainable development of the region.

I refer the Leader again to the Premier's statement, where he said:

... important economic and environmental asset for South Australia.

I must emphasise that we have had, I believe, very productive discussions with the pastoral industry. I met in Birdsville and in Marree with mining industry representatives, as I believe has the Deputy Premier, and we have clearly set out our position. It is our task force, this is our initiative and I am pleased to see the Opposition following in our footsteps.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety confirm that a doctor recently appointed to the board of WorkCover has been under investigation by the Fraud Investigation Section of WorkCover? Will he investigate whether the WorkCover files on the doctor concerned were destroyed after his appointment? On 29 April this year, the doctor was appointed to the WorkCover board. His appointment, I understand, was sponsored by the Minister and supported by the United Trades and Labor Council.

I have been informed that the actions of this same doctor in relation to pain treatment have caused many difficulties for WorkCover case managers because of questionable high cost treatments and frequent calling of case conferences, which

also adds significantly to the cost of cases. I have further been informed that a special committee advising WorkCover on pain treatment has expressed concern about the methods used by the doctor and that the files relating to an investigation of his methods were destroyed when it became known that the doctor had been appointed to the board.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The doctor referred to by the member for Bragg was supported by the United Trades and Labor Council and a number of employer organisations. It is also true to say that there was not unanimous support from all the employer organisations. I was advised, after his appointment, that there had been some question as to that doctor's practices. I was also advised that the inquiries undertaken found no malpractice and that those allegations were unproved. As to whether or not those files were burnt, I will inquire.

TAXATION

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the House of the level of taxation which resulted from the change of Government in Victoria?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can inform the House of some of the changes that have taken place in Victoria, and I do so in the spirit of information for South Australians if they should be tempted to have a change of Government here at the next election. Prior to all the most recent elections in Australia where the Liberal Party has succeeded in winning the Treasury benches—and, in all fairness, it is not just Jeff Kennett—they have done so on the basis that they could fix things up: no dismissals, no retrenchments, no lessening of services, no increase in taxes and they would somehow square the circle. What has been the reality?

The reality is that, on every occasion when a Liberal State Government has been elected, it has said, 'Good heavens, things are much worse than we expected.' Bang! The poor old members of the public are then hit viciously. If this State were to experience a change of Government, I could confidently predict what the Opposition would say the following day. I do not want anyone in South Australia to be under any illusion about what would happen if there were a change of Government in this State. I will briefly list just a few of the changes that have taken place in Victoria. I am reading from the *Sunday Herald* of 1 August, which indicates that Victorian families on average—

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The point of order relates to relevance—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will wait for the call.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The point of order relates to relevance: the Minister is talking about Victoria.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The question concerned changes if there were a change of Government. I assume that there has to be some basis for that assessment and, therefore, I do not rule the subject out of order. The Treasurer.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Treasurer to be as brief as possible.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir, I will be brief; I will restrict myself on this occasion to Victoria, but I can assure the House that this situation applies to other States where the Liberal Party has won power. On average, Victorian families are \$640 a year worse off under the Kennett Government than they were under Labor, and the amount increases to people being more than \$900 a year worse off for the 800 000 people previously covered by State awards that were abolished in March this year. On average, they lost \$266 per annum in annual leave loading.

Since those figures were compiled, there have been further increases; these figures are very conservative. A brief breakdown shows that transport fares have increased by 10 per cent; 3¢ per litre has been added to petrol prices; and car registration costs have doubled—a 100 per cent increase. In Victoria, electricity and gas charges have increased by 10 per cent and water consumption charges have gone up by 76 per cent. I contrast that to the real reductions that have occurred in terms of those two commodities here in this State. Further, 3 per cent has been added to car and house insurance and a \$100 tax—and this is a beauty—has been placed on property owners in the form of a State deficit levy. The Victorian Liberal Government has even touched Tattsлото tickets to the tune of 10¢.

That is not a comprehensive list of the tax increases that have occurred in Victoria, and I just want to make clear to South Australians that, if there is a change of Government in this State, on the following Monday morning they can look at something very similar.

NATIVE TITLE

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Does the Government intend to amend the Roxby Downs indenture to safeguard the project against native title claims and, if not, will the Premier explain precisely—as he did not in his ministerial statement—how this mine will be protected for the duration of its 200 year life in the face of the Federal Government's policy which will expose the current mining lease to native title claim when it expires, well short of the 200 year term?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Kavel claims that I did not detail this, but of course I did detail it. Let us come to the issue of mining leases. I refer to page 3 of the ministerial statement and, if members turn it over, I will walk them through it.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I gave a whole pile to the attendants and I presume they were distributed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If you are not privy to receiving them from your own Leader, that is your problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Kavel will come to order and the Premier will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My apology, Mr Speaker; I gave a bundle as required—the number of statements required—for distribution, and apparently a copy was not distributed to the honourable member. I make the point that the situation is no different with respect to native title situations than it would be with regard to mining leases on freehold title. A parity situation applies there. The situation is this: if there is a dispute between—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. This is the first day and it is a new game. Members will behave. I have a copy of the ministerial statement, which I will lend to the member for Kavel.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, apparently the member for Adelaide has one but the member for Kavel does not. I refer to the top of page 3:

... the Commonwealth proposes—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It states:

... the Commonwealth proposes that native title may revive after the expiration of mining leases.

That is the 'Commonwealth', and that is the first point, and 'may' is the second point. The statement continues:

This would accord with the existing position in general Australian law, under which a mining lease over most of Australia does not extinguish freehold title.

In other words, there is a parity in the situation between freehold title and native title. Let me go on a bit further. The next paragraph talks about what the Commonwealth is proposing to do, and the statement then goes on to refer to various matters. It states that native title tribunals should have the opportunity to make an adjudication. However, I draw attention to the fifth paragraph—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have spoken to the Deputy Leader twice.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Deputy Leader asks whether I will leave it to the tribunal. If he read the fifth paragraph on that page, he would know that that is clearly not the case. I will read it again:

Governments should have the right to override a decision of the tribunal concerning such a development proposal if they consider it to be in the national interests to do so.

We will have our legislation brought before this Parliament. This is what I am saying: that we should have the right—the State Government should have that right—and we will ensure that we do have that right. I do not see how I can be any clearer than that.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am making the point that we are going to enact legislation. I am detailing the issues that we think are important, and one of those issues that we think is important is set out in the statement, and I come back to it again:

Governments should have the right to override a decision of the tribunal concerning such a development proposal if they consider it to be in the national interests to do so.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Kavel makes a big deal of the word 'should'.

Mr Olsen: Or 'may'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I did not say 'may' or 'must'—I said 'should'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will again resume his seat. The member for Walsh is out of order. The Premier.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Now we are having other words being put in there. What is wrong with 'will'? I am happy to say that, because that is what 'should' says when you take it in the context of what we are going to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I must continue to point out to the Opposition, in terms of all the corrections that have to be made to Standing Orders concerning members' conduct in this House, that it is their Question Time that they are wasting. The Chair can only apply the rules: members allow them to be applied. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: So, we will have legislation in place. It will protect legitimate interests in this State, and that legislation will be there for all the Parliament to see. That is what this statement is about today: it makes it quite clear, and I suggest that the member for Kavel—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Unless by some unusual definition Roxby is not a mining lease—I thought it was—in making these various statements that I have made about the protection of situations in South Australia, yes, it does include it. I would have thought that it was a clear answer, which was already clearly enunciated in my ministerial statement.

DEPARTMENTAL MERGER

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure inform the House of the range of functions within ETSA and the E&WS Department which comprise the principal opportunities for reducing costs through the elimination of duplication when these organisations merge?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I can appreciate the honourable member's question and I have some sympathy for him. When I go around my electorate, I have many people saying to me, 'Of course, the merger of the E&WS and ETSA is a reasonable thing to do. Why is the Opposition against it and can you provide us with more information on it?' So, it is appropriate that I do the same for the members of the House.

At least 50 common functions have been identified within those two organisations which will lead to opportunities for cost savings through the sensible removal of duplication, and there will be further opportunities for cost saving through a rationalisation of a wide range of assets and facilities. Indeed, there has been a number of those estimates of amounts of savings over the past few months. They started off at about \$30 million to \$50 million; we are now on the basis of saying that they are likely to be at least \$50 million, and estimates have ranged considerably higher than that. Work is being carried out to further define and refine those numbers for the early years of the merger, but the work already done on the known areas of duplication makes it very clear that substantial savings are indeed available.

Oddly enough, it seems that the Opposition requires basically a breakdown of every last position, every potential structural change and estimates of savings to the last ballpoint pen and paperclip. That demonstrates to me that there is a degree of terminal timidity in the leadership of that organisation. Indeed, if the Liberal Party were fortunate enough eventually to fall into Government, it would probably take it one or two terms merely to make up its mind how to deal with the problems that it now considers urgent if we use this as a basis for comparison.

It should, however, be glaringly obvious to the Opposition that the rationalisation of two major service organisations with a largely common customer base, with a multitude of common functions and with duplicated assets provides

enormous opportunities for savings. There were interjections earlier from the Opposition asking for some detailed financial information to be made available. It is interesting that I had a letter from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition only a couple of days ago—late last week. The interesting situation is that the Opposition decided to oppose this merger, and then weeks after it opposed the merger it wrote to me and said, 'We have a couple of questions we would like answered, please, and we would like to give you two or three days to do it.' Sixty odd questions! So, here we have an Opposition that first makes up its mind to oppose, and then asks for information.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It then asks for information to see whether or not it should be opposing it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: That is nonsense, and there certainly is a great degree of silliness on the part of the Opposition in its whole strategy. However, I intend to table at this stage a document entitled 'Strategic Savings Potentials—ETSA and E&WS Merger'. There will be figures in it for the honourable member to look at. The member for Bragg tells me that he knows there are no figures in it even though he has not seen the document.

Mr Ingerson: I have seen it.

The SPEAKER: Will the Minister resume his seat. The member for Bragg has been spoken to several times today. Interjections are out of order, and if Ministers address their remarks to the Chair there will not be any debate across the Chamber. I ask the Minister to address his remarks to the Chair and draw his response to a close as quickly as possible.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will do both of those. The document that I am referring to has been prepared by a composite team of senior ETSA and E&WS executives and support staff to identify the potential savings available from the speedy establishment of the new merged organisation Southern Power and Water. It is intended as a public information document and it may help the Opposition to establish or re-establish its position on the merger. The main finding of the report in relation to the merger is:

The anticipated gross potential savings from the present budget based on 1993-94 are estimated to reach the range of \$55 million to \$111 million per annum in 1995-96.

It should be clearly understood that, as the report itself points out, it is 'a working document which will require refinement in the light of further detailed analysis as the merger progresses'.

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES MINISTER

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier dismiss the Minister of Primary Industries, and if he does what will be the time frame for doing so? The Minister has stated that he will not be bound by the convention of the collective responsibility of Ministers for Government decisions. Further, the Premier has described this convention as one which 'affirms that Ministers are bound by Cabinet's conclusions at all times' and requires all Ministers 'to give their support in public debate to collective decisions of the Cabinet and the Government'. However, the Minister has publicly stated on a number of occasions that his campaign for re-election will bring him into conflict with Government decisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The answer to the question is 'No'. The member for Hayward has significantly distorted some comments of the Minister of Primary Industries and in another case has quite clearly totally misrepresented my position. I can assure the honourable member that the Minister of Primary Industries, as with all Ministers in the Cabinet, knows the rules of Cabinet solidarity and actively works within that. In his capacity as Minister of Primary Industries and Minister assisting me on multicultural and ethnic affairs, he does that with great skill and great dedication to duty.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: So, the answer, I repeat—to save the time of the House I will put it in one word—is 'No'.

DEPARTMENTAL MERGER

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Albert Park resume his seat. The member for Heysen has been spoken to several times. I do not intend to continue speaking to him. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Sir. My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Can the Minister advise the House whether there has been any independent confirmation of the Government's view that the proposed ETSA and E&WS merger will result in major financial savings to the State? I have been approached by a constituent who works at ETSA and who has advised me of an article appearing in the *Advertiser* of 23 July which states, in part:

ETSA chairman, Mr Robin Marrett and a director, Mr Martin Cameron, who was a Liberal MP for 20 years said yesterday that annual cost savings from the merger of ETSA and the Engineering and Water Supply Department could be as high as \$100 million.

My constituent has asked me to ask the Minister what is the situation: are there savings or are there not, and why did the Liberal Opposition not contact Mr Cameron to determine whether or not his statements were correct?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes'. Not everyone is afflicted with the terminal timidity of the Liberal Party. In fact, I can quote the Director of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, Professor Cliff Walsh, who I am sure will be trying his very best to be impartial and totally independent in this matter; but when one realises that he used to be the economic consultant to Malcolm Fraser one can probably recognise that he would not be leaning over backwards to give unnecessary praise to the Labor Party. I will paraphrase some of Professor Cliff Walsh's comments made on the Keith Conlon show last Friday, 30 July. Even though I am paraphrasing slightly, I am quite sure that I am not doing that person any injustice. He stated:

... I think... there are substantial savings to be made out of... bringing together... ETSA and E&WS. I mean some of them will be at the service delivery level... reducing duplication in shop fronts. Some of them will be in corporate services and middle management level and top management level and some of them at lower levels in terms of the number of jobs... so it seems to me out of that there will be substantial savings... It's not an irrational thing to do. There are at least two other Territories in Australia... both have power and water supply combined and... for a State like ours perhaps it makes as much sense...

Another independent source—again one which I would not really rank as one of the 10 greatest friends of the Labor Party—is the *Advertiser*, which in its editorial on 19 July stated:

The State Liberal Party would do well to have second thoughts about its opposition to the merger of the State's water and electricity operations... A merger of the E&WS and ETSA is not exactly the kind of thing which lights political fires. But a strong case can be made for it...

Further:

Even if they were not combined elsewhere—which they are—this would be no reason for a refusal to move here... It would make no sense for the Liberals to go into an election having set their faces against one of the few measures with a realistic chance of saving public money.

Finally:

This is a large but not essentially controversial matter; it is one for the quiet application of the saying, 'Second thoughts are often wiser thoughts.'

It is probably also reasonable to quote Mr Cameron, a former well-known Liberal parliamentarian, to whom the honourable member referred in his question, who now serves as a member of the ETSA board and who has expressed support for the merger and the benefits that it offers to the State.

Robin Marrett, Chairman of the Economic Development Authority, a former General Manager of ETSA and current Chairman of the trust, is also a strong supporter of the merger. Mr Marrett has an exceedingly well credentialled background in the private sector and is an executive for whom I understand the Opposition has in the past expressed considerable regard.

One other person who probably is not disinterested, but probably not terribly interested, I will also quote from the *Australian* of 2 July 1992. The Leader of the Opposition said that one of the things that needed to be done was the 'streamlining of the water and electricity system'—not, as far as I know, 'systems', not two of them, but 'the system'. I presume that the Leader of the Opposition is now going to claim credit for all of the things that have happened since then.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I certainly read the *Australian* back in July 1992. It will be a tragedy if the Opposition succeeds in obstructing this merger. It mouths a great deal of motherhood about the need for much greater efficiency at every level of life in South Australia but provides no detail of how it intends to achieve it. By opposing this merger, it has denied itself yet another option for real savings and efficiency gains and has further damaged its credibility as potential manager of the State's future.

RURAL DEBT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. Will the Government urgently commission an independent study on the size of the State's rural debt, and will he immediately call a meeting of rural financial institutions to revise farm viability criteria and seek to relieve the intolerable stress that is currently being faced by many farmers threatened with unrealistic terms and eviction?

I am informed by many troubled farmers that the rural crisis is being compounded by the extent of rural debt and the criteria being applied by the Government and financial institutions in determining the viability of farms. They also state that the criteria which determine the interest rate, subsidies, grants and other rural financial assistance from

Government are inflexible and not relevant to scores of farmers facing financial hardship and, in many cases, ruin.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Those matters were dealt with at the ministerial conference which took place in Alice Springs on Thursday and Friday. Rural assistance is a matter of agreement between the States and the Commonwealth Government. It does not matter about political persuasion, because Liberal Governments participate with Labor Governments in working out what is in the best interests of the rural communities. I meet the banks regularly and input is provided by me as Minister and *vice versa* by the banks. The banks have worked on unseasonal rains committees, and they are represented in various forms within the department.

I am concerned about the nature of evictions and whether consistent policies are being applied by the banks. I intend to write to the banks asking them to establish a series of what could be termed protocols to ensure that all measures are properly exhausted before any ultimate action is taken against farmers in terms of eviction.

The matter of farm viability criteria has been considered at the ministerial conference, and Liberal as well as Labor Governments agreed that these issues need to be looked at through a working party. A RAS committee advises the Commonwealth Primary Industries Minister, and well represented on that committee are members of the Farmers Federation who have considerable input into the question of viability. Those processes are already in train.

Rural debt in South Australia for the previous financial year was approximately \$1.4 billion. If the honourable member paid attention to the Governor's speech, it adverted to the fact that State and Federal Governments are supporting about \$450 million of rural debt, which is about 30 per cent of it. The figures for rural debt this year are being examined and I will advise the House in due course. I assure the honourable member that everything that can be done to assist farmers is being done by this Government and other Governments throughout Australia. The issues that the honourable member raised are proper issues for consideration, but I point out that they have already been addressed at the ministerial council.

LION NATHAN

Mr HERON (Peake): My question is directed to the Minister of Business and Regional Development. What assurances has the Minister received from Lion Nathan that its purchase bid for the South Australian Brewery will not adversely impact on jobs and on hotel leasing arrangements in South Australia; and will the Chief Executive Officer of Lion Nathan be prepared to meet representatives of workers and affected hoteliers when he visits the State?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I appreciate the concern of the local member for many of the workers at the brewery. Yesterday I sought assurances—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that members opposite find the issue of jobs funny. Yesterday I sought assurances from Rick Allert, the Chairman of the holding company, about whether or not there was to be any change in location of their head office function and was given the assurance that there are no plans for that.

I also spoke to Jeff Ricketts, the director of Lion Nathan who is responsible for the bid, and he also gave some assurances that there were no plans whatsoever to wind down the operations of the brewery. Indeed, I was told that the

brewery is considered to be under capacity and it has plans to expand market share and production. However, this morning I followed up the matter with Mr Ricketts through my office, because I wanted an assurance not just that it had no intention of winding down and also not laying off workers but that the Chief Executive Officer of Lion Nathan, Mr Douglas Myers, would be willing to come to South Australia and meet not only the Premier and me but also the workers' representatives and the hoteliers concerned. Mr Ricketts informed me this morning that the Lion Nathan Chief Executive Officer, Douglas Myers, who is currently in the United States, will visit South Australia, probably the week after next, and will meet work force representatives and representatives of hoteliers.

I have been assured that Lion Nathan is making top priority the maintenance and/or extension of the leasing arrangements which apply in SA Brewing's hotels. Their view is that the leasing arrangements are the key to the future of the hotels, not who owns the bricks and mortar. Mr Ricketts also told me that he wanted to stress that Lion Nathan had an excellent track record in New Zealand and other parts of Australia in terms of sports and other sponsorships and that it wants to maintain that aggressive stand in terms of sponsorship.

GORGE ROAD

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Why is the Government still refusing to finalise compensation arrangements for a family whose home at Newton was destroyed almost nine months ago by a burst water main? This morning flooding of the Elizabeth Shopping Centre has brought a reminder of the destruction of the home of the De Corso family on Gorge Road, Newton, on 25 November last year. Mr De Corso has told me today that the Government is still refusing to make a firm offer on compensation. As a result, the family is forced to live in a unit and does not know whether they will be in a position to attempt repairs to their home or to demolish it. Mr De Corso makes the additional point that, even though the Minister is also their local member of Parliament, he himself has not contacted the family to assess the position they have been left in through no fault of their own.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Minister, the House will come to order. The Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The situation with regard to the De Corso family is that, very soon after this incident, I checked the legal position. The legal position is that the E&WS is not liable if it does not wish to be. That is the legal position. If members wish to quarrel with the legal position, there are ways of doing it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is getting difficult to make myself understood. All of a sudden, members of the Opposition seem to have no difficulty understanding my language. Let me continue, and members opposite can all quieten down. I then spoke to the Director-General of the department and said that, if it was possible to make *ex gratia* payments to these people because they had been caught in circumstances through no fault of their own, it should be done. He then contacted them and asked, 'Are you insured'?

They said 'Yes', and he said 'When you have talked to your insurance company, come and talk to us.'

If people are insured against things of this nature, it is perfectly reasonable that the insurance company should be claimed against. If members do not want to accept that situation, they will make a very interesting Government—if they are ever lucky enough to get into that situation. I will be grey and old and probably bald at that time, but I will remind them—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have a lot to go yet. The situation is that this is not a laughing matter, these people do need to be looked after—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Heysen.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have made certain that these people will be looked after in the sense that, when the insurance company settles up, there will be a top up from the E&WS Department to make sure they are dealt with properly. If members think that that is unreasonable, that people ought to be making a profit on these things, it is up to them to say so. I think that I have discharged more than the duty of the department: I have handled this with a degree of sensitivity that was not necessary.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House what assistance will be made available by the State and Federal Governments to South Australia's primary industry producers for 1993-94? All members will be aware of the many unexpected and unfortunate circumstances that have occurred in South Australia's rural community, particularly during the latter part of last year and the early part of this year, not the least of those being rain damage and the current mouse plague.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am very pleased to receive this question, because South Australia was very successful as a result of the ministerial conference in Alice Springs on Thursday and Friday of last week. The cutoff date for unseasonal rains was 30 June, and we have received 2 850 applications for assistance. We have been by far the hardest hit State. Victoria has had fewer than 500 applications for assistance, which includes the wool assistance package, but the assistance to be provided to primary producers in South Australia during 1993-94 is very significant. In round figures something like \$70 million will be available to primary producers. This comprises \$23.4 million, which is the ordinary RAS allocation to South Australia (which of course is 90 per cent Commonwealth funding, 10 per cent State), and the ordinary RAS application is for the interest rate subsidies of 50 per cent, in respect of core debt and carry-on finance, for farm re-establishment grants of up to \$45 000 and for farm financial management.

In addition, an important clarification was made by the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy at that conference, the concession being that it was made quite clear that the exceptional circumstances moneys would be additional over and above the ordinary RAS allocation for South Australia. In other words, there was no attempt to set off by suggesting that some of those people who have applied for exceptional circumstances would have been eligible for ordinary RAS in any event.

It means that the additional allocation for the exceptional circumstances will be over and above the ordinary RAS—

which we expected to be the position, but which was most important to have clarified. If the bulk of those 2 850 applications are successful, the outer parameter for exceptional circumstances relief will be \$25.4 million. That, of course, provides for interest rate subsidies on carry-on finance of 100 per cent, with 50 per cent on core debt. I should say that, although the cutoff date was 30 June and we are processing those applications, we had already allocated somewhere between \$3 million and \$4 million in advance.

In fact, of the 1 122 applications processed as at 22 July, the approval percentage rate is something like 86 per cent, so that already 968 have been approved. We received something like 1 800 applications in June alone, because I personally wrote to every primary producer in this State to make sure that each one was aware of the assistance available. Up until about the third week of May we had had only 700 applications, and I visited major country centres and talked to farmers as to why applications were not being made. It was then I decided to write to every primary producer. As a consequence, 2 850 have applied.

In addition to that assistance—and members can see that that is of very significant dimensions—about \$15 million will be available during 1993 from the State Government in loans to the rural sector. Of course, with the loans that we provide to the rural sector—some at commercial rates, others not—the fact that we do lend out commercially keeps the interest rates down. In addition, some \$4 million is available to the wool industry during 1993-94.

Of that component, \$2.8 million is Commonwealth funding, \$1.2 million State. With regard to the \$25.4 million being the outer parameter of the exceptional circumstances funding, I think the State's contribution will be \$5 million or \$6 million. Further to that, and I will conclude on this, as Minister—and this is something unique to South Australia—I was able to make available a post farm gate value added fund of \$5 million for farm diversification, something no other State has done. We have done this through good management of our rural finance funds.

About \$200 000 of that \$5 million has been allocated, and I will be making further announcements. All in all, during 1993-94 assistance to primary producers by the Federal and State Governments will total something like \$70 million. That is a considerable contribution by State and Federal Governments to primary producers in South Australia.

COLES, MEMBER FOR

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted

Mr HAMILTON: In 1980 or 1981 I was very critical of the then Minister of Health, the member for Coles, for what I believed was inaction by the then Government in relation to the use of Debendox particularly for pregnant women. Following the AMA Council's decision to strike off a medical practitioner—Dr William McBride—I unreservedly apologise to the member for Coles and place on record that I was wrong. I hope the member for Coles accepts my apology in the manner in which I relate it to the House.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: During Question Time today the member for Bragg asked a question about the alleged destruction of a file on a WorkCover board member. I have since been advised by the Chief Executive of WorkCover—and I can now advise the House—that the board member's file has not been destroyed. How about apologising?

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Ingerson: Was he under investigation?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg has been spoken to several times. All comments will be through the Chair and not across the Chamber.

STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That for the remainder of the session Standing Orders be so far suspended as to provide that—

(a) At the conclusion of the period for Questions without Notice the Speaker may propose the question 'that the House note grievances'. Up to six members may speak for a maximum of five minutes each before the Speaker puts the question.

(b) The motion for adjournment of the House on Tuesdays and Wednesdays may be debated for up to 20 minutes, provided it is moved before 10 p.m.

(c) The motion for adjournment of the House on Thursdays—

(i) may be moved later than 5 p.m.;

(ii) may not be debated.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): During the recess I became aware of a number of problems in respect of safety, particularly for aged occupants of Housing Trust complexes in my electorate. A number of issues came up, and most of them involved security measures of one kind or another which were needed for various buildings, such as proper window locks, adequate security doors, and a number of things like that. I am aware that current Housing Trust policy for new dwellings built in aged care complexes and complexes for single mums is that these things are included as a matter of course.

In recent times I have seen some Housing Trust dwellings that have been built where I would say that the security measures are indeed adequate. The problem now is that in many of the older Housing Trust complexes, and particularly some of those in my electorate—and in particular the one in Codd Street, Para Hills West—the adequacy of security measures is very much lacking. There is also no doubt that in some of those areas the aged people and some of the single mums have been preyed upon by some of the elements out there, but hopefully the police will catch up with them in the very near future. Indeed, in the Codd Street complex, there has been a large number of thefts, break and enters, and intimidation of the aged residents. The police have been very good about this. They have beefed up patrols.

They have counselled people and they have sought to catch the offenders, but, at the end of the day, the problem still remains that the level of adequate security in these premises is far from what it should be. In my view, there is no doubt that the Housing Trust needs to look after these people, and to make sure that this year an adequate level of security is introduced into the complexes where people just do not have the means to pay for these measures themselves. In many of the complexes in my electorate where the single mothers reside, they have been preyed on by peeping Toms and a series of other people whom as yet the police have not been able to apprehend.

There are also situations where aged constituents of mine are so terrified that they will not answer the door. There are other instances where, when they have gone to answer the door, people have asked whether they can have a glass of water and, instead of there being a decent security door to keep them there at arm's length, what happens is that, as soon as the person goes to get the glass of water, somebody jumps in through the door and steals a possession. It may be worth only a few hundred dollars or it may be something that the constituent values very much—something for which in all honesty the person who steals probably gets very little money.

It causes enormous distress, particularly to the aged constituents out there, to know that their houses have been violated and that they do not have the means to put adequate security in these premises. I therefore take this opportunity today to call upon the Housing Trust to look very seriously at putting in place a program where adequate security measures, such as (in particular) security screen doors, adequate window locks and whatever other means are necessary, can be put into these complexes, particularly where there is a proven track record of breaking and entering and where police have consistently had to beef up patrols because of the problems I have mentioned. It is my hope that the Housing Trust will be able to treat its old tenants as it treats its new ones.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to pick up a number of issues from Question Time today, to highlight the ineptitude of this Labor Government in South Australia, because it is now a Government in paralysis, and it will stay in paralysis until we are through this election and it is thrown out of office. I will pick up quickly a number of initial points. The first is the case of poor Mr De Corso, the man whose house was blasted apart by a burst E&WS main nine months ago in November last year. He has not been visited by his own local member of Parliament, who happens to be the Minister responsible. He has received no compensation, despite repeated assurances from this Government that it will look after him.

The Minister says that there is no legal case, because the Act provides that no compensation needs to be paid, but what about social justice? What about some moral code of behaviour from this Government in the case where, through a Government action—inadvertent or accidental, of course—a water main bursts and a house is destroyed? This Government cannot even make an *ex gratia* payment to settle within nine months. It is an absolute disgrace.

We come to the second major issue that was raised during Question Time today, namely, the merger of E&WS and ETSA. I have been accused of waiting several months and then deciding to oppose the merger without the hard evidence. I will detail the facts for the benefit of the House. The

merger was dreamt up in the Premier's Department one week before the Premier's economic statement, with no investigation whatsoever; there were no figures, no costings—absolutely nothing.

He had the hide to stand in this House and make a statement that this proposed merger was to the benefit of the State. In fact, the Minister opposite was quite wrong. I received a briefing from the E&WS prior to making any public statement on this whatsoever. The member for Heysen happened to be present at that briefing, and the facts are that, when that briefing took place, they could not give me any hard evidence whatsoever. I asked for it and they could not give it, because it had not been produced.

I come to the third important issue and the one I raised in Question Time today, which relates to the State Bank disaster, the crash of Beneficial Finance, who is responsible and who should be held accountable. I point out to the House that the Auditor-General's second report quite clearly states that Mr Baker and Mr Reichert, both of Beneficial Finance—the two top men—carried on illegal and improper conduct.

We know from the evidence already presented in the first and second royal commission reports, by the evidence given to the royal commission and in the *Hansard* of this Parliament, that the former Premier and member for Ross Smith knew exactly the reason why Messrs Baker and Reichert were dismissed on 3 August 1990. Yet, the former Premier came into the House on 7 August and said:

Baker, as has been reported, has retired from his position as Managing Director of Beneficial Finance, and that has occurred because there was a disagreement in the direction of the company. It had absolutely nothing to do with the direction of the company; illegal or improper conduct was carried on by those two men, and they were dismissed for that reason. But what is the evidence? The evidence is that they were paid very substantial settlement payments—\$200 000 in one case and \$100 000 in another—before they had even left, to keep them quiet, when in fact, because of this misconduct, they should not have received one dollar. More importantly now, based on the evidence from the Auditor-General's Report and the royal commission, it is quite clear that the former Premier deliberately concealed evidence of this misconduct and failed to take it to the police. Here is the most senior man of this Government who had a moral responsibility to look after the funds of the people of South Australia and he failed to—

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—carry out that responsibility and then misled Parliament.

The SPEAKER: The Leader is out of order. If the honourable member continues to speak over the Chair, I will have to take severe action. The other point is that the honourable member cannot allege the misleading of Parliament except in a substantive motion. That point has been raised time and again in this Parliament, and it will be dealt with severely if it is not done in the correct manner.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would like to refer to the Leader of the Opposition's pomposity here today. And I might say that, if anyone raises a question about the Italian family whose home was severely damaged by water, I have the greatest sympathy for them. I question the pomposity of the Leader of the Opposition. I refer back in time to an occasion when the Tonkin Government was in power and a constituent in my electorate of Royal Park threatened to shoot the management; what did the then Minister of Environment

and Planning do? Nothing, absolutely nothing! The Leader of the Opposition has the gall to stand up in this place and talk about social justice, but what did his Minister say at the time? And may well he walk out of the Parliament, because he dishes it out like Paddy's dog but cannot take it—with a sickly grin all over his silly face.

What happened was that the then Minister of Environment and Planning said to me, in writing, 'If they have a problem with noise, go and see the Beaufort Clinic.' So much for their social justice; so much for their concern about the little people in the community! I have a long memory for those disastrous days between 1979 and 1982 when people talk about social justice.

I remember vividly when I put a question to the now Leader of the Opposition in relation to what was to happen to a proposed school on Delfin Island. After intense questioning by me in the budget Estimates Committees when he could not answer the question—he was too stupid or did not know his subject matter—he said, 'Well, plant pine trees on there and you will end up with a pine plantation.' That really went over well with the people in my electorate. Like hell it did!

That is the sort of garbage we are being fed here, and we know the reasons why that sort of rubbish is being said in this Parliament. We know we are leading up to a State election. Any attack, any matter such as this to try to discredit people, to gain some cheap political capital, is being addressed in this Parliament. So let us call a spade a spade. That is the reality of what has taken place.

We talk about integrity. What about the Cawthorne report? Never once last session—or in this session, I suggest—did the Leader of the Opposition have the guts, the integrity or the decency to give the reasons why he would not release the Cawthorne report in 1982. It was commissioned by the taxpayers, by the Parliament of this State, yet he would not release that report. Can we trust him in industrial relations matters? He is silent; he is quiet; he hides behind anything and he will not even talk to the trade union movement.

Why would he not release the Cawthorne report? It was because Magistrate Cawthorne proved beyond doubt, on the record, that there were not the problems for which the then Minister of Labour was criticising the trade union movement, yet he has the gall to come here today and talk about integrity and social justice. What a pompous, pious hypocrite he is, in my opinion, when he talks in those terms, with his new found concern for workers and the disadvantaged people in the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to the member for Albert Park that 'hypocrite' has been ruled in this Chamber as unparliamentary, and I would ask him to moderate his use of words.

Mr HAMILTON: I am sufficiently chastened, Sir. I accept what you have said, but I have deep feelings about the hypocritical statements that have been made by this man, who says he believes—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I apologise, Sir. I withdraw. I have a deep feeling about those statements—they incensed me—made by the Leader of the Opposition when he was in government, and he did nothing to address those problems. That is why I am angry, and I believe this is the place for me to express my anger about those sorts of statements. I am not prepared to sit here and listen to that garbage—that puerile garbage—which has been recorded in *Hansard* without someone like me standing up and refuting it, recalling to the

Parliament and the people of South Australia the things which he said when he was in power.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I am surprised to follow the member for Albert Park in this debate and somewhat disappointed by the remarks and the attack that he has made on the Leader of the Opposition. While this House was in recess, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the Government in this session would employ scare tactics as the only method which it had of frightening the electorate of South Australia into voting for it. Mr Murray Nicoll, on the ABC, took the Leader of the Opposition to task over it. What did we see today? One of the prime questions was the Deputy Premier of this State being asked, 'What if Liberals are elected? What might happen? What has happened in Victoria?' And he regaled us by reading an article and putting forward a completely hypothetical proposition about what Liberals might do in this State. Every member of the Opposition has a clear message for the Government benches in this session, and it is quite simple—even the member for Albert Park will be able to understand it—and it is this: wait and see.

We are not far from an election. Dean Brown, the member for Alexandra, will be the next Premier of South Australia, and we will then see whether Dean Brown is Jeff Kennett. Every member of the Opposition can assure you that he is not. So the Deputy Premier and the member for Albert Park would be better to desist from raking over ancient history and getting on with the business of governing the shambles which is currently South Australia and at least getting it in some sort of order so that we can take it over and run it properly, because it certainly has not been so for the last decade. The member for Albert Park would do well to remember everything that has happened. He wants to remember selectively—and the member for Albert Park is here, so he can correct me if I am wrong—but he was one who absolutely slammed on-the-spot speeding fines as a revenue raiser. He was most vocal during the Tonkin Government about how money was being used to raise—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, we can see quite clearly from the records the escalation in revenue that has occurred through on-the-spot fines; it has gone through the roof. The member for Albert Park, who in this place is noted for calling a spade a spade, does not seem to think that in this case we have a spade, because he has said very little about it. I could not find in this session, in this Parliament, any reference to the member for Albert Park criticising on-the-spot fines. Perhaps he was wrong about that as he graciously admitted today he was wrong on another matter, but hopefully he will therefore admit all his past transgressions and mistakes and will get up progressively during this session and confess to us where he has been wrong in the past.

We come to the school that was never built on Delfin Island. According to the member for Albert Park, it was a fatal mistake of the Liberals not to build that school, but they did build the West Lakes High School and the West Lakes High School is now closed.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Albert Park has been spoken to several times. I call him to order.

Mr BRINDAL: I do stand corrected: it was built with a different name. The honourable member is quite right. Nevertheless, his Government closed that school and there was very little said by the member for Albert Park in respect

to its closure. It is this Government which Her Majesty's Opposition is putting under scrutiny in this session. It is this Government that is given the governance of South Australia by the people. It is this Government that the Opposition has the right to call to account, and it is fairly puerile when a Government has no record but to criticise what might happen if an Opposition achieves government. It is the will of the people that determines who will govern and the people will make a decision on this Government. The member for Albert Park can laugh, because he is in a relatively safe seat because of his good representation of the electorate, but many of his colleagues will not be beside him after the next election. So, his laughter, his mockery, is at the expense of his colleagues, because the people of South Australia will judge.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the few minutes that I have available to me today, I would like to give some background on the Australian Arid Lands Botanic Garden in Port Augusta and at the same time to pay tribute to some of those people who have worked so very hard in order to get this project under way. It is more than 10 years since the proposal to develop an Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta was launched, and this was done in a paper which was presented by Mr John Zwar to the Royal Australian Institute of Parks and Recreation Adelaide Conference in 1981. Mr Zwar had been on a Churchill Fellowship overseas for six months and, as a result of that trip on which he had been looking at the amenity horticulture in arid regions of several countries, he came back deciding that there was a real need for an Arid Lands Botanic Garden in Australia.

He settled on Port Augusta as being an ideal place to locate such a garden. His concept was to establish a world standard arid lands botanic garden featuring plants from as many regions of arid Australia as possible for study, research and display, thereby helping to conserve Australia's unique arid lands flora.

That is a very laudable objective. In Mr Zwar's eyes it was expected that the garden would become an important centre for education at all levels and that an advisory and extension service would be provided for residents, communities and commercial developments in arid Australia. It was also proposed by Mr Zwar that there could be an exchange of information, plant material and seed worldwide. That concept resulted from the world trip that he had undertaken at that time.

Other benefits that he saw with such a development included the creation of a tourist venue of major importance, with considerable impact on local tourism, together with the creation of employment. The garden would also be a venue to display and demonstrate technology appropriate to arid Australia perhaps encompassing (in Mr Zwar's words) solar, windpower, water harvesting and conservation techniques, desalination and appropriate building design, to mention just a few of those technologies.

A site was set aside for the Australian Arid Lands Botanic Garden encompassing an area of 300 hectares at the Port Augusta West site on the road leading to Woomera. That is indeed a good site for such a garden. Since first proposing this development for an arid lands botanic garden in 1981 there has been widespread publicity, promotion and lobbying of Governments to obtain funding for such a venture. In 1983 a working party, chaired by Dr Brian Morley, Director of the

Botanic Gardens, Adelaide, was established to investigate the proposal.

In 1984 the Friends of the Arid Lands Botanic Garden in Port Augusta Inc. was formed. This group has worked continuously over almost 10 years to raise funds for the botanic garden in Port Augusta. Its members have done many things, such as promoting it through newsletters, petitions to Government, circulars and pamphlets, displays, media contacts, provision of guest speakers and guided tours. This work has largely been in the hands of three people: Mr John Zwar, whose idea it was initially, Mrs Pauline Schiller and her husband, the late Mr Wally Schiller. Between them, Mr and Mrs Schiller have put in 14 years of dedicated work on this project, and Mr Zwar has put in 10 years and perhaps 10 years even before that because of the work previously undertaken.

I would pay a tribute to those people for the work that they have done. A complete survey having been done, the garden is getting under way, and a plan has been adopted. I am looking forward to both State and Federal Governments contributing towards this garden, which will be an important tourist venture for South Australia. It will also be important in the area of primary industries and the environment. The work that has already been done has laid the foundation for an excellent tourist attraction for South Australia. Indeed, we need more such attractions, but certainly we need to make sure that we support a project such as this.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): While some members were able to have a break overseas or perhaps a holiday during the winter recess, those of us in rural communities found the recess extremely difficult in these tight economic times, particularly in regard to the plight of people in tight financial circumstances. It is not easy getting telephone calls at night from farmers and family members in distress. As a member of Parliament, I certainly am not trained to be a counsellor, although one does one's best in such circumstances.

It is for that reason that I am raising this matter in the House today. I refer to my concern about the way in which the financial crisis is being handled, because it is not good. During the break there were at least four widely publicised evictions. I fear that unless some better means of handling those evictions or displacements of farmers is found someone will get hurt. I say that in all sincerity, because I know of the individuals involved in two of those cases. I do not know the others personally, and I can only read and listen to the accounts of what has occurred as they have been given to me.

When one has the threat of the Sheriff, the Star Force and the Dog Squad entering one's property to undertake an eviction, one must seriously question what is wrong with the system that we get that far. For that reason I contacted the Minister's office some weeks ago and asked him to explore the feasibility of having the principle of a compulsory conference applied, so that when people get into a financial circumstance where they tend to withdraw and not want to talk to anyone, the financier or, for that matter, the farmer—if he or she is not getting cooperation from the financial institution—can call a compulsory conference. This does happen in the industrial sector and under the Planning Act, and I believe that there are examples which could be used to say that it should occur here.

I understand that there are no evictions in Western Australia, mainly because the police will not act. Their response is: negotiate, renegotiate, and if that fails, renegotiate again. But they refuse to cooperate. Therefore, it is a

situation that is being avoided. I might add that that is also an American experience: a short time back there were a lot of evictions, but there are none now. I will not relate that to this House because it may rekindle some thought of fear tactics and people may get a little irrational.

I raise this issue because in some instances farmers and people on the land are being forced to the point of breaking. If one of those persons does break and causes some injury, and more particularly the loss of life, we as a society and a Parliament must seriously look at where we are going.

I am concerned that some of the evidence given to the Rural Finance Select Committee has not been followed through. Some of the evidence given by the banks involved mere platitudes and has not been followed through. I wonder whether in fact the Rural Finance Select Committee should not be recalled. I was pleased to hear today that the Minister of Primary Industries, in response to a question, said that he was contacting the banks in order to establish some form of protocol. If that will satisfy my present concern, that will be great, because the banks do need some sort of collective bringing together and some way of achieving perhaps the same ends but without the cost of injury that I foresee may well occur.

There is a sense of arrogance on the part of some of the hatchet men within banks. I am concerned that I have had related to me recently that some senior bankers at Adelaide Airport were heard to be scoffing about the way in which they were going to have farmers evicted. That sort of arrogance is something that I do not think we as a Parliament, or anyone else, can tolerate. It is probably the key point that triggered my raising this matter here today: people in senior positions within banks and financial institutions were seen to be joking in a public place about the plight of farmers, how they had it sewn up and how they had so and so to force the eviction.

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

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That a committee of seven members be appointed, consisting of the Speaker, Messrs Atkinson, Blacker, Brindal, Ferguson, Gunn and the Hon. J.P. Trainer.

Motion carried.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That a committee of five members be appointed, consisting of Mr Atkinson, Mrs Hutchison, Messrs Lewis, Matthew and McKee.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I move:

That the committee appointed by this House on 17 February 1993 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that

the time for bringing up its report be extended until Wednesday 6 October.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That the committee appointed by this House on 19 February 1992 have power to continue its sittings during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended to Tuesday 7 September.

Motion carried.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That members of the committee have power to continue their consideration during this session.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): For many years now, both prior to and since my entering this Parliament, I have heard stories from many people in the community, particularly younger men, alleging that they had been assaulted by bouncers in hotels and clubs. On those occasions that I was contacted prior to becoming a member of this place, I suggested that people should go and see their local member of Parliament, and after I had taken my seat here I took these matters up personally.

Recently, it was brought to my attention that a young lad about 18 years of age had visited a nightclub in Hindley Street, and if I did not know this lad personally I would have perhaps doubted the story he related to me. I have to be careful about what I say because I understand the matter may go before the courts some time in the future. However, the story he relates is that, in the company of another lad, he went into this particular establishment in Hindley Street and was assaulted by a particular bouncer.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: That is the sort of inane interjection we have come to expect from the member for Murray-Mallee. Whether we are in Government or Opposition, I do not believe anyone has the right to assault another person. If the member for Murray-Mallee had the wit to understand the amendments made to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act—and I would suggest he read them—he would know the basic aims of those amendments, which came into effect in December 1991. There is a whole range of things that the committee recommended, involving a code of practice dealing with the use of force by private persons engaged in private law enforcement to be drawn up in consultation with the Commissioner of Police.

It further recommended that the code be as detailed as possible and publicly disseminated and that the code be admissible in evidence in any legal proceedings as evidence of the standard of behaviour expected of such persons. To

date, I am advised that no such code has been implemented. Being very concerned about this matter, I wrote to the Minister responsible on 27 May, and I think it is important to incorporate my comments in *Hansard*, as follows:

Dear Minister,

I have been approached by a constituent who is well known to me and who was assaulted at a nightclub in Hindley Street by the bouncers of that club. I would therefore appreciate your advice as to the following:

- How many complaints have been brought before you in relation to bouncers employed by private security firms or other private agencies since January 1992 until April 1993, and what was the nature of such complaints?
- How many complaints from the public against bouncers were upheld and what disciplinary actions were taken in each instance?
- What is the criterion for the engagement of bouncers by private firms or agencies?
- Are bouncers investigated as to their suitability, and, if so, by whom and, if not, why not?
- How many public security agencies are there in South Australia? What are the names of these agencies and are they all registered agencies and, if not, why not?
- Is there a code of practice and/or regulations for such persons and, if not, why not? If not, why has the Government not introduced amendments to the Commercial and Private Agents Act in line with the recommendations of the Select Committee on Self Defence, which recommended that a code of practice dealing with the use of force by private persons engaged in private law enforcements be drawn up in consultation with the Commissioner of Police?

The same committee recommended that the code be as detailed as possible and publicly disseminated and be admissible in evidence in any legal proceedings as evidence of the standard of behaviour expected of such persons.

If progress has been made on the above, when will such recommendations be brought before the Parliament and will that be by way of amending legislation and/or regulations?

I thank you for your assistance.

To date unfortunately I have not received a response. I have raised this matter because of the severity of the problem. What right does any bouncer or thug, if you like, have to assault a person? I understand from allegations made to me that this person has made a habit of this. I am advised that it has been brought to the attention of the police that on a number of occasions prior to and after this offence was allegedly committed that the person concerned had carried out this practice of assaulting people who visit this particular establishment. If that be the case, and as I detailed in my response, where is the responsibility upon that agency or the organisation that employs these bouncers? I hasten to add that not all these bouncers are thugs, but I believe there is a minority that gets some kick out of thumping people around.

It is not unusual, if one visits these clubs and speaks to the younger set in the community, to hear that some of these people have had their jaw smashed. There was a lad who lives just around the corner from me—in Ladd Street—and who years ago visited a hotel in the western suburbs of Adelaide. This lad was well-known to me and played football with my son. He was king hit and had his jaw broken.

The concerns I have raised with the Minister are genuine. I would vouch for the lad in question; he has integrity, is a top athlete and is a very quiet person. What right has that person, if the allegations are correct, to thump him in the way in which he did and allegedly carry out similar actions?

I again raise the question as to how such people can be employed. Do they have a criminal record? Is any investigation carried out by the agency as to whether they have been involved in such practices in the past? Have they been up before the court? Have the actions of these people been brought to the attention of police? How does one become a

bouncer? Do they just go and make an application to an agency, which says, 'Yes, you'll do, Graham Gunn. We will have you down there.' I certainly mean no offence to the member for Eyre in saying that.

In my view there has to be accountability for these people when they register or are engaged by a particular agency. How many private security firms are there? I understand they are governed by a particular Act of Parliament. It also raises in my mind the suitability of some of those agencies. I do not want to cast aspersions on all of them, but I wonder about the suitability of those agencies and their management. What skills, expertise or knowledge do they have about their private policing of these clubs? Are they vetted by the police? I believe they should be. There should be some accountability to the major police enforcement organisation in this State. I believe that the Commissioner of Police should have a supervisory role over these people. Can some bloke from interstate or overseas come in and go to an agency and ask to be employed as a bouncer without anyone checking on his suitability?

I raise this matter generally because I believe it has to be addressed. We cannot allow our youth of today, or anyone else for that matter, to be assaulted allegedly by thugs because they get a kick out of thumping some young fellow. In my view, it is not on, and I believe that the Government—

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise the decision of the Commonwealth Government, aided and abetted by the State Government, to have listed on the world heritage list the Lake Eyre Basin. This would have to rank as one of the most opportunistic political exercises in which any Prime Minister has engaged in a long time. It was opportunistic because they set out to appease elements within the conservation movement at the expense and economic welfare of the people of this State. They made a calculated decision. There was no regard for those 300 or 400 people who are directly affected and there was no regard for those thousands of other South Australians who are affected by this irresponsible and unnecessary decision.

It was obviously a throw-away line, but the ramifications of that decision have already been horrendous. Constituents of mine as far south as Orroroo have been asked by their bank managers what effects this decision will have on the value of their properties. Immediately that happens the alarm bells start to ring. If the property is suddenly devalued, it will affect their future viability. I am sorry that the member for Stuart is leaving the Chamber, because I want to say something about the attitude of this Government and of Labor Party members. They will all have to be counted.

Mr Atkinson: Even the member for Spence.

Mr GUNN: Even the member for Spence. Let me make my position very clear. I am totally opposed to the world heritage listing of one square metre of South Australia. I do not believe that it is necessary or desirable. The Leader has made the position of the parliamentary Party very clear: that we will oppose this proposition in Government. I go even further. If the Commonwealth Government proposes to have the Lake Eyre Basin world heritage listed, I, with my constituents, will go to the hearings in Paris and attempt to lobby them and point out that not only do the people of this State not want it, but that it is contrary to the economic welfare of the people of this State and it was nothing but a

cynical political trick pulled by the Prime Minister to gain a few votes at a Federal election. Those are the facts.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will be very happy to go and so will my constituents. My constituents will be affected. If the member for Spence does not have the wit or wisdom to understand what I am talking about, I cannot help that; that is his problem. He will have to stand and be counted; he will not be able to sit on the barbed wire fence, like the member for Stuart did when she responded to one of the councils in my area. It is quite clear that one cannot go along with both groups. If members do not support local people, the pastoralists, then they are opposed to it. Unfortunately, the Conservation Council, led by a Mr Puckridge, has been far from truthful. It has no regard for the economic welfare of my constituents. Unfortunately, the Conservation Council is funded by State taxpayers. I believe that ought to be stopped.

But those people have engaged in a quite disgraceful exercise. They have already reported me to the Leader once or twice; let them report me again for what I have said today. However, I have a clear conscience. I stand on behalf of those people from the pastoral, mining and tourist industries and from local government areas who have contacted me and who will be affected. They are opposed to it. Every responsible South Australian should be opposed to it, because the effects of world heritage listing on South Australia have far more serious long-term ramifications than the Mabo High Court decision.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

Mr GUNN: They will not get my vote to fund them. I wouldn't give them a cent; they are not worth the time of day. I will give a few details in respect of this escapade. The Lake Eyre catchment covers one sixth of Australia's land mass from south of Lake Eyre around Leigh Creek to just north of Mount Isa, including parts of New South Wales and the Northern Territory. It encompasses the Queensland channel country, Coopers Creek in South Australia, Lake Eyre and the Mound Springs. It also includes the Moomba gas fields, Roxby Downs, the Leigh Creek coalfield and the bulk of South Australia's bulk beef cattle production. The Prime Minister's announcement during the election campaign of a move towards world heritage listing was without prior warning to those whose properties would be affected.

Ros Kelly, the Federal Environment Minister, has said that the push is coming from South Australia. Mr Mayes has stated publicly that South Australia is not worried whether it goes ahead. The Queensland Environment Minister has stated publicly that the Queensland Government is strongly opposed to the world heritage listing of the basin. Mr Mayes has jointly announced, with the Federal Government, a study. Pastoralists say recent statements by Mr Mayes that they support the study misrepresent their position. The pastoral industry already works under tight controls. So, we have this sorry tale.

The worst aspect of this—and I do not know how many people understand this—is that, if the Lake Eyre catchment is placed on the world heritage list, the Federal Government will be handing total control of one sixth of Australia's continent to the World Heritage Bureau, which consists of Brazil, Cuba (that is a democratic country!), France (that is a country high on environmental values, given that it is still letting off atomic bombs in the Pacific!), Italy, Pakistan, Tunisia and the USA. That is the group to whom they are

handing over one sixth of Australia. The document goes on to say a number of other things.

The Conservation Council has been unduly provocative. On the very day that the people were holding a public meeting to discuss this matter, on 19 May at Birdsville, the Conservation Council issued a press statement as follows:

ACF support Lake Eyre basin for world heritage listing.

That was released on the very day that those citizens concerned about their future and that of their children were having this meeting—

Mr Atkinson: What's your point?

Mr GUNN: The point I am making is that not only was it unduly provocative but it has continued to misrepresent the facts. The council has been untruthful, and it has no regard for the welfare of my constituents. It is prepared to jeopardise the economic future of this State for some misplaced views which it holds. In my judgment, it is an organisation that not only should be treated with the greatest degree of caution but it is contrary to the long-term interests of all the people of this State. That provocative action should not be allowed to go unanswered.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: No, as long as it is self-funding it can—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence is out of order. He could find himself banned if he carries on the way he is.

Mr GUNN: It can do what it likes. The people of South Australia and the people of the electorate of Eyre should be fully aware that this South Australian Government could have stood up and said from day one, 'We are opposed to this move.' It is no good the Minister's running around the north

making statements that appease no-one. It is no good the member for Stuart's having two bob each way, writing letters to councils without committing herself.

There is only one course of action that all members of this House should be adopting, that is, total opposition to world heritage listing for the Lake Eyre Basin. If you do not accept what I have to say, just look at the way the people in the Willandra area, which is world heritage listed, have been treated: the untruths they were told; the loss of value of their properties; and the heartbreak they have suffered.

The concern that has been inflicted upon these people whom I have the privilege of representing ought to be understood, and the only way to protect these people is to oppose this move at all levels. The member for Stuart cannot get away with trying to appease the pastoral industry and the conservationists: she can support only one. There is only one group to support, and that is the group comprising the pastoral industry, the mining industry and the tourist industry. That group will do something for the people of this State.

You can protect sensitive areas under State law without going to this extreme length, which is not only undesirable but completely unnecessary and most unwise. Having been involved in this argument over the past few months, I am appalled.

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

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 4 August at 2 p.m.