HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 10 August 1988

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: X-RATED VIDEO MATERIAL

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the possession of X-rated video material and refuse classification to R-rated versions of X-rated material was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

PETITION: WINE GRAPE PRICING

A petition signed by 70 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to repeal the legislation dealing with pricing and terms of payment for wine grapes was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table.

By the Premier and Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1987.

RIVERLAND REGIONAL HOSPITAL AT BERRI

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

Riverland Regional Hospital at Berri.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions I advise that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning and Minister of Emergency Services should be directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology and that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister of Health should be directed to the Minister of Transport.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

Mr OLSEN: Is the Premier aware that the Minister of Agriculture has just instructed his solicitors to proceed with legal action against the member for Coles for statements that she made five months ago about the Minister of Agriculture's conduct in relation to invoking section 50 of the Planning Act to prevent construction of a small church on a property in his street in Unley for which he was an unsuccessful bidder? Has the Government agreed to indemnify this Minister in respect of his action and, if so, when was such indemnity given?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, I am not aware that the Minister of Agriculture has initiated those proceedings. However, I make the point that I think the Opposition fails to understand the way in which these indemnities work. A perusal of the guidelines which have been with the Opposition for some four years lost in the office of the Shadow Attorney-General—and despite the agreement made four years ago to settle Mr Dean Brown's case—I think makes fairly clear the sorts of principle under which indemnities are given. If a Minister wishes to initiate proceedings, it is very rare for indemnities to be provided.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But in the case of a Minister being sued, where in other words the Minister is defending the Minister's statements and impliedly the Government policy or whatever embodied in those statements, that is when an issue of indemnity does arise. If what the Leader of the Opposition is saying (if the Minister of Agriculture has issued proceedings) is that he is doing that on the basis that the Government is paying his costs to indemnify him, the answer is, 'No', it is not, and it will not be. It is up to the Minister. He is taking the risk, and if he loses the action—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If he is not successful, he is up for the expense personally. It is a very different situation from the Minister being the victim, if you like, of an action, being in fact the defendant in an action. That is where indemnity prevails.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Ms GAYLER: My question is directed to the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General in another place. Would the recent sexual harassment judgment by Justice Einfeld of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission effectively requiring—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Agriculture and the Leader of the Opposition to order. It is bad enough when the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier conduct a dialogue across the Chamber. For it to be done at the distance being conducted at the moment is an even grosser infringement of Standing Orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Murray-Mallee. The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: Would the recent sexual harassment judgment by Justice Einfeld of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission effectively requiring women to endure sexual harassment by employers apply equally in South Australia? The decision confirmed that the three women employees of a doctor had experienced a range of sexual harassment including mild, if aggravating touching; momentary (though unsought) holding; one was briefly but firmly held around the neck; in another case, the accused placed his hand underneath the uniform of a complainant and touched her inner thigh; and on another occasion, zips on the front of the women's uniforms were lowered and raised.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this issue because I know it has caused a great deal of concern in the community and it is something that has occupied the time of the United Trades and Labor Council and the Chamber of Commerce in this State. Indeed, I am sure that it is a concern to all responsible people and

higher latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere and certainly within latitudes in which significant populations live.

The Western countries have fiddled for far too long with this problem and action is imperative. Since I brought my previous Bills into this place, the Tasmanian Liberal Government and the Western Australian Labor Government have acted on this issue. They have not waited for the Federal Government, which has fiddled and continues to fiddle. It is now starting to talk in terms of acting along the lines of the Montreal protocol but, as I suggested, the protocol has not gone far enough. It was a compromise that had as much to do with the interests of DuPont, other manufacturers and manufacturing countries as it did with solving the problem.

Some would argue that what is needed is self-regulation. I suggest that no-one can seriously suggest that we can cut our production to 5 per cent simply by asking for self-regulation. Even the aerosol industry, which is trumpeting what it has achieved so far, uses aerosols in something like 20 per cent of its sprays. While that is 20 per cent of production, overall production is continuing to rise. The problems will not be solved unless the Government insists that CFCs are removed in almost all cases. A letter has been brought to my attention which indicates the sort of things that are happening in South Australia at the moment. The letter was addressed to the Pollution Management Division of the Department of Environment and Planning and reads:

> Respective Sirs,
>
> I feel compelled to inform you of what I think to be a gross neglect of proper safety precautions to contain the environmentally hazardous liquid gas freon (fluorocarbon). This neglect is being carried out at a partly governmentally controlled organisation/company namely Telecom Australia, precisely, the Kidman Park Telecom workshops, Tele 1 manufacturing group. As a worker at this complex, I have placed suggestions to improve the containment of the use of freon as a PCB, PAB flux remover. I was assured by senior supervisor technical officers that my concerns are unfounded. I believed them to be telling me the truth, so I took the matter no further. As time has passed, I have frequently viewed different 44 gallon drums of freon every 1½ months or so. Workers using the baths have informed me that large amounts of freon escape into the atmosphere. I estimate approximately 1 601.6 litres escape per year.

From this one Telecom workshop—a Government department—something like 2 tonnes of freon is allowed to escape into the atmosphere. Clearly, something needs to be done. I will refer now to a refrigeration magazine which discussed the problem of the ozone layer and what needs to be done, as follows:

> However, let us correct a flaw in our own industry where some service companies flush out dirty finned condensors on the job with, say, 10 kg of R12 refrigerant in a way similar to compressed air. They, of course, charge the customer, but at the same time this valuable ingredient should not be used at the expense of the civilised world.

I have had contact with the bodies representing refrigeration engineers, and they are seriously concerned about what some of the cowboys in their own industry are doing. They have told me clearly that they want regulation brought in.

I will now address the clauses of the Bill. As I see it, we have the capacity to virtually eliminate the use of CFCs as a propellant. We also have the capacity to virtually eliminate its use as an expanding agent in the manufacture of foams. We do not have the capacity to eliminate its use as a refrigerant. No-one would seriously suggest that we return to using ammonia and other dangerous gases in refrigeration systems. The important thing with refrigeration and refrigerated air-conditioning is not so much whether CFCs are used, although ideally in the long run they should not be, but whether CFCs manage to escape from those systems.

Clause 4 of the Bill provides very firm controls on the design of refrigerators and refrigerated air-conditioners, and their manufacture, sale, supply, servicing and ultimate disposal. It is important that such units are designed so that the prospect of leakage is decreased. That means putting in as few joins as possible which are prone to leakage. It also means prescribing different materials. For instance, aluminium is frequently used but it has fairly high porosity and far too much freon can escape through it. Alternative materials should be considered.

In addition, when a refrigerator is serviced, the refrigeration mechanic should not bleed out the existing freon before replacing it. Devices are available to pump out the remaining CFCs so that no refrigerant is released into the atmosphere. I have a copy of an advertisement for such a device. The same thing should happen with cars. If cars use CFCs, they should be designed so that the unit containing it is not placed in a position where it is likely to be broken in case of accident. At the moment, they are put at the front of the car where they are prone to damage in an accident.

When a refrigerated air-conditioner comes to the end of its life, it should not be unreasonable that the remaining refrigerant is bled out of it and not let out into the atmosphere but recaptured for further use. If we do that, the release of CFCs from refrigerators and refrigerated air-conditioners can be cut to the bare minimum.

Clause 3 is a general prohibition clause which says in simple terms that a person shall not use chlorofluorocarbons for any purpose other than as a refrigerant. It is important that clause 5, the regulations clause, gives the Governor power to make regulations. For instance, CFCs are a propellant in asthma sprays, and it has been argued that nothing else is suitable to use. They are not a major contributor to CFCs in the atmosphere, so it is not unreasonable that the Government would grant an exemption. Where a company needs the chance to change its tooling so that it can use alternative propellants in aerosols, it is not unreasonable that an exemption be made.

I believe that in the few cases where CFCs are absolutely essential, the fact that they are essential would need to be demonstrated to the Government and it is probably at that point not unreasonable that the Government grants an exemption by way of regulation. In the case of the production of foams, which is another major use, it is worth noting that in the United States, much of the polystyrene foams are now expanded not using CFCs, but using simple hydrocarbons, and there are no problems there. In fact some companies have reverted to using cardboard rather than using foam and are having no problems there.

There is, I suppose, one final alternative. I guess that if a company can demonstrate that it uses the CFC as an expander, within a closed system, whereby the CFCs are captured again and do not escape, once again there is the possibility of exemption by regulation.

The Bill is a fairly simple one but I would suggest it is highly workable. It is time for procrastination to stop or we in this place and members in other Parliaments around the world will be severely judged for fiddling not so much while Rome burns, but while the world burns. I ask all members to give this matter serious consideration. I think many members are far more aware of the problems than they were 14 months ago and I ask for bipartisan support of both Labor and Liberal on this matter.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 11 August at 2.15 p.m.

particularly employers. The simple answer to the question is that the decision that was brought down by Mr Justice Marcus Einfeld does not apply in South Australia because the Equal Opportunity Act in South Australia protects people against sexual harassment *per se* and, in that sense, South Australia is unique in the Commonwealth.

Whereas the Commonwealth Sexual Discrimination Act requires complainants to not only prove sexual harassment but also further disadvantage in employment and education, in that sense South Australia has led this country in this area and has laws which will overcome the problems that this most recent decision has highlighted. I know that this legislation was debated for some 12 or 13 hours in this House. Much of it was opposed by the Opposition but I think one member of the Opposition crossed the floor on this aspect of the Bill to give it that strength which now serves our community so well.

I understand that the Attorney-General has made a statement in another place about this matter and has been advised that employers, educational authorities and providers of goods and services are still required by State Acts to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the workplace is free from sexual harassment. The Equal Opportunity Act of South Australia defines sexual harassment and therefore provides the basis for serious consideration of all complaints of the various forms of sexual harassment that occur unfortunately in workplaces and in the community.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier sought a ruling from the Taxation Commissioner as to whether fringe benefits tax at the rate of 49c in the dollar applies to the recent damages and costs awarded against the former Minister of Health? If the Premier has sought such a ruling, has he received it and, if he has received it, what is that ruling?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This issue was raised by the Opposition yesterday and, since then, I have asked my officers to have discussions with the Taxation Office because the Leader of the Opposition claimed to have definitive advice from that office that the fringe benefits tax applied. At this stage, I have seen nothing from the Taxation Office, but I am given to understand that no such ruling could be given because, until liability is established, the question of such a ruling does not arise. That means that the question of a fringe benefits tax is hypothetical at this stage. Certainly, it would be extremely anomalous if there was some liability in this case. However, I can shed no further light on this matter at this stage.

ADELAIDE GAOL

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say when tenders or expressions of interest will be called for the development and future use of the Adelaide Gaol and its environs? Further, what criteria had been established on which to assess the various proposals for the future use of the gaol? At a ceremony earlier this year the Minister of Correctional Services closed the notoriously inadequate Adelaide Gaol and handed both the keys and the responsibility for the building back to the Minister of Housing and Construction, who indicated that there would be a process of public discussion, debate, and evaluation of a range of alternatives for the future use of the site, located as it is on alienated parklands. There has been considerable interest in the tourist information and museum uses to which the gaol could be put and a large sign outside the gaol recommends that people with ideas about the former gaol should present them to the Heritage Unit of SACON.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. Perhaps it is topical that he should ask this question this week because the Adelaide Gaol will be open to the public this weekend, on 13 and 14 August. Although members on this side have other pressing appointments this weekend, I urge members opposite who may have time available to look at what the gaol has to offer. In saying that, I am not in any way making a derogatory remark about the Opposition. I merely ask them to go to the gaol as visitors: if they want to become long-term tenants of Her Majesty, we have a place for them at Mobilong or Yatala. A Government committee is investigating ways in which the Adelaide Gaol could be developed as a publicly accessible heritage site and at the opening this weekend we shall be able to gauge whether there is sufficient public interest in using the gaol as a tourist attraction. The gaol at Port Arthur, in Tasmania, may be a little older and have a more significant history than the Adelaide Gaol, but what is to be seen at Port Arthur compared to what is to be seen at the Adelaide Gaol leads me to say that the Adelaide Gaol has much more to offer, and I am sure that the Minister of Tourism would agree with me in that regard. I was pleased to note that for once the member for Hanson supported me in urging the public to take advantage of the opportunity to visit the Adelaide Gaol.

The prices are very reasonable: for adults, $5, for children $2.50 and for pensioners and unemployed $3, and a family ticket is $12. Tickets are available from Bass. So far the reports of the public interest have been encouraging and I urge all members to make it known in their constituencies that the public has a chance to see Adelaide Gaol this weekend.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In view of the Premier's answer to the question of fringe benefits tax being applied to the total sum of damages and costs of the former Minister of Health, will he give a guarantee that his Government's insistence on indemnifying the former Minister will not be extended to cover additional personal income tax which may be accrued by the Hon. Dr Cornwall as a result of the Government's decision? The Premier has attempted to justify his decision to have taxpayers foot a bill of at least $150 000 on the basis that the former Minister was acting—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member that she is clearly debating the matter and leave will be withdrawn if she continues in that vein.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: —as an employee of the Government. Given his failure to investigate all the potential financial implications—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Coles cannot see that statements that are linked together by phrases such as 'given a certain fact' and so on is clearly debating, I am surprised. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In explaining the question to the best of my ability by giving the House facts which relate to the question and of which the Premier is obviously not aware,

I am explaining the question in accordance with Standing Orders, and I seek a review of that decision.

The SPEAKER: I point out that under our Standing Orders leave is given for explanation of questions according to a fairly strict format that is spelt out in the particular Standing Order. Leave is granted by the Chair on behalf of the House. Leave can be withdrawn by the Chair on behalf of the House or by any honourable member. If the Chair permits the honourable member to continue with an explanation to a question that is clearly in breach of Standing Orders, then any other honourable member can just as easily withdraw leave, as the Chair has done. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, the member for Coles was seeking to explain the implications of the Income Tax Act to the damages awarded against Dr Cornwall. The member for Coles was prevented from explaining the import of that Act which would dictate that Dr Cornwall would have to pay $73 000—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The Deputy Leader will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles was clearly reading from a prepared question. It is surprising that on a particular matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is surprising that, on the matter she put before the House by way of question, its being a prepared question, explanation should be necessary. If any explanation is necessary, Standing Orders are quite clear that the explanation should contain only facts such as may be necessary to explain such question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, the member for Coles was seeking to explain a question. I doubt very much whether the import of the question was clear from the amount of explanation that you allowed. She was putting before the House facts explaining the question: nothing more, nothing less. If we have to take up the time of the House to disagree with your ruling, Sir, it would be unfortunate. I put to you again, Sir, that the member for Coles was putting before the House facts in explanation of a question that was fairly obscure in the bald form as first read.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has exercised its prerogative to withdraw leave, the same way as any other honourable member in this House can exercise his or her prerogative to withdraw leave. Leave is withdrawn. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order which arises specifically out of the ruling you have just given, with respect. I acknowledge that ruling but—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has not given a ruling. The Chair has withdrawn leave.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I apologise, Mr Speaker. In your action to withdraw leave from the member for Coles you told this House that the question, being a prepared question, therefore did not need an explanation. That is a very new ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order and the Chair did not say that. The Chair implied that a prepared question would have a more carefully prepared explanation which would not lead to leave being withdrawn. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question itself is a hypothetical question about tax treatment of an individual's income, and whether or not something is income is, I would have thought, not an issue in this case. Clearly, it is nothing to do with income. I am not prepared to stand here and be an instant tax expert. I simply say that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —the question is hypothetical.

GRAND PRIX

Mr RANN: Can the Premier inform the House whether there has been any progress in negotiations to secure the right for Adelaide to stage the Australian Formula One Grand Prix before the 1991 expiry date of the present contract?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a very topical question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: And so I should. It is a very topical question. In fact, today I tabled the 1987 report of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. I would say that, as far as negotiations are concerned, they are under way. Their progress, of course—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question I am attempting to answer relates to whether negotiations are in train and what progress is being made in terms of extending our contract for the Formula One Grand Prix beyond the 1991 expiry date. I was advising the member for Briggs that those negotiations are in progress. They are dependent on a number of factors, in particular, of course, the conclusion of the contract between FOCA (the Formula One Constructors Association) and FISA (the Federation Internationale Sportif Automobile).

I also make the point that we cannot conclude negotiations because the Act covering the Grand Prix in Adelaide contains a sunset clause. In fact, it expires at the period at which the contract ends. So in order to achieve an extension of that contract, the Act will have to be brought before the Parliament again. I certainly give notice that I intend to do that at the appropriate time, but at this stage we are working to see what sort of value we can get and what sort of contract can be brought up.

As to the results so far, I mentioned that today I tabled the report of the 1987 Grand Prix, and there was wild interjection from members opposite who asked, 'When is it going to make a profit?', 'What loss did it make?' and so on.

I am pleased to advise that that report in fact shows that the Grand Prix for 1987 virtually broke even. There was an extremely small operating deficit of $54 000—and that is out of an expenditure of about $20 million—compared with $1.5 million in 1986. There was a positive cash flow of $1 million, and that was against the background of expenditure on improvements to the circuit and other increased costs which, in fact, improved the amenity of the Grand Prix. Last year, for instance, there was a new seating system, improvements were made to the existing grandstand seating facilities and there were additional services for the public.

Despite all of that, the fact is that the Grand Prix came very close to breaking even and we can see, as the series continues, that in terms of its actual operating expenses it will produce a positive result.

Let us put that in context: that is talking about the actual return—the ingoings and outgoings—on the event itself. If one wants to look at the true profit and loss picture, the Grand Prix has been in profit from day one, and quite considerably so. The fact is that the 40 000 or more visitors

from both overseas and interstate who came to South Australia for the 1987 event generated an enormous amount of economic activity in South Australia, and the return to Government alone through payroll tax and all the other economic related imposts was very great indeed.

Many of those same people—the 40 000—go to the casino and by so doing earn more revenue for the Government and, therefore, for the community of South Australia. The Grand Prix has been in the black from day one—there is no question of that—and for the Grand Prix Board to achieve this sort of operating result I think is very commendable indeed. I would like to congratulate it on what has been a superb financial performance.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Is the Premier aware of the terms of section 26 *(e)* of the Income Tax Assessment Act which states that an employee is liable to pay personal income tax on compensation granted to him in relation to his employment? In the case of the Hon. Dr Cornwall the Premier has determined that the taxpayers will pick up the $150 000 damages and costs bill. The Opposition has been advised that, if fringe benefits tax is not paid by the Government as the employer of the former Health Minister, the Hon. Dr Cornwall may be faced with additional personal income tax on that amount.

At the top rate of 49c in the dollar, this would mean that the former Minister would be liable for payment of about $73 500 in income tax out of his own pocket. In deciding that taxpayers would foot the cost of damages and costs on behalf of the former Minister, the Premier claimed that the Hon. Dr Cornwall was acting in his capacity as a Government employee and should therefore not be personally financially disadvantaged, which suggests that the Premier may seek to extend the indemnity—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's question directed to the Premier is clearly beginning to argue a case, and I suggest that, if she examines the wording of her explanation wherein she links phrases and sentences by words such as 'therefore', the honourable member will see that it clearly constitutes putting together an argument.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Well, Mr Speaker, the fact is that the total pay-out will be $223 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the key to the honourable member's question was the words 'may be faced'—it is hypothetical; it has not arisen. Personal income tax is the responsibility of the individual, not the Government.

CAR TELEPHONES

Mr De LAINE: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of prohibiting the potentially dangerous practice of drivers using car telephones while their vehicles are in motion? Recently I was driving behind a vehicle whose driver was speaking on his car telephone and steering with one hand. There was a series of bends in the road and the driver had great difficulty negotiating them and avoiding oncoming cars.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I recall one rather spectacular occasion when the use of car telephones was not all that helpful, and I am sure that Mr Kennett and Mr Peacock would agree. On the general question as to whether or not car telephones represent a threat to road safety, I think that we would have to concede that they are a fact of life, and many people in the community—many busy people—have an advantage through being able to use a car telephone. Certainly, there is a very serious factor in the honourable member's question. I would imagine that if a passenger were using a car telephone there would be no problem at all. I am not too sure of the circumstances should a driver of a car merely answer the telephone. In those circumstances it may be similar to talking to someone in the front seat, except that the driver would be steering with one hand and holding the telephone receiver with the other.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think the member for Alexandra makes a good point which could be looked at. There may well be, though, some difficulties when drivers of moving motor vehicles are attempting to dial on the car telephone, because that would have to be quite distracting, and any activity that distracts drivers could cause a potential problem. Car telephones are a fact of life, but there is no evidence available to me to suggest that they have in any way presented any road safety problem to the community. However, if used inappropriately car telephones may well compromise road safety, and that matter concerns not only South Australia but all of Australia.

As a consequence of the honourable member's question I will have the Road Safety Division make inquiries with the Federal Office of Road Safety and the road safety agencies in other States to see whether there is evidence that would suggest that the inappropriate use of car telephones can present road safety problems. If that is the case, we will have to look at the matter. If there is no evidence to suggest that that is the case, then I as Minister would not propose to interfere with what has become a common practice throughout Australia. Nevertheless, I accept the seriousness of the question, and the matter will be looked at.

HEALTH COMMISSION SPENDING

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier say what Health Commission spending is to be cut back to pay the costs and damages of the former Minister of Health? The cost of the former Minister's legal action may now be at least $220 000 and will have to come from the Health Commission budget. As an illustration of its potential impact on Health Commission programs, last financial year the commission's grant to the Anti-Cancer Foundation was $209 300; to the Crippled Children's Association, $244 000; and to nurses' continuing education, $243 000. Recipients of financial assistance from the commission are now asking how the Government intends to pay this bill and whether their vital programs are going to suffer as a result.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can assure them—and I hope that the honourable member will pass this on—that the Health Commission's programs will not suffer as a result.

COASTAL CORRIDOR TRAFFIC

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Transport set up a working party consisting of representatives from the Highways Department, the Road Safety Division and foreshore councils to investigate matters concerning traffic on the coastal corridor? Recently members of the foreshore councils, mainly consisting of Glenelg, West Torrens, and Henley and Grange councils, met to discuss their increased concern about the rising volume of traffic along the foreshore corridor. This traffic has increased considerably in the past 12

months, and it would appear that many more motorists are bypassing the main corridor of Tapleys Hill Road in order to avoid the traffic lights on that road. The increased volume of traffic is of concern to the local residents because of increased noise levels and the increased potential for accidents. Most foreshore councils agree that motorists should be encouraged to use Tapleys Hill Road in preference to using the foreshore roads.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The amount of detail that the honourable member was giving, in effect, constituted argument or debate. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. I am sure he will not mind my just acknowledging in the House that the member for Morphett has raised this matter with me on a number of occasions, as has also the member for Hanson. Those three members represent that part of the South Australian coast that seems to be suffering difficulties with vehicles leaving the main arterials, including Tapleys Hill Road, and travelling through local roads. I am certainly happy to have such a committee established. In fact, I thought that perhaps it had already been established to investigate what measures might be available to remedy the problems being encountered by the honourable member's constituents and those of the other members I have mentioned.

I am not certain that the reason why motorists are leaving Tapleys Hill Road is the lights on that road. Most motorists will seek to get from one point to another as quickly as they can, and it is quite clear that they try to avoid traffic lights. There are examples where traffic lights are coordinated, as now are most traffic lights on arterial roads in metropolitan Adelaide, and motorists can get from one point to another more quickly by staying on the major arterial roads: that is what they are there for. Local streets are not expected to take the volume of traffic that emanates from outside a local government area and travels through that area to a destination on the other side of it. That is not the role of local roads and never should be. Unfortunately, it has become so in a number of examples.

I am also aware that the delay in completing the Tapleys Hill-Brighton Road link, which has been on the works program for some years but has not been able to be completed because of a lack of road funding, is creating some difficulties for traffic travelling through our western suburbs. I will certainly take up the matter with both the Highways Department and the Road Safety Division so that they can coordinate with the local councils involved to establish the committee as quickly as possible in order to give advice to the Government as to the best actions that can be taken. Whether those actions will be the responsibility of local government or of Government, through the Highways Department, or whether it will be a coordinated responsibility is something that needs to wait until that report is available.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier advise the House from which part of the State budget the money will come to pay Dr Cornwall's bill of some $220 000 if it is not to come from the health budget? In a previous ruling the Auditor-General indicated to the Parliament that damages in the Chatterton case had to come from one of Mr Chatterton's departmental lines in the agriculture budget.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If in fact what the Auditor-General was saying is that it had to be paid through that line, that is very simply done by adding the appropriate amount to the Health Commission lines.

Mr Olsen: From where?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: From the revenue of the Government—from the Government's allocation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We have a $4 000 million budget. The amount involved represents probably .005 per cent—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —or something like that. If in fact the Government is caught in litigation, workers compensation payments—

Member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. All interjections are out of order. It is particularly out of order for the indecorous behaviour of the honourable member for Victoria, who is not in his place and is interjecting out of order. I caution him particularly above all other members for his interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, my response to the honourable member was that we will not make our programs in the health area—about which I was asked particularly, but I will say generally—suffer because of the need to pay this amount.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BRIGHTON TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Transport undertake to review the position of the school crossing lights on Brighton Road adjacent to Brighton Primary School? It has been put to me that the problem encountered by students attending that school arises from the fact that the existing lights are too close to the Jetty Road intersection, with the result that motorists driving north or south on Brighton Road frequently fail to distinguish the pedestrian crossing lights from the traffic lights at the intersection. Further, motorists turning north from Jetty Road occasionally do not have time to see the nearby pedestrian lights and there have been instances of children being hit on the pedestrian crossing by motorists turning left out of Jetty Road. I am informed that several months ago a group of eight or nine children on the pedestrian crossing were scattered by a fully laden semitrailer the driver of which did not see the lights and drove through the children. In the light of that explanation, I ask the Minister to consider—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not necessary to repeat the question. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The problem recounted by him is similar to that raised by the Speaker himself at, I think, the Richmond Primary School on South Road where the pedestrian lights serving the school were close to the intersection of South and Richmond Roads. The matter referred to by the member for Bright has been represented vigorously by him and, in fact, recently I have heard that he had visited the school and talked with the school council and with the parent groups involved. I have undertaken to have officers from the Road Safety Division and the Highways Department meet with the school bodies, especially with the parent groups that have raised the matter and have submitted a petition to me for consideration. One solution to the difficulty may be to move the pedestrian crossing

farther north so that it links into Highet Avenue and access from the school may be off Highet Avenue rather than Brighton Road. However, that is a matter on which the traffic engineers and other experts could advise me.

It must be remembered that pedestrian lights are pedestrian lights and are not exclusively school crossing lights, although to a large extent they are used as such. It is difficult to place lights in a location where one can be certain that all pedestrians are likely to use them. Indeed, all the evidence available shows that pedestrians will not walk more than 30 metres to cross a road where the lights are located: rather they make their own way across and, if there is a median strip, the crossing can be made relatively safely, but if there is no median strip it is dangerous. In this regard, Brighton Road is heavily patronised by traffic. We have considered whether an underpass or an overpass would be desirable at this location, but an underpass would cost a minimum of $500 000 and an overpass a minimum of $300 000. Further, for obvious reasons people do not use an underpass after the sun goes down and people using an overpass are likely to drop things on passing motorists. That is irresponsible behaviour, but it happens.

So, not only would an underpass or overpass be expensive but there is no guarantee that people would use either. I acknowledge that there are difficulties at this location concerning the placement of lights. The Road Safety Division and the Highways Department, having considered this matter, have advised me that the current configuration is the most appropriate. That is not to say, however, that new evidence might not evoke a different recommendation from my department. Because of that, I thank the honourable member for his continued representations on what is, in the view of the local people, a dangerous situation. I will have the Highways Department and the Road Safety Division look at what can be done to remedy whatever problems may exist.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr OSWALD: Following his statement yesterday that Cabinet had agreed in May 1986 to indemnify the former Minister of Health for his legal costs on the condition that 'appropriate apologies' would be made to Dr Humble, will the Premier reveal the full terms of the apologies offered to Dr Humble so that taxpayers, who will have to foot the bill for the former Minister's behaviour, can determine whether those apologies were 'appropriate' in view of the facts subsequently established during the trial?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I dealt with that matter quite adequately yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I dealt with that matter quite adequately yesterday but, for the benefit of the honourable member who clearly was not listening, I will go through it again. What was indemnified at that time was the costs involved in obtaining a collective settlement. That is all the parties to the action—the media representatives as well as Dr Cornwall—were to negotiate a joint settlement. If that joint settlement had been successfully effected, the Government would have indemnified the Minister of Health's costs in respect of that settlement. That settlement was not effected. The media was able to settle for a sum, I think, of $55 000 (from memory) in terms of damages plus costs, but the Minister of Health's part in that settlement did not proceed and the plaintiff indicated that he wished to take Dr Cornwall to court.

The thing that was seized upon yesterday, and again I thought that I adequately explained it, was that it would certainly have been true—I have not seen the actual correspondence—that Dr Cornwall would not have apologised for using the terms 'scurrilous fool' and 'liar' for the simple reason that Dr Cornwall maintained consistently that he did not use those terms. Therefore, he could not apologise for using terms when he was claiming that he did not use them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: So, if that was the factual situation clearly you do not offer an apology for something you contend you did not say. As I understand it, the court finding was that the term 'scurrilous fool' had been used, but the term 'liar' had not been used. That was the finding, but it had to be determined by court action. Therefore, an apology in relation to that matter was clearly not an issue until and unless the court had so found.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the House does not come to order satisfactorily, the Chair may have to dispense something else.

GAS CONCESSIONS

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy reassure South Australian pensioners that the South Australian Gas Company's current review of concessions will not deprive eligible pensioners of their gas concessions?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Newland for her question. I appreciate the concern that she is showing on behalf of her pensioner constituents. The Gas Company has advised me that the assurance she seeks is contained in the letter sent by the Gas Company to each consumer and, I believe, most members of Parliament received such a letter.

That letter unequivocally states that the pensioner concession scheme is to continue. Information supplied to my office by the Gas Company indicates that the sole purpose of the review is to ensure that all consumers who are currently getting such a pensioner concession are, in fact, eligible. This has been prompted by what the Gas Company describes as a disproportionate increase in the number of concession recipients in recent years, compared to the number of total customers. The company is seeking two things: first, from the people receiving the concession an assurance that they are still eligible and, secondly, it is seeking authority to verify their eligibility with the Department of Social Security or the Department of Veteran Affairs. Unlike the electricity concession scheme, which also has been operating for some time, the Gas Company has not previously been able to check pensioner numbers with these two departments and has had to rely on people coming forward when they are no longer eligible for concessions.

My office has been told that since the company wrote to consumers in receipt of concessions, a substantial number have contacted the Gas Company to indicate that they are no longer eligible. I fully appreciate that it is a relatively easy thing to overlook, and I also appreciate the honesty of people in coming forward and saying so when they are contacted. It is, therefore, quite reasonable for the member for Newland to reassure her constituent pensioners that the changes will not in fact affect them.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier explain why he believed it was appropriate for the former Minister of Health to resign if the Premier and the rest of Cabinet accepted, in approving the indemnity for legal costs and damages, that the Hon. Dr Cornwall MLC had been acting reasonably in his capacity as a Minister at the time that he slandered Dr Humble?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have gone through all of that, both in press statements and press conferences, and I have been fully reported.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Premier to order. I caution the House that what I dispense I would hope would be justice but it may not be mercy.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

Mr RANN: My question is to the Minister of State Development and Technology. What impact would plans for a Cape York spaceport have on South Australia, and what prospect is there for industry in this State to share in this project?

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN: With your concurrence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House and the member for Mitcham, I will explain the question. A national study is under way to examine the feasibility of the spaceport concept. This proposal has come at a time when we have seen a resumption of rocket launches at Woomera and, I believe, an increase in aerospace related business activity in South Australia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This question is very significant because, certainly, South Australia does have a record in the space industry, but that record is not all we will see about South Australia's involvement. There is a very significant future for the South Australian space industry. With respect to the Cape York spaceport proposal, it has to be acknowledged that Woomera is not suitable for the launching of the types of rocket that would be launched at a spaceport. Nevertheless, it is an excellent place for the launching of sounding rockets and, indeed, the Woomera site very much fits into a complementary role with any development that may take place for a spaceport at Cape York.

I may say that the opportunity for Woomera and for general activities in the launching of certain types of rocket is reflected in NASA's 10 year agreement and plans by the Defence Department to use and develop the base at Woomera in the foreseeable future. In that context I repeat that Woomera will serve a complementary role to anything that is developed at Cape York. I want to take the matter one step further. The member for Mitcham, in his usual effort to deride any advance or development in South Australia, interjected that this was a kite-flying exercise.

I may say that the South Australian aerospace industry is about much more than flying kites: it is about real development; it is about real technological advances. Some recent developments include the development by British Aerospace Australia of a tracking scanner for the European Space Agency's earth resources satellite. Secondly, Codan has recently launched a prototype satellite ground station developed for OTC by a consortium led by Codan, which looks to have some international potential in terms of sales. British Aerospace is also working on a joint venture with the State Government—that is the SATCOM joint endeavour—in a complementary project to develop a medium capacity earth station.

A new company at Technology Park, Australian Launch Vehicles, has been seeking private investment in a project to develop expendable satellite launch vehicles, and the State Government, through the South Australian Development Fund, has put some resources into that company. Furthermore, the Remote Sensing Centre has also developed international expertise in the enhancing of satellite images for a range of activities from agriculture to resource management.

As I mentioned, there is the 10 year program of NASA for sounding rockets at Woomera rocket range. One could go on to the British Aerospace contract with the Soviet Union, also involving some space development. Clearly, there is a very exciting future for this industry in South Australia that technically, from an Australian involvement sense, began in 1967 with the launching of the Wresat satellite from Woomera.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Mr MEIER: My question is directed to the Premier. When Cabinet, last Thursday, approved the indemnity for the former Minister of Health, did it consider the fact that the Minister's attitude to and conduct during his trial had greatly increased the amount of costs and damages awarded against him and, if so, will the Premier explain why taxpayers have to foot the bill for such behaviour?

The judgment against the former Minister makes clear that if his attitude to the trial had been more responsible the proceedings could have been considerably shortened, thus reducing costs, and the damages award also would have been far less. I refer to comments by his Honour Acting Judge Bowen-Pain that the former Minister had used the trial 'to further his political ends by making political statements at every opportunity' and also that 'the conduct of the defendant, the manner in which he has conducted the case and his obvious reluctance, even now, to accept that what he said of the plaintiff was unjustified, warrant the award of aggravated damages'. Accordingly, one of the precedents established by this indemnity is that Ministers can show complete disregard for the judicial process—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not only debated the question but also clearly commented. I withdraw leave for him to complete his explanation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am surprised that the honourable member wastes his opportunity and valuable Question Time in just rehashing matters that have already been the subject of questioning in this House and of extensive public debate. I have put clearly on the record the principles under which the decision was made. I invite the honourable member simply to look at the words I used, and I think he will find that there is ample precedent for that view. That has been explored at considerable length.

Yes, I read the judgment too. I know of that comment. We also know that Dr Cornwall intends to appeal against elements of that judgment, and I think before we make any final comments on it we ought to wait and see the outcome of that appeal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Mr DUIGAN: I direct my question to the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Local Government in another place. Will the Minister advise the House whether there is any intention on the part of the Government to close public libraries, to reduce funding to public libraries or to require public library borrowers to pay a borrowing fee? An article in yesterday's *News* entitled 'Libraries in South Australia face closure' contained a report from a South-East Local Government Association conference, which was told that some of the 132 libraries in the State are on the point of closing down. The article contains part of a letter written by one of the librarians in one of those council areas, as follows:

> Unless councils make a stand and protest at the reductions library services will continue to deteriorate and councils may find they will be asked to pay the lion's share more and more . . .

A representative of the Local Government Association reported to the conference that the funding of libraries had in fact reached crisis proportion.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question and will, of course, refer it to my colleague in another place for a detailed reply. It is appropriate for me to say that this Government does not intend to wind down libraries, as the Tonkin Liberal Government did when it came to office in 1979. We can all recall the problems that that action caused in the community. We are very proud of our libraries in South Australia. I believe that we have the best library system in Australia, and a number of people in the wider community have made outstanding contributions to libraries in South Australia. I do not think it is inappropriate for me to mention one of those people, Mr Crawford, and the outstanding work that he has done over a number of years. We are very fortunate that Mr Des Ross has been able to take over the reins as chairperson of the Libraries Board.

I just want to repeat that the library system in South Australia is one of which the Government is justly proud and one of which I believe the people of South Australia can be justly proud. Certainly, as far as this Government is concerned we will ensure that the people in South Australia continue to have access to the best library system in Australia.

HON J.R. CORNWALL

Mr LEWIS: I want to ask a question of the Premier—I was going to ask him about whether or not he had the Cabinet table wired yet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Does the Premier intend to accept the advice of the President, the Vice President and the Secretary of the Peake District Assembly of the ALP given in their letter to the Editor published in the *Advertiser* this morning that he should reappoint the former Minister of Health to Cabinet 'at the earliest opportunity'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already again said quite publicly what my position on that is, namely, that when a vacancy occurs the ex-Minister of Health will be entitled to seek that vacancy. Whether or not he chooses to do so and whether or not he is successful will depend on the judgment of his Caucus colleagues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition, and any further infringement will result in his being named.

FLINDERS CHASE

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I direct my question to the Minister who is representing the Minister for Environment and Planning today. Has the Government received expressions of interest in establishing and operating tourist accommodation facilities in the Flinders Chase flora and fauna reserve on Kangaroo Island? If so, by whom were those expressions of interest registered? Has the Government decided on any one or more of those registrees proceeding with such a development? About four years ago the South Australian Travel Centre commissioned a study into the needs in this direction. The report ultimately recommended tourist accommodation being established in the region referred to, but not specifically in that flora and fauna reserve.

For one reason or another, no development has taken place in the interim. Furthermore, against clear local opposition to such a development in the island park the Government proceeded, as I understood it, and a decision was to be made on or about 30 June this year. That timetable has now expired by six weeks, with no announcement having been made by the Government—indeed in a climate of some rumour circulating the community in relation to this subject. In order to clear up that rumour, an answer from the Government forthwith would be appreciated.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I shall be somewhat briefer than the apparently brief explanation of the honourable member by saying that I shall refer this matter to the Deputy Premier for a response as soon as possible.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

> That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills to be introduced before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

> That Standing Orders be so far suspended that on Thursday the adjourned debate on the question 'that the Address in Reply as read be adopted' take precedence over all other business including questions between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Advances to Settlers Act 1930. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes an amendment to the Advances to Settlers Act 1930 that was enacted to provide loans to settlers on Crown land. In 1986, the Act was amended, prohibiting new loans as from 30 June 1986. Existing loans under the Act are administered by the State Bank, as agent for the Government. The purpose of the Bill is to make several minor amendments to the Act to allow the regulations under the Act to expire on 1 January 1989.

The existing regulations under the Act were made in 1953 and subsequently amended in 1958. An amendment to the Subordinate Legislation Act in 1987 enacted a provision for regulations made prior to 1 January 1960 to expire on 1 January 1989. The 1958 amending regulation, which deals only with fees payable in respect of new advances, no longer has any application given that no further loans can be made under the Act.

The remainder of the regulations only have limited application, dealing with collateral or substitute mortgages, the need for which may still arise in the event of a division of land in which the bank has an interest. Sections 10 (5) and 11 (1) of the principal Act both require the form of mortgage documents to be prescribed by the regulations. By deleting these references and thereby allowing the bank to determine the form of any future mortgage documents, the whole of the regulations will have no further application and so can be allowed to lapse on 1 January 1989.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 10 of the Act by removing the requirement in subsection (5) that mortgages executed under that section be in the form prescribed by the regulations.

Clause 3 amends section 11 of the Act by removing the requirement in subsection (1) that a mortgage executed under that section be in the form prescribed by the regulations.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Rural Advances Guarantee Act 1963. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this amendment is to transfer to the Director-General of Agriculture certain responsibilities presently carried out by the Land Board. The change is being proposed because the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture administers most other State Government measures relating to farm lending and has greater relevant expertise and experience.

The Rural Advances Guarantee Act empowers the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of loans for the acquisition of land for rural production. Since 1963, 212 guarantee applications have been approved, of which 33 are still current. Prospects for farming are such that new loans are now rarely made. Activity under the Act is limited almost exclusively to the consideration of applications for the deferment of loan repayments.

At present the Act places responsibility upon the Land Board to advise the Treasurer with respect to the valuation of properties and the ability of the borrower to undertake the business of rural production. The board is also required to furnish reports to the Treasurer in relation to guarantee applications and proposals for deferment of loan repayments.

The Act requires the Director-General of Agriculture (or a person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture) to furnish the Treasurer with a report on the adequacy of the land in question to maintain the applicant and his family after meeting all reasonable costs, including loan repayments.

In practice, the Land Board has, for some time, accepted advice from the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture prior to fulfilling its statutory role. The legislation seeks to formalise these arrangements.

I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clauses 2 to 5 are self-explanatory.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNAUTHORISED DOCUMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Unauthorised Documents Act 1916. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to provide protection against the unauthorised use of a distinctive South Australian commercial logo based upon the well known J150 logo.

During our Jubilee Year the J150 Board adopted a logo devised by Lyndon Whaite. This comprised a stylised Piping Shrike in black, gold and blue with the number 'J150' in the top left corner and a title at the base comprising '1836 South Australia 1986'. The device proved to be popular and the J150 Board raised money by licensing manufacturers and others to use the logo commercially for a fee.

There is a steady flow of requests to use the State Badge comprising the Piping Shrike against a golden orb which depicts the sun. Where such requests come from associations representing the State of South Australia in non-commercial ways or in sporting contests or requests come from manufacturers of acceptable souvenirs, permission may be granted.

Requests to use the State badge are refused where its use might imply Government authority—for example, jackets with a State badge shoulder patch or chest decoration, badges on wine labels and letterheads of private bodies. Nevertheless there may be some advantage in such applicants being able to obtain access to a distinctive South Australian label without official connotations. Whilst the Sturt pea and wombat are available floral and faunal emblems they are not depicted in a standardised form and are not widely known in South Australia and still less interstate.

An opportunity therefore exists for the State to capitalise on the established recognition of the J150 logo by amending it by deleting the numbers and words and replacing them with 'South Australia' in the top left corner. In a coloured version the black areas will become dark blue to coincide with the other State colours of red and gold already used.

The State will charge a licensing fee for the use of the commercial logo which will be protected from unauthorised use by amendments to the Unauthorised Documents Act contained in this Bill.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for operation of the amendments from a date to be proclaimed.

Clause 3 provides an offence for unauthorised use of the State commercial emblem. Subsections (2) and (3) authorise the Minister to grant permission to use the emblem for a fee and revoke it. Based on J150 experience it is anticipated that this will yield sufficient to cover the cost of administration plus a small profit.

Subsections (4) and (5) provide for compensation and injunctions if breaches of the section occur. In subsections (7) and (8) power of seizure of suspect goods is provided with the proviso that owners may recover the goods or their market value if a successful prosecution does not eventuate. If there is a conviction the goods are forfeited to the Crown.

Subsections (10) and (11) provide a definition and means of establishing a 'State Commercial Emblem'. There is the possibility that other such emblems would be authorised at some time in the future although this is not presently envisaged.

Subsection (12) preserves the right to institute civil or criminal proceedings and for continuance of any existing rights.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 88.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Mr Speaker, I commend His Excellency for his speech on the opening of this session of Parliament. This is the sixth occasion on which I have had the opportunity to listen to His Excellency open a session of Parliament, and I must say that during that time I have not disagreed with one word he has said.

I extend my condolences to the family of Sir Douglas Nicholls. I did not know Sir Douglas personally but I was certainly proud as a South Australian to know that Sir Douglas was the first Aboriginal Vice-Regal representative in Australia. I understand that he discharged his duties in an excellent manner and, along with all other members of this House who have expressed the same feelings, I was very sorry to hear of his death.

During the parliamentary recess, I was also saddened to hear of the death of Mr Arnold Noack. Being the Head Attendant in the House of Assembly, he was somebody whom I came to know and respect over a long period. Nothing was too much trouble for him and he certainly was of assistance to me as a new member coming into this House when from time to time I made requests of him with which he willingly complied. I was very saddened to hear of his sudden departure, and I extend my condolences to his family.

I pay a tribute to the retiring Cabinet Ministers—the Hon. Roy Abbott, member for Spence; and the Hon. Ron Payne, member for Mitchell; and also to the Hon. John Cornwall, member of the Legislative Council. In my opinion, all of them have done an excellent job in the time that they have been in Cabinet. The Hon. Roy Abbott was the one I had most to do with, involving his duties in the area of transport, and it was through his understanding of the situation occurring in the area of Henley and Grange that the Henley and Grange council was able to secure the parklands that have been known as a railway corridor in that area. That achievement will go down in history as a tribute to him in his role as Minister of Transport. He was also involved in the initial decision to shift the old Grange railway station to its new site, as well as being responsible for other expenditure in my electorate, and I received nothing but satisfactory results from my dealings with him.

The Hon. Ron Payne took over the onerous portfolio of mines and energy at a very difficult time, when the uranium debate was raging pretty strongly within the community, and he had a difficult time in his early months in that portfolio. I shall never forget the way in which he quietly but competently handled those matters. He also took over the portfolio when the Cooper Basin gas problems had become significant but, with his quiet and consistent negotiation, he was able to bring that problem under control, so that we find ourselves in a very satisfactory situation today.

There will not be one electorate where the influence of the Hon. John Cornwall did not extend. It certainly extended to my district, where I have seen remarkable changes in the area of health and welfare, with many changes made at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There have been many welfare reforms, and during the past three years I believe that the welfare budget in my area has expanded. I will be ever grateful for the work undertaken by the Hon. John Cornwall as a Cabinet Minister.

I extend my congratulations to the new Ministers—the member for Todd, the member for Mawson and the member for Florey—all of whom I believe are competent and whose record will show in the fullness of time that the Caucus made the right decision. I wish them well in the future, and I expect at some future time, when they retire, to be saying the same things about them as I am saying about those members who are now retiring from the Ministry.

From time to time members have heard me discuss the lack of child-care facilities within my electorate. It is a subject about which I speak with some passion. Anybody who believes in equality at all should also believe in the provision of child-care. I make no apologies for, over the past five and a half years, taking every opportunity to tell the House about the lack of facilities in my own electorate. Just to get the record straight, and for any student who may read Hansard 40 or 50 years from now, I point out that a child-care centre has been established in my electorate.

I take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Children's Services and the Children's Services Office for the decision taken to establish that child-care centre. Members will recall that, from time to time, I have informed them of the necessity and my belief in the need for child-care facilities in the electorate. It is very pleasing to note that the Kidman Park Community Child-Care Centre will soon be in operation. The outside building works have been completed, and it is now a matter of waiting for the inside fittings to be completed before that centre is up and running. An interim management committee has been formed under the chairmanship of Sebastion Consalva, and an enthusiastic committee has been putting together all the preliminary work

necessary before the first intake of children. This represents a forward step in the provision of community facilities in my area and, judging from the number of telephone calls I have received about child-care, this centre will be rapidly filled and the need that I have reported in the Parliament will be demonstrated.

I would like to thank people who have volunteered to form the initial committee and for the work they have done for the community. I believe that the establishment of this child-care centre demonstrates what a local politician can do for his own area, provided he is persistent enough in his own endeavours. I must say that I was alarmed at certain proposals being floated about the way in which child-care should be funded in future through a voucher system. I understand that these proposals have now been scrapped, and I would hope that the traditional thoughts on the way that children should be taken into care will be continued.

It was with very great pleasure that I heard that a project at Henley Beach had been approved on 31 May by the Home and Community Care Program for the revitalisation and changing of the senior citizens organisation in Henley Beach. A grant of $171 623 capital and $21 000 recurrent expenditure has been made to upgrade the Henley and Grange Senior Citizens Centre and to employ a worker to provide day program activities for frail aged people.

The proposed aim of the centre is to stimulate the frail aged through the provision of creative social, physical and educational opportunities in a friendly supportive atmosphere. The centre will provide a meeting place where people can contact others and it will provide a range of activities enabling the renewal of old skills and the development of new ones. It will also enable the transfer of skills and knowledge between participants and enhance their self-esteem. The centre will help support an independent lifestyle, so enabling many of the aged to remain in the community. Clients will be transported to the centre by taxi or volunteers where such methods are suitable. A structured activity program will be run depending on the assessed needs of the clients, and assessment by the coordinator will be ongoing.

The type of activity offered will be physical and social and the clients will be given the opportunity to become actively involved. Games played will include carpet bowls, table tennis, chess, whist, and trivial pursuit. Other activities will include keep fit for the elderly, basketry, craft, bingo, and discussion groups on current affairs. Education and training of volunteers, carers and clients will be provided as required. Proposals are under way for a carer program and a personal security for the elderly program. The provision of meals will enable full day care and thus provide respite for carers.

Visiting facilities for podiatry are planned as an extension of the services for the senior citizens club. Information will be given and referrals made for services that are not available. The overall program will be managed by a full-time coordinator assisted by part-time aid and volunteers. At present, 76 frail aged are among the target group requiring the service. Initially, it is expected that this service will run on three days of the week and cater for 20 clients daily. However, depending on demand, the service will be extended to five days a week and the number of clients per day increased.

I am extremely pleased to see this sort of development in my electorate and I congratulate the Federal Minister for Housing and Aged Care (Hon. Peter Staples) and the former State Minister of Health and Community Welfare (Dr John Cornwall) for their consideration in respect of this venture. I am especially impressed by the opportunity for elderly people to obtain meals at a reasonable cost in this centre, and I look forward to seeing just how the centre can contribute to the welfare of the community.

I also take the opportunity of thanking the Federal Government for the provision of a grant, through the Department of Local Government and Administrative Services in Canberra, to the Henley and Grange Council for the establishment of an economic innovator in the council offices. This project aims to promote and implement development activities that will benefit the area and the ratepayers generally; to identify and realise the entrepreneurial opportunities available in the council's area; and to produce profits for the council.

I believe that this project is seen as a pilot project and that, if it is successful, it can consequently generate involvement by other councils. The whole idea of the project will demonstrate the possibilities for local councils to tap into revenue raising ventures that will help alleviate any future major increases in rate revenue and reduce reliance on State and Federal Government grants.

I was happy to see the establishment of the economic innovator in the council district. The Henley and Grange council faced a much changed revenue base. The new provisions for the minimum rate are likely to have an adverse effect on the rate base of this council. The population of Henley and Grange includes 25 per cent of people of pensionable age, so revenue gathering will not become easier as the years pass. The Federal Government's revenue sharing grants, which are based on 1.9 per cent of personal income tax receipts in lieu of the previous 2 per cent, will have a downward effect on the influx of Federal Government money and it is expected that the $450 300 that was provided this year will be reduced to about $100 000 over the next five years.

Further, concerning miscellaneous grants distribution it is likely that, because of State Government finances and the general downturn in finances being made available by both State and Federal Governments, the number of grants and the total of the grants will diminish, so it seems only reasonable that the Henley and Grange council, in considering ways and means whereby it can increase its revenue, should adopt an entrepreneurial approach. I have been advised that, since the economic innovator has taken office, he has managed to generate considerable funds for the council but, until audited figures are available, I should be unwilling to disclose just how much money is involved, although I understand that he has done extremely well.

I take this opportunity to express my concern about the need for further work within my electorate, specifically the removal of the old Grange railway station. I was pleased to receive an undertaking from the previous Minister of Transport (Mr Roy Abbott) that he would have the Grange railway station moved from its previous site to the other side of Military Road. This move has been a forward step even though it drew criticism from some areas, especially from shop keepers on the corner of Military Road and Jetty Street who thought that their businesses might be affected by the moving of the station. However, small businesses in the area have not been affected and there has been no noticeable difference in the number of customers, so the original criticism has been proved unjustified.

However, traffic volumes have increased along Military Road as more and more development has occurred, both in the West Lakes area and beyond. This has caused considerable traffic problems at the corner of Military Road and Jetty Street, and I believe the time is now opportune for the old Grange railway station platform to be removed. I have naturally conveyed this message to the present Min-

ister of Transport and to the Highways Department, and I have been told that the department is ready to act when the Henley and Grange council has completed some of the work required for this operation to take place.

I believe that most of the problems in the locality revolve around parking problems at this intersection. I have been contacted by the Henley and Grange Ratepayers Association, which is most anxious that work commence on the removal of the old station. I hope that, if there are any differences between the department and the council, those differences can be settled so that the Highways Department or the State Transport Authority (I am not sure which is more directly concerned) can go ahead and remove the platform as was originally promised when the new station was built. This is a matter that I, as local member, need to pursue vigorously, and I will certainly take it up again as soon as practicable.

I should also report to the House that in earlier Address in Reply contributions I expressed concern for certain teenagers in one part of my electorate, namely, near the corner of Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade. Some of the problems involved in this area are similar to the problems of any new settlement. It is a question of getting newcomers to meld in with the rest of the community, and I find that that has presented some difficulties.

Some of the children are creating problems in respect of vandalism, graffiti and the like. Certainly, I would like to take this opportunity to say a word of thanks to the Department for Community Welfare for the interest it has taken in this matter and for the work that has been done in this area by the South Australian Housing Trust. It has established a committee which is already doing good work. There have been several working bees to clean up the graffiti that has been spread around the place and the Department for Community Welfare has provided on a temporary basis a community worker for a short period to lend assistance to try to integrate these new people into the community. I extend my congratulations to the department for the work it is doing. Also, I take the opportunity once more to congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his opening speech to Parliament and I positively support the motion now before the Chair.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to express my sincere and deep sympathies to the relatives of Sir Douglas Nicholls, K.C.V.O., O.B.E., one-time Governor of South Australia. I have very fond memories of his term in office. In particular, when he visited my electorate of Glenelg North, as it was in those days, before one of the many redistributions that I have had to suffer. Sir Douglas gave the message to those who assembled at the Old Gum Tree on Proclamation Day 28 December 1976. As was customary after the ceremony at the Old Gum Tree, official guests were invited to a buffet luncheon at Glenelg Town Hall by the Glenelg council. His Excellency, the Mayor, and a representative of the Premier always ate at an official table and the rest of the guests obtained places around the hall. Some even ate their lunch out on the balcony.

After about half an hour I looked up to see His Excellency at the head table on his own. Being the local member of Parliament I made myself known. I felt sorry for this lonely person sitting up there. He asked me what would happen next. I explained to him that after some time, if he wished, he could walk around and meet some of the guests, and then he would officially withdraw from the function. The late Sir Douglas said, 'Do I really have to.' I said that somebody should be looking after him and I asked him what was happening. He said, 'I do not know, but I want to look at the athletics.' I said to him, 'You are the Govenor, it is up to you. If you want to withdraw, you have to walk down the middle of the hall and do it officially.' He asked, 'Can I go out the back way?' I said, 'If that is what you want to do, it's okay, come with me.'

As we went out the back door of the Town Hall Sir Douglas noted the women working in the kitchen and he thanked them for an excellent lunch. There was a bit of a panic because a couple of them were having a quiet smoke, including my wife. I then escorted Sir Douglas down the back stairs of Glenelg Town Hall and we walked towards Colley Reserve where Bay Sheffield heats were being held. His Excellency recalled what it was like, when he was a boy, to be down in the area. He remembered a fine merry-go-round at Glenelg. I said, 'Come on, we will look at it.' We walked over and the person operating the merry-go-round immediately spotted His Excellency the Govenor and said, 'Would you like a ride?'

Sir Douglas thought that perhaps he should not, but he spoke to many of the children enjoying themselves and he got great delight in seeing the young ones enjoying what he had enjoyed many years ago. As we walked down sideshow alley he talked to different people and various stallholders offered their services to him to try this or that. I could see the delight in his eyes as his memories went back to earlier days. However, he really wanted to meet the athletes, and I took him down to the reserve. However, this meant that he was at the official function about 45 minutes too early.

Back at the Town Hall the guests realised that they had lost the Governor, although someone was supposed to be looking after him. People wanted to know where he was. Mad panic broke out while people tried to ascertain what had happened, and then someone remembered that they had seen Becker head off with His Excellency towards the kitchen area.

Again, it was a great delight to see His Excellency relive his younger days as he sat down on the grass talking to athletes as they prepared for the various events. Unfortunately, an official of the Athletics Association spotted His Excellency and again panic broke out. People asked what was he doing here and said that he should not be present so early. I said, 'Leave him alone; he is happy.' The athletes themselves were delighted to have the opportunity to relax and talk to His Excellency and benefit from some of his experiences. Finally, he went back to the centre of Colley Reserve and the athletics track where he sat down to watch the events. By that time the official party caught up with us. I did not stay to find out what happened after that. I thought that I had done my duty for the day.

Whenever I met His Excellency after that occasion he grabbed my hand and said, 'Thanks very much. It was a great day down at Glenelg.' I believe His Excellency was one of nature's gentlemen: he was an Australian of whom we could all be very proud. To his family I extend our deepest sympathy. Certainly, I want to thank them for lending him to South Australia, albeit for such a short time as Governor. He is warmly remembered and always will be remembered for his term in office.

Also, I wish to extend to the Hon. Murray Hill, the former long standing member of the Legislative Council, and his wife Eunice, a long, happy and healthy retirement. Murray Hill gave me some valuable advice, guidance and inspiration on occasions after my election to State Parliament. It was never my intention to be a member of Parliament. I stood because the Party wanted someone to stand, and I won the seat. It was members of the ilk of Murray Hill who said, 'We don't care if you never make a speech or ask a question; just hold the seat for the Party.' It was his guidance

on many occasions that kept me here, because I would have been much happier back in the bank. There would be many members in this House who are sorry that Murray Hill gave me the advice to stay on, but I have delighted in the past 18 years in doing something for my State. There are many things I look to, both in legislation and the actions of the Government in getting things done for the benefit of thousands of people, if not for the whole State. Certainly I thank Murray Hill for that.

It comes back to this debate again, even though the time has been reduced for those who wish to speak. It is starting to grind into a very hard and difficult exercise, and it gets a little bit boring. We find that we get members such as the member for Briggs who vent their spleen and take great delight in continuously abusing and berating the Leader of the Opposition, which I think is most unfair. It would be acceptable if the member for Briggs would tell the truth occasionally and I suppose that he, of anyone on the Government benches, would be responsible for some of the misleading perceptions and untruths which are spread from time to time throughout the community of South Australia. He got up last evening and berated Nick Greiner and the New South Wales Government, but what he did not tell this House—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I thought it was excellent because Nick Greiner would laugh like hell if he ever heard it. He would not bother reading it. But the member for Briggs may very well rue the day that he made some of those comments, because I am told, when he criticises members of our staff going over there, that his behaviour also came under the microscope. However, he did not tell the House some of the things that Nick Greiner inherited.

Let us have a look at the *Financial Review* of Wednesday 3 August. The New South Wales Commission of Audit report 'Focus on Reform' had this to say:

> The State Rail Authority has liabilities of $4.8 billion, substantially more than the previously stated official figure of $3.1 billion.

How can you cover up $1.7 billion? That is $1 700 million. The report continues:

> The Urban Transport Authority has liabilities of $458 million, more than 600 of its staff are on 'select duties' because of illness and accident, and its staff take an average of 12.8 sick days each year. Elcom, the electricity generating authority, has $2 billion invested in generating equipment which is not needed and is thus earning no return. It also does not buy the cheapest coal available. The result is higher than necessary electricity charges. The Maritime Services Board values all its assets at $1, makes many errors in its billings, has a slow and inefficient invoicing system and exploits its monopoly position to generate 'excessive returns'. The commission estimates that increased use of outside contractors would produce savings of between 20 per cent and 50 per cent on all major works.

Those are just a few of the things that have been discovered in New South Wales that were created under Sloppy Joe Unsworth and the previous administration which Nick Greiner has inherited and now must try to straighten out. It is all very well for those who want to criticise the incoming Government in New South Wales. I am glad that the member for Briggs is here. As I said earlier, his behaviour was monitored, and if he wants to carry on with the nonsense he does, let us also not be frightened to advise his Party what goes on.

I am most concerned at some of the actions and activities of the member for Briggs, because we know that he was the press secretary of the Premier and, of course, is now a member of this House and using $1.5 million of taxpayers' moneys to ensure that his Party and his Government set up a media monitoring arrangement by supporting very strongly the appointment of additional staff to each Minister. That is $1.5 million per annum to provide the propaganda, the research and backup facilities of these Ministers and, of course, more importantly, to suppress anything the Opposition in South Australia has to say.

We know what happens when Governments go out to oppress the Opposition, suppress what it has to say in informing the people of the electorates and the people of the State exactly what is happening. Let us have a look at the suppression of what is probably one of the greatest scandals in this State. What happened to the $5.7 million project of the Remote Sensing Unit? What happened to the contract that was going to help the Ethiopian Government? Why was the Government so sensitive over this $5.7 million contract which was announced by the Premier on 4 May 1987? Let us read what the Premier had to say:

> A South Australian company based at Technology Park has won a $5.7 million contract to help alleviate the effects of drought in Ethiopia. The South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing won the contract despite strong Swedish competition. Announcing the contract, the Premier, Mr Bannon, said the project would involve reafforestation of parts of Ethiopia to lessen the effects of drought while high-tech resources would be used to formulate a plan to help manage existing energy resources in the country.
>
> 'Ethiopia has recognised that the loss of its forests has contributed to declining agricultural activity and has been a very important factor in prolonging and aggravating drought,' he said. Mr Bannon said the Centre for Remote Sensing had developed a worldwide reputation for its application of satellite technology. 'This technology can be used to monitor various resources and has applications in a wide range of fields, including agriculture and mining,' he said. Company director Mr John Douglas said that over the years Ethiopia's area of forest had declined to about 10 per cent of the country.
>
> The need to use wood for energy further compounded the problem. The Ethiopian Government had realised the need to develop a plan to help reafforest the country, but it had to start by itemising existing resources. His company would do this using satellite technology and then would help develop a resources development plan, looking at such areas as soil management and agriculture.
>
> It was part of a long-term program which would eventually enable Ethiopia to cope with droughts by such means as growing crops in areas not considered before and developing a management program for wood reserves. The project will last four years and will involve the supply of equipment, including computer technology, and the training of Ethiopians to use it.

What actually happened was quite a scandal in terms of commercial negotiation between a State, a technology arrangement and a foreign Government. On the first occasion when the Remote Sensing Unit had to meet with the Ethiopians, the South Australian Government sent two solicitors, so I am told, to negotiate with the Ethiopian Government. That Government pulled out of negotiations because they simply said 'Why did you send two solicitors? Don't you trust us?' That is the way South Australia deals with its agents overseas.

At this stage we have not heard or seen anywhere that the Premier made a statement that there was also a joint venturer in the project. A Canberra company called Fortech was involved in the contract all the way through. It was never announced at any stage, and any subsequent announcement never mentioned that there was a joint venturer in the project. On the second occasion, another deputation was sent to Ethiopia after the first abortive attempt, and another solicitor went along and again the negotiations were bogged down. It then went on and on for months trying to negotiate a contract with the Ethiopian Government to the benefit of the Remote Sensing Centre, so that we could come to help in some respect a country which has been devastated by droughts and a people who have not enjoyed a good standard of living.

Here was the opportunity for South Australia to do something constructive and to help with modern technology, and what happened? The Remote Sensing Unit was given until 4.30 on 20 May to sign and seal the contract, and was asked

to telex by 4.30 on that Friday afternoon whether or not it would accept the contract. Somebody fouled it up, because the telex was not sent until the Monday morning. In some Government departments 4.30 is a pretty busy time. At 4 o'clock in some Government departments they just do not operate. Some Government departments do not even operate after lunch. Do not worry: private enterprise is not much better, and that is the trouble in this country. Not many people really want to work all day. Too many enjoy a hell of a long lunch. Many Government departments are in the same situation. So we lost that contract because on the Monday after Friday 20 May the Ethiopian Government cabled back and said, 'Bad luck: the deadline was 4.30 on Friday.'

I am advised that information pertaining to the collapse of the Ethiopian project has been covered up to safeguard the Minister of Transport, the Acting Director of Services and Supply, Ray Dundon, Dennis Patriarca, currently working for the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing, and Robert Martin from the Crown Law Office. There are people involved in this who know all about it, who want the truth to come out, and it cannot be done.

Since my first press release on this matter there has been a witch-hunt in the bureaucracy to find out how the Opposition came by the information and certain details of it. It is also known that only John Douglas and Lia Michael (who succeeded in winning Australia's biggest remote sensing project) knew the true facts—that only those two people had face-to-face contact with the Ethiopians as well as closed door telephone conversations with the Ethiopian Government every time Minister Keneally and Ray Dundon were antagonistic in their responses.

The Minister of Transport has a case to answer; he is the person who should be held responsible for losing this contract. The Premier has been called on to investigate why we lost this contract and there has been no response again from Mr Good News; he announced it but has not said a word since. We have lost a valuable contract and an opportunity to make a contribution to another country and to help in a time of need.

What is happening—absolute dead silence from this real good news Government. I think it is a shame. I believe that if the Premier does not hurry up and get going on this and does not advise the House and the people of South Australia of what has happened to the contract and advise taxpayers of how much money it has cost South Australia then we will have to move that the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee investigate again the Department of Services and Supply and, in particular, the Remote Sensing Unit at Technology Park. It is not good enough.

I understand that Fortech, the joint partner in this venture, has spent at least $50 000 and, under normal commercial arrangement, would be suing the State for that amount of money. Of course, we know what it is like suing the South Australian Government; it would be just throwing good money after bad. It would probably cost the State Government at least $100 000 to $150 000.

It is interesting to note that in the last financial year the South Australian Centre for Remote Sensing had a budget of $1.3 million ongoing costs and about $1.4 million was allocated for capital spending. So, the Government has a case to answer. It owes the taxpayers reasons why this very considerable contract and wonderful opportunity has been lost. There is also the damage that has been done to Australia as a nation, and to South Australia. The Government's credibility has suffered, and this situation affects commercial undertakings not only in this State but Australia-wide. A lack lustre performance by this Government is not good enough. The coverup will not be accepted. We now want to know what is going on.

Of course, when one wants to know what is going on in coverups around the place one should just look at the Correctional Services Department. We have had some excellent examples in the past few weeks of what is going on there, but of course the Government has been too preoccupied with the numbers game—replacing those who suddenly resign (and you can bet your socks they did not want to resign on the day they did after yesterday's announcement). When a Government spends more time worrying about the numbers and appointing Ministers and covering up situations, then good administration falls by the wayside.

A few remandees at the Adelaide Remand Centre have been on a hunger strike for the past three days, and I am told that the reason for it is that they are not satisfied with the menu. It costs more to keep an offender in the Remand Centre than it does to stay overnight in the Hilton Hotel. As a matter of fact, the cost of running the Remand Centre per remandee per day is on a par with costs at the Hyatt Hotel. If the remandees at the Adelaide Remand Centre wish to be put in the same class as the Hyatt Hotel then we can make certain arrangements. However, when they complain about the quality of the menu it seems to me that it is about time some discipline was instituted.

Let us turn to the menu. For dinner they have Swiss steak, mint peas, buttered corn, creme of rice and fresh fruit. The next day they have corned silverside, parsley sauce, boiled potato, mint peas, baby carrots, peach pie and custard. On Wednesday they have roast chicken, gravy, roast potatoes, buttered broccoli, sweet corn, preserved pears and cream. On Thursday it was grilled lamb chop and sausage, onion gravy, chipped potatoes, fresh cabbage, buttered carrots, chocolate mousse and fruit salad.

On Friday they have fish, chips, and lemon wedges, buttered cauliflower, brussels sprouts, chilled rice, baked custard and cream. On Saturday they have veal schnitzel and gravy, fondant potatoes, macedoine of vegetables, fruit, trifle and cream. On Sunday they have roast pork, apple sauce, gravy, roast potatoes, broccoli au gratin, buttered cauliflower, and custard slice.

They are beautiful meals. The meals vary at the Remand Centre in a 21 day cycle and include steak diane, chicken and gravy, veal schnitzel, corned silverside, crumbed fish, savoury meat balls, roast beef, grilled sausages and bacon, spaghetti bolognaise, braised sausages, chicken schnitzel, fish and chips, and roast lamb and gravy. They are evening meals and one cannot complain about them. As the member for Gilles said, that is as good as we get at Parliament House, and I bet my socks it is probably better.

For lunch they have meat pie and vegetables, savoury sandwiches, savoury meat balls, cornish pasty, Chef's choice, and veal schnitzel. One cannot tell me that the standard of meals at the Adelaide Remand Centre is so poor that the remandees have to go on a hunger strike. They are probably better off than they have ever been in their lives, probably having survived on meals from Hungry Jacks, McDonalds or pizza from take-away shops or Dino's and the like. That is probably all they are accustomed to—one meal a day—and then suddenly they get three meals a day, including breakfast, and they cannot take it. They have nothing to do up there.

It is about time that the Minister went to the Adelaide Remand Centre and said, 'They are the meals. If you do not like it, bad luck. Go without.' The remandees at the Adelaide Remand Centre have this hunger strike with these superb meals! It is better than I get at home.

I now turn to conditions at the City Watchhouse. The Minister says, 'We are not interested in the watchhouse.' The conditions there are disgusting and disgraceful. Its purpose is to hold people overnight and, because of bureaucratic bungling, one cannot transfer people from the watchhouse to the Remand Centre after about 4.30 p.m. Why somebody cannot be employed until 6 p.m. to allow time for the courts to clear their cases and get the people there and settled I will never know. I asked a representative of Offenders Aid to inspect the conditions at the watchhouse and meet with one or two remandees and see whether what was alleged to me was correct. I obtained a report from Offenders Aid about the conditions as follows:

I spent one and a half hours at the lock-up on Monday 4 July 1988 and interviewed every prisoner. There were 39 there at the time. I was told by the police that there had been over 70 that morning and they expected another inflow when court finished at the end of the day.

I never cease to be amazed at some of the stories we get from the Police Media Liaison Unit when we make allegations that this and that is not right. They will deny anything. The report continues:

1. All prisoners were in cells. Some did not have mattresses and had to sleep on the bare boards. There is also a shortage of blankets/pillows.
2. Food is very poor and very little. I was told that breakfast was a bowl of cornflakes with very little milk—that was all! The evening meal last Friday night was two sandwiches.

No wonder they want to go to the Remand Centre. It continues:

3. Washing—there is an ablution block on ground level—complaints that the showers are inefficient and if all in use the water is cold—there were showers for some on Saturday and those omitted were to have them later but this did not happen. Need a wash before going to court.

One can imagine what it is like to be held in the watchhouse for several days and not to have a proper wash or change of clothes before one appeared before the bench; and that is what is happening. The report continues:

4. Recreation—those who smoke need cigarettes—also need for playing cards, books, and other activities. Are in cells 23 out of 24 hours so need for exercise. The lock-up seems very secure, so question whether prisoners could use between cells area. Also, need for socialising, e.g., work at cleaning, playing cards or some activity.
5. Visits—police policy varies with change of shift. Some allow and others refuse. Need for a consistent policy.

That is not going to cost the Government anything. But surely in the name of humanity persons who are held in the City Watch House are entitled to have someone come and visit them when they want them to. The report continues:

6. Warrants—some serving out warrants and question whether they should be doing this at E Division. Others came to court from the ARC and have not been allowed back. One remandee has been in the lock-up for seven days because cannot raise bail of $250.

How tough and how rough is this Government going? It continues:

Recommendations:
1. OARS should provide welfare as long as needed—provide cards, books, etc.
2. Urge police—
   (a) to provide mattresses, blankets and pillows,
   (b) to have consistent policy on visits,
   (c) to have showers on an organised, regular regime . . .
   (d) to do something about the food.

Of course, I believe that the whole place should be pulled down and redeveloped. However, there are further allegations of cover-up. On Sunday 31 July there was an incident in the Adelaide Remand Centre. A remandee went berserk and six staff were attacked. One person was hospitalised because of that incident. On another occasion, 23 hours following a murder at James Nash House the matter was made known to the public. This was another cover-up. The director of that department should have been told within half an hour of that incident, but he was not told—there was a delay of several hours. A young person committed suicide at the Youth Training Centre at Magill. We do not know whether there will be any inquiry or a coronial investigation as well—again, very hush-hush. These are the actions and activities of this Government. As I say, the 'good news Premier'.

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In rising to speak in support of the motion for the adoption of the draft Address in Reply, first, I want to, in concert with other members, express my regret and sadness at the passing of Sir Douglas Nicholls on 4 June this year. Sir Douglas was recognised everywhere as a fine leader of the Aboriginal people. I was privileged to meet him on a number of occasions as a member of the Cabinet during those all too few months of his term as Governor in early 1977. I was impressed by his gentle and kindly nature and, may I say also, by his sense of humour. I express my condolences to members of his family on their sad loss.

I also want to record my regret at the recent sudden death of Arnold Noack, who was a member of the parliamentary attendants staff over a number of years. I knew Arnold well over that period and I found him to be a helping and caring person, also with a lively sense of humour. My sympathies go to his family in their loss. I offer my warmest congratulations to our two new Ministers, the member for Mawson and the member for Todd, and the new Minister-elect, the member for Florey. They will do an excellent job for South Australia and for the Labor Party. I wish them long tenure in Cabinet.

At this point I want to record my commendation for the work done by the Hon. John Cornwall and for his care and concern for the underprivileged and needy in society. As a member of Cabinet over quite a few years when John was there, I can attest on a first-hand basis to his efforts in the areas to which I have referred. I note also the retirement of the Hon. Murray Hill from the Legislative Council, and I wish him well. In so doing, perhaps I could point out that Murray and I were contemporaries in the Royal Australian Navy in the Second World War. Perhaps as is the fashion nowadays I should also point out—because it could be said that I have a vested interest in wishing him well—that I bought the land on which the house at 17 Scottish Avenue is situated from Murray Hill and Company back in 1949. To avoid any possibility of some strange link or collusion or whatever, I make that disclosure to the House. I have been very satisfied with the land. It has made an excellent base for me and for Labor in that area. In addition, if I remember correctly, I paid £85, which was the peg price in those times. I suppose it could be argued that I have made a realisation. So, I want to make it quite clear that I was speaking objectively.

During the very eloquent moving of the motion that we are now addressing by the member for Fisher I listened with considerable interest to what he put before the House with respect to the South Adelaide Football Club. I think he told us that he was a member of a working party that is looking at the feasibility and/or possibility of a move further south for the club. I think the honourable member deserves commendation for being so actively involved in such a matter. I believe that I ought to mention that at the moment South Adelaide Football Club is located in my electorate. I point out that I have not had a very close association with

the South Adelaide Football Club although on occasions over a number of years when it has requested my help it has received it. That was in respect of water on one occasion, relating to the provision of a bore, and so on. That goes back quite a few years.

I was only too pleased to help, but my natural sympathies or tendencies, as it were, are more aligned with soccer, which I played for something like 18 years, including some years in first division for Cumberland. Cumberland Soccer Club is also located in my electorate and thus members would appreciate that over the years I have spent a lot more time (and still do) at the Cumberland Soccer Club than at the South Adelaide Football Club. Notwithstanding, I support the efforts of the South Adelaide Football Club in relation to juniors. Football is a healthy and pleasant sporting outlet for young people. I know that South does a good job in fostering juniors in the area. The other thing that I want to mention is that the member for Spence has been very actively associated with the South Adelaide Football Club, as a former player. With my being a former soccer player and Roy a former league footballer, the relationship that we have had with our respective clubs seems fitting.

In analysing His Excellency's speech, I must say that I was flattered by the fact that considerable prominence was given to matters which were formerly my responsibility as Minister of Mines and Energy. For example, in the speech given by His Excellency—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You wrote it.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I didn't write it. If the member for Chafey does not want to follow the forms and format of the House, that is fine, but I intend to do so. Perhaps I am a little old fashioned. I understand all the little nuances to which the honourable member may be referring, but I point out that I certainly had nothing to do with arranging the order of the points contained in the speech. The honourable member ought to remember that, as he spent some fleeting time in Cabinet. Item 6 refers to the $850 million Roxby Downs project. It mentions that it will progressively come into production and provide more than 1 200 jobs, having an important multiplier effect through the regional centres associated with it.

It might be useful if a little more amplification with respect to the small notation in the speech was available to members. I can advise that the proposed production schedule for next year's production, 1988-89, is as follows: 1.4 million tonnes of ore will be milled. Metal production will be, in terms of copper cathode (the design of the plant allows for 55 000 tonnes), proposed production, 43 000 tonnes. With respect to uranium oxide, the design is for 2 000 tonnes per annum and the proposed production is 1 500 tonnes. Gold production will be 27 000 ounces and it is proposed that silver will produce 560 000 ounces. I have received advice from the joint venturers that the schedule to which I have referred has been prepared as a maximum copper schedule for the facilities constructed and assumes, of course, that there will be no major commissioning, start up or processing problems, and I would not expect that to be the case because the project is based on a pilot plant which underwent extensive trialling before the joint venturers proceeded with the major project.

There has been a revision of the production program, as I have indicated because of the difference between the current design figure and the proposed production, and that has been a result of the fact that the amount of gold ore being treated will be somewhat less than earlier envisaged in the first stages. Future production will be reviewed, depending on a number of factors including market capacity, mine and plant actual production, throughput, and recovery factors. The important thing for members to note is that the flexibility of the mine design and plant flow sheet means that the project is well placed to take rapid advantage of any changes to the world uranium demand, and that is a reference to the proposed production of 1 500 tonnes at this stage rather than the 2 000 tonnes which could have been proceeded with.

It seemed to me that some information about gold on both an Australian and a world basis might be of interest to members, now that South Australia will become a much larger gold producer. I am using figures from 'Gold 1986' which are complete for 1985. Total gold production in the non-communist world was 1 212.8 metric tons, which sounds like a nice amount of gold. In Australia, it was 57 metric tons. The gold usage figures—and this is what I found most interesting, one of the things I had never thought of before I had the responsibility for the portfolio which I have now vacated—are very surprising. In 1985 in the non-communist world, 111 metric tons of gold were used in electronics and 52 tons in dentistry. I suppose that is something we do not often think about. Industrial and decorative uses accounted for 51 tons. Metals, medallions and fake coins—and 'fake' does not refer to an attempt to defraud but to ornamentals and jewellery—accounted for 13.9 tons, while official coins, a very large user a few years ago (and I am certain there has been an increase), accounted for 108 metric tons. Jewellery accounted for 898 tons.

People may wonder where a lot of the gold goes to and I must confess that I have wondered in the past; the figures indicate that a very large amount is being worn in order to adorn the human form of both sexes. Gold is becoming used more and more. Watches are made in a more decorative way, rather than in a utilitarian style. So, 898 tons of gold were used in one year for those purposes. That would certainly augur well in terms of the usage of any gold produced from Roxby, and the figures are intended to relate to the life of the mine, which could well be 100 years on present indications, without taking into account any further work that might take place.

I listened carefully to the contribution of the member for Fisher. I also gave some attention to the contribution of the member for Kavel, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I was actually outside the Chamber when he began and I made a bet with the two people I was sitting with. There is no need for me to name them, but if they read *Hansard* they will know who they were. I suggested that within a minute or two there would be a reference to 'pie-in-the-sky', 'mirage in the desert' and 'enrichment of uranium'. I scored on all three counts.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: You were on a cert, weren't you?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I knew that I was on a cert. I did not have the heart to persuade the people I was with to have a wager with me. It would not have been fair, because it was a lay down proposition. There was no doubt that that would happen.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition reminds me very much of 'Dr Who', whom I used to watch when my children were somewhat smaller and still living at home. It seems to me he is in the same sort of scene, a time warp. Nothing has ever changed. He is back in 1982 and, because the Liberals lost office, nobody else has the right to do anything about uranium, the nuclear fuel cycle, mining or whatever unless the Deputy Leader okays it. He does not seem to realise that the public of South Australia recognised there was a better management team available and installed it. We are still there and we intend to continue. The Labor Administration returned to the Treasury benches in 1982

where it belonged. It is esconced and is managing the State's affairs well, whether it be in mines and energy or any other area. New people are already taking over the reins and they will do every bit as good and, indeed, better in these areas, I am sure. I do wish that the Deputy Leader would rethink his situation.

For example, he was talking about enrichment and I think his argument was that we lost a great opportunity with Urenco-Centec, we ought to be in the enrichment game, and so on. I think that he argued in that vein on the same day that every member in the House received information from the uranium institute that pointed out a fact that most people who are interested in these areas know—that there are some great technological changes taking place in the enrichment game, and that to be hooked on gaseous diffusion or even centrifuge methods, even if we could get work for them (because there is no surplus of work at the moment—we would be scrambling for work) is to be hooked on to a more costly technological process. He keeps saying, 'Why aren't we doing it?' Hence my remark about the time warp.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes. He does not seem to be able to go forward at all. I suppose that illustrates he has a difficulty whereby he cannot come to grips with the fact that they were done like a dinner and will not get back.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That is right. One only has to look at the information which was supplied to all of us and which refers to the fact that the atomic vapour laser isotope separation analyst process is on target for full scale demonstration of commercial feasibility by the early 1990s. Whether or not we should be in the enrichment game might well be considered at that time. At the present time, we would have been backing a loser if we had gone down the track that the Deputy Premier keeps advocating. I hope that from now on we do not have to live with that any more.

The member for Mount Gambier is always very faithful if nothing else. He tried to help a little in his contribution, but it really did not advance the Deputy Leader's cause, it seemed to me. Indeed, it might have been better if the honourable member had stood off, because he did not assist the Deputy Leader's cause. Paragraph 16 of His Excellency's speech states:

> ... my Government has embarked on a number of initiatives including the announcement of a third generating unit at Port Augusta's Northern Power Station, to cost $450 million and due for commissioning in 1996.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: As the member for Chaffey would be only too willing to remind the House, I would know that that item was likely to be in His Excellency's speech and I confess that I did. Although I had no input in the exact wording or the order in which it would appear in the speech, I believe that such detail can help members in this debate or at any other time in the House. ETSA and the Planning Executive, after examining all the options available, concluded that NPS3 was the logical choice for the next increment of base load capacity in South Australia. Their view was that it could be developed economically because it would be an extension of an existing power station that would use fuel from an operating mine.

Most of us can understand that kind of reasoning when it is put forward in support of the argument that it is the most logical choice and should be able to be done economically. The construction timetable, as the speech says, is for commissioning in the first quarter of 1996 with commercial use scheduled for six months later. I understand that ETSA expects to order the boiler and turbogenerator later this year and that major site works will commence in early 1990. The third station, NPS3, will provide a major boost for the State's heavy engineering sector. That is something that members may not necessarily have considered and the trust will naturally be ensuring maximum use of local labour and resources.

In addition to the employment generated during the construction phase, manning of the unit and increased coal production at Leigh Creek will also generate additional employment. That is good news for the State's developmental and employment future. Coal production at Leigh Creek will rise by 1 million tonnes a year when the new unit operates, lifting total annual production to 3 500 000 tonnes. Further, the trust is installing additional coal handling facilities at the Northern Power Station at a cost of about $3 million, which will result in further employment in that northern area where additional employment is needed.

Dealing with that matter, which concerns a responsibility of the Electricity Trust, I should like to acknowledge the many kind words that have been said by members in this debate about my efforts during my ministerial years. I thank members for their thoughfulness and generosity in making those remarks. I confess that I was slightly tempted to be the last speaker in the debate because it is always pleasing to listen to nice things being said about one but, as I thought that they might not continue, I decided to speak at this stage so that my remarks could complement those of earlier speakers.

If I have had any success in my role in recent years as Minister of Mines and Energy, I must pay a tribute to the service rendered by ETSA board members who have come from both sides of politics in South Australia. Indeed, one could say, if one wanted to do a little stirring, that they came from the three sides of two sides of politics, because one was a former member of the Liberal Movement, which at one time was part of the circus run by members opposite when they did not know which outfit they were in over a period.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I always thought that the member for Chaffey could at least count and one would have thought, when he looked over to this side of the House each day, he could figure out that there were more members on this side than on his side and that we had the right act going. If he says that we should have more, we shall be only to pleased to accommodate him at the next election. Persons who have served on the ETSA board during my time as Minister include Mr Gilbert Seaman, a former State Under Treasurer. All members to whom I refer have given long service and some have retired. They include the Hon. John Carnie, a former member of the Legislative Council; the Hon. Glen Broomhill; the Hon. Geoff Virgo; Bernie Leverington of Quarry Industries and associated activities; John Lesses of the United Trades and Labor Council who is still a member; Professor Stapleton from the University of Adelaide; Ron Barnes, also a former Under Treasurer; and Keith Lewis, a former Director of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who served for 10 years from 1974 to 1984.

I am proud to mention Josephine Mercer, a lady whom I appointed to the board. She is doing an excellent job and is qualified in law and other areas. Mr Lee Parkin, a former Director of the Department of Mines and Energy, now retired, rendered valuable service on the board. All these people have contributed to whatever success I may have had because all of them were on the board during my time as Minister. I thank them all and I pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the board, Mr Bill Hayes, who has served

as a member for over a decade. Indeed, he has faithfully served both Labor and Liberal Administrations, and I am sure that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would agree with the sentiments I have expressed on behalf of the Government. Bill has given tremendous service in that area. After all, the ETSA board is a busy one, but seldom has he not been available to chair a meeting.

The decisions made by the board over the years have led to ETSA's being recognised as one of the best utilities, if not the best utility, in Australia in respect of its economic and financial performance as a result of its lower interest burdens and its ability to raise finance internally. Indeed, ETSA is often mentioned at national financial and economic conferences and the Chairman deserves special commendation as he has been there through a difficult economic period.

I could develop other areas, but I am a little like the Hon. Geoff Virgo who, when asked by a person from 5DN soon after his retirement in 1979 as to his political view, said, 'There is nothing as stale as yesterday's politician and I have nothing to say.' I have always remembered that and I think that to some extent yesterday's Ministers are also in that category. Therefore, I now turn to matters other than those for which I previously had a major responsibility.

Because there does not appear to be any media representative present at all, it is probably a good time to raise the question of how the media operates these days. Perhaps some members will say that I am definitely in my dotage, and I accept that, but I go back to Saturday 4 October 1862, when the *Critic* newspaper began in Adelaide. At that time we had the *Advertiser* and the *Register* as well. In this first issue, George Isaacs, who used the pen name 'Arthur Pendragon', sometimes known as the 'King of Camelot' said:

> The aim of the *Critic* is not to advance the opinions of any political Party but to comment, in a candid and impartial spirit, on the events of the week and on the various sentiments initiated by the daily journals.

He would be referring to the *Advertiser* and the *Register*. He continued:

> Satire: generally recognised as one of the most effective correctives of folly and abuses, [it] will be by the *Critic* somewhat freely employed; but as it is often misapplied, and the term no less frequently misunderstood, it becomes necessary to state here that the satire of the *Critic* will be characterised by—
>
> Fun without coarseness,
> Humour, free from vulgarity,
> Wit, devoid of bitterness, and
> Ridicule clear of personalities,
>
> so that, while the *Critic* will unsparingly denounce any abuse, laugh at any folly committed by a public man, and distil as much pleasantry from the topics of the day as possible, it will never intrude upon private affairs—never be the medium of persecution—never assail, by insinuation, any reputation—or pander to gross tastes.

I almost do not dare mention, for example, a lady whose name we have all come to know, that is, Dallas Hayden, and what some newspapers and other media have adopted as their role. They could well have taken note of the simple principles espoused by the *Critic* in its first issue of Saturday 4 October 1862. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in so doing, I express my regret at the passing of Sir Douglas Nicholls, who certainly made a significant contribution to Australia and, above all else, to his people. Sir Douglas will certainly be long remembered. The member for Mitchell has referred to the two new Ministers who have been appointed and to the Minister-elect. I add my congratulations to the member for Mawson and the member for Todd, and to the member for Florey in his soon-to-be position as a Minister in the South Australian Government.

I offer my congratulations to Murray Hill, who has had a long and distinguished career in South Australian politics. No-one would deny that his contribution to this State has been significant over a long period, and I certainly wish Murray and Eunice all the best in their retirement.

I now turn to the content of His Excellency's speech in opening Parliament. Paragraph 6 refers to Roxby Downs, to which the member for Mitchell referred at some length. The honourable member was somewhat critical of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the position he took over a long period. At least the Deputy Leader has been consistent from day one. He has been an absolute and total advocate for that project, which is more than can be said for members opposite, particularly the former Minister of Mines and Energy, the member for Mitchell, who vehemently opposed the project in this Parliament. Indeed, with great hostility members of the present Government opposed the project as being a disaster for South Australia and certainly not in the interests of this country.

Today, Government members say what jolly good fellows they are and refer to what a wonderful job they have done in respect of Roxby Downs, which they acknowledge is the biggest project undertaken and promoted in South Australia in the past decade. Certainly we agree with that: it is a tremendous project for South Australia, but I cannot help but recall the debate in this House when, led by the Premier, there was a vehement attack on the legislation that the Deputy Leader as the then Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy had introduced in the House, the indenture Bill to provide for Roxby Downs as a mining venture to proceed in this State.

If it was not for the statesmanlike approach of Norm Foster, who had the courage of his convictions and who was more interested in the future of South Australia than in his future in the Labor Party, the venture would not have got off the ground, and great credit should go to Norm Foster. It should be recorded and remembered for all time that without his support the Liberal Party would not have been able to get this major project off the ground in South Australia by getting the indenture Bill passed through both Houses of Parliament. I find it amusing that Government members now try to claim credit for this great project. I can do little more than smile and think what absolute hypocrites they are.

I now turn to paragraph 15 of the speech, in which His Excellency states:

> Following a review of the State's fisheries legislation, it is intended to introduce a Bill to amend the Fisheries Act 1982. This legislation will increase penalties for some offences related to abuse of fishing controls, introduce an expiation system for minor fisheries offences and redefine some fishing activities in order to remove anomalies.

There is much more involved in managing the fisheries of South Australia than just increasing penalties and introducing expiation fees. One need only look at St Vincent and Spencer Gulfs and the degradation that has occurred, particularly in regard to sea grasses, the state of the seabed and the overall ecology of the two fisheries, to understand the situation. Indeed, I will look more closely at the situation concerning Gulf St Vincent.

Much of the degradation that has occurred is the result of fishing practices and stormwater run-offs from streets in the metropolitan area and the outfall of sewage treatment works at Bolivar, Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Christies Beach. They have all contributed significantly to the degradation of Gulf St Vincent as an important fishery in this State. One has only to discuss the issue with members of the

Scuba Divers Association, people who are actually out there with equipment and are effectively able to go down to the seabed and examine closely at first hand just what is happening. We need look only at the condition of the Aldinga reef.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What's the alternative?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Certainly, there are alternatives as far as fishing practices go. First, we must look carefully at the manner in which prawn trawling is carried out to see whether there is a better method of prawn trawling whereby the nets are kept further off the bottom and less damage is done to the ecology of the seabed. Destroying the ecology of the seabed is exactly the same as taking the habitat away from any species. If we take away the habitat, whether of fish, water fowl or anything else, we effectively destroy that species. That is clearly borne out on wetlands. If we take away the habitat of water fowl, we do not have to fire a shot; we will effectively get rid of that species.

That has been proved beyond any doubt in North America, in relation to the work that has been undertaken in the United States and Canada by a group known as Ducks Unlimited. They have been involved in re-establishing the chain of wetlands throughout North America from Canada down to the Gulf of Mexico, and re-establishing the migratory pattern of water fowl from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and back. By developing all the lands through the United States and bringing them under agricultural production, getting rid of many of the wetlands which existed naturally, many of the water fowl species were effectively destroyed, not by firing a shot but by taking away their habitat.

It is exactly the same with fisheries. We can have all the regulations in the world, restricting size limits, having on-the-spot fines and increased penalties, and fish stocks in the fisheries around South Australia will continue to decline unless we do something about the habitat, the ecology in which the various fish species live. I place a lot of confidence in remarks that are fed back to me by people who are out there in a practical sense, getting down on the seabed and examining exactly what is going on. There is much more sense in doing something about trying to preserve or reconstruct the ecology that used to exist.

Of course, we have sewage treatment plants and stormwater runoffs taking a lot of pollutants—oil in particular—into the sea from the streets of metropolitan Adelaide and from the southern metropolitan area stretching down towards the cape. Those pollutants carried into the sea all must have a detrimental effect on the ecology of Gulf St Vincent. It is a closed water: it is not a high energy coastline. We merely get the ebb and flow of the tide within the gulf, which is quite different from an open coastline, which one could describe as a high energy coastline, where many of the pollutants that go into the sea are dispersed. That is not the case in the two gulfs, and I merely say that until we in this State get back to a practical approach of the management of our fisheries, rather than having a whole series of academic theories about increasing penalties and increasing size limits, we will not solve the problem.

It is the same with the Murray River fishery. Limiting the gear that can be used and the number of fish that can be taken, their size and so forth, will not solve the problem. The problem in the Murray River is the same as that in Gulf St Vincent and is largely a result of the changed ecology of the river, with increased pollutants and increased salinity generally. Because the Murray-Darling system now is a very highly regulated river system, the normal fish breeding process which used to occur in native fish has largely been eliminated, in that native species (particularly the Murray cod) need high flows in the river. The waters need to spread out over the flood plains and reach a certain temperature before cod will spawn. Of course, the process of the waters going over the flood plains releases an organism from the clays of the flood plains, on which the small fingerlings live in their early stages.

That is why there is great difficulty in breeding native freshwater species in captivity. Much of the work in determining the problems that exist was carried out in the early days by John Lake, who was, I believe, Director of the Fisheries Research Station at Narrandera. He determined that the reason why it was extremely difficult to breed native freshwater species in captivity was that they needed natural conditions, with the water spreading over the flood plains of the Murray to trigger off the breeding process.

Until we deal with some of the practical aspects of protecting the ecology of the gulfs (particularly Gulf St Vincent) and do what we can to redevelop the natural grasses that used to exist, the fish population will continue to decline. I give full marks for the efforts that have been made to date in creating artificial reefs by using worn out tyres, which are certainly working. However, we do not need three or four reefs of that nature: we need a vast number. I suggest that the Government look very closely at utilising old car bodies, or anything of that nature.

I believe that it is illegal for a private individual to deposit car bodies in the sea for the purpose of making artificial reefs, but where it has been done—and it has been done in numerous instances—it has been very effective. Of course, the car bodies will not have the life in the water which the tyres have but, by the same token, they start the chain of recreating the environment needed to attract the fish back into the gulfs and provide the necessary food chain for their existence. I strongly suggest to the Government that it is time that it looked very closely at utilising the countless thousands of wrecked car bodies to be found throughout South Australia and that they should be strategically placed in a pattern so that we can start to build up the natural environment once again.

The other matter to which I wish to refer in His Excellency's speech is paragraph 18, where mention is made of the Happy Valley water filtration plant. That filtration plant, which is due for commissioning in November next year, is a major undertaking, the development and construction of which was started during the time of the Tonkin Government.

It makes sense to commence construction of the plant at Myponga now to bring it on line fairly close to the time that the Happy Valley plant will come on line. The Minister will find that the people to the south of Adelaide will not accept a situation where, during the winter months, they receive filtered water from Happy Valley and during the summer months they will be back to water which contains sediment and is heavily coloured. It is totally unreasonable for the Government to not adopt a program that will bring the Myponga Reservoir on line at the same time that the Happy Valley Reservoir comes on line.

I do not wish to refer to other paragraphs in the Governor's speech, but I will comment on one or two other matters, particularly the Murray River Management Review which the Government some months ago placed before the public of South Australia for comment. Various groups and organisations have responded since that time. The vast majority of councils from the Victoria/New South Wales border down to the river mouth have contributed to a consensus submission that went to the department in response to the draft management proposal. The councils are not happy with the proposal as it stands and see the

recommendation that there be virtually no development below the 1956 flood level as totally restrictive. We believe that there can be responsible development below the 1956 flood level in many areas, and to deny that development puts a major impediment in the way of tourism development in this State.

We believe that responsible, properly engineered developments will not be largely affected by floods above, say, the 1974 flood level. Murray Valley Holiday Homes and Site Owners Incorporated made an excellent submission, and its summary states:

Council recommends that:

- the consultative process should be ongoing and a consultative group with council representation be formed under the Murray Valley Regional Coordinating Council.
- the flood plain for planning purposes be set on the 5 per cent or 1974 flood event.
- the infill of existing sites on the flood plain be allowed using a 5 per cent flood risk as a planning criteria but without increasing the guidelines for building which make infill unachievable for the average South Australian.
- the concept of valley character units be adopted but the size of the recreational and tourist units be reduced to smaller compact groups and the number increased to spread the regular recreational users along the valley and lower the impact on the river.
- the boating regulations be better enforced with more inspectors and any zoning of the river to be developed with the local community who use the area considered for zoning.
- better management of the casual visitor particularly in the use of the environment of the river.
- the linear park concept be reviewed taking into account the needs of the various users including the land based users of the river.

The submission then backs up the proposal that it be taken on board by the Government and states that its proposed plan should be adopted.

About three or four weeks ago the member for Coles, the member for Light and I visited each council in the Murray Valley to discuss with them the Government's plan and their response to it. As we went down the river and moved into the council areas with most of the shacks it became apparent that they were totally opposed to the restrictive nature of the document. In fact, councils in the lower reaches unanimously supported the 1974 criterion or, as was referred to previously, the 5 per cent flood risk. Also, infill was an important part of their submission.

Many shack areas along the river have vacant blocks, but the Government has denied their owners the opportunity to build on them. At this stage I believe that the Government should allow infill, particularly in the form of transportable buildings, and if certain parts of the life tenure problems are not resolved the transportables can be picked up and moved to another area. At present the Government refuses to allow any significant upgrading of life tenure shacks in South Australia. This results in the standard and quality of many shacks rapidly deteriorating, and this is not in the interest of the State. I believe that there should be the opportunity to upgrade in this form, particularly in relation to bringing in transportable buildings. The concept of having transportable buildings below the 1956 flood level is a practical approach because, in the event of a higher river, those buildings can be taken to higher ground.

The Murray is not a river subject to flash flooding. One has two or three months warning of what will occur, so obviously there is no risk to life and limb. However, the Government argues that one of the reasons for denying development on the Murray River flood plain is its concern about the risk to life in the event of a flood coming up quickly. If one cannot move off the flood plain in two or three months, one will have a great deal of difficulty surviving anywhere. When compared to bushfire risks in other parts of South Australia this is totally inconsistent with the Government's approach to safety. People are allowed to rebuild in bushfire prone areas and it is regarded that they do so at their own risk. I believe that exactly the same should apply in relation to the Murray River. We have one major concern above all else: that developments do not increase the pollution of the water. In fact, I believe that with further development pollution can be reduced.

In many of the shack areas, if it is deemed that some of the areas are contributing to the pollution of the river and it can be proved, I have no doubt that, with the engineering ability and technology that is about today, simple effluent disposal schemes can be put into effect and the effluent diverted away and used on wood lots for further reafforestation of the flood plains back from the water's edge.

So, there is a lot in the draft management plan that has been put forward by the Government that is not acceptable to the people who live in the Murray Valley or to the local government bodies along the Murray River in this State. I wanted to discuss the subject of the Chowilla area of South Australia, another saline pollution area, which largely has been brought on by the construction of Lock 6 and the building of the Lake Victoria water storage, which has built up a ground water movement into that area, and the preferred option that the Government has adopted. The preferred option is not on as far as I am concerned and as far as most of the people in the Murray Valley are concerned. However, there is an option; it is slightly more expensive but it will protect the environment, the ecology of the area, and at the same time significantly reduce the salinity. Unfortunately, that is a subject that I will have to address at a later date as my time on this occasion has expired.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the Address in Reply. I acknowledge the continuing active and constructive role of Sir Donald Dunstan as Governor and the support given to him by Lady Dunstan. I extend my sympathy to the family of the late Sir Douglas Nicholls. He was a true champion of his people and he remains a model for us all. I also extend my sympathy to the family of the late Arnold Noack, former Head Attendant of the House of Assembly. Arnold was a loyal servant of the House, a patient, kind and efficient man. I wish his successor, Ray Blain, well. I congratulate the members for Florey, Mawson and Todd on their recent election to the Ministry. I note the Government's program, in particular its legislative program, and I trust that the session will be productive.

I want to discuss some of the issues of constitutional reform which tend to have been given a much lower priority over the past few years. I speak in the context of the Federal referendum on four-year terms, recognition of local government, fair elections, and civil rights. Before doing so, I want to refer to a more basic issue in the State arena, and that is the two-House system. This system came about as a consequence of the resistance of privileged sections of colonial society to the nineteenth century voting reforms. We have Upper Houses only because this group was successful in maintaining its resistance to a democratically elected House of Assembly, which is directly elected by and responsible to the voters.

Any other justification for the continued existence of the Upper House is quite simply nonsense. Any suggestions that such Houses can or should be based on different electorates or different voting procedures go from being stubborn to outright dangerous. Any suggestion that by having such a dual system the legislation can be more effectively or appropriately prepared or more accurate simply reflects on the administrative procedure or professional competence

of the House of Assembly or its advisers or staff. It is, of course, equally nonsense. The plain fact is that the Labor Party, in particular, is failing to even attempt to carry out its eminently sensible policy to abolish these highly expensive and unnecessary symbols of conservatism and patronage. We ought to be proceeding to persuade people to our way of thinking and to hold the referendum envisaged by the Constitution.

To my mind, there is a clear distinction, by the way, between the State Upper Houses and the Senate, and it lies in the fact that the Federal Constitution specifically sought to preserve, at least, the capacity of the States to secure direct representation. I realise that all that has been achieved as of recent times is the enabling of minority groups, in particular the Australian Democrats, to have a disproportionate influence, but the basis of justification is completely different. The plain fact is that the Labor Party now, as much as the Liberal Party, dreads the thought of the upheaval that would be caused by the disestablishment of a large number of parliamentary members. I should very quickly say that I do not believe that such a thing should be lightly undertaken, and there should of course be appropriate avenues for compensation.

The task is made harder by the effect that any corresponding change in the House of Assembly members would be fairly marginal and, even then, hard to justify. But even assuming that the House of Assembly was enlarged to, say, 54 seats, from the present 47, there would be considerable temporary dislocation. Well, I am afraid that we have to face up to that and there is no basis on which those problems should be stopping our fundamental responsibilities.

I now turn directly to the referendum questions, and I begin with that involving parliamentary terms. In this State the term is, in effect, between three and four years, and the Commonwealth proposal provides a term of up to four years. Personally, I think it is a disgrace that neither Party is prepared to advocate and demand a fixed four-year term. As for a four-year term without a fixed limit, that must surely, however, be better that the present non-fixed three years. It surely can be only self-interest and weakness that is stopping the parties from grasping the nettle and fixing a four-year term. It would ensure at least a three-year period of relatively stable administration, and, while it is true that political parties and governments might be helpless victims of a sequence of events in the final portion of their office, that will cut both ways over a period of time and I think that that is a relatively low price to pay.

I applaud the Commonwealth Government for introducing the referendum question on fair elections. It is an outrageous state of affairs that in this bicentennial year there are still some State electoral laws which do not reflect the principle of 'one vote one value'. It is true that for purely practical purposes a tolerance of 10 per cent needs to be allowed. In fact, this principle is already provided for by Federal law and by New South Wales, Victorian and South Australian State law. But we still have the outrageous example in the Queensland Legislative Assembly and its extraordinary gerrymander, and to a lesser extent there are significant disparities in the Western Australian Legislative Assembly and in the Legislative Councils of Western Australia and Tasmania.

It is true that this is direct interference in the State electoral process, but by now the States in question have had more than a reasonable time to establish these basic civil liberties. We will not deserve any credence at all as a nation, and in particular in this region, when we call for democratic procedures but do not establish them ourselves. I also support the questions on recognition of local government and basic civil liberties.

I want now briefly to discuss the issue of home ownership and State housing provided through the Housing Trust. Over the past 50 years the combined effect of readily available private housing finance and public expenditure on Housing Trust rental stock has been such as to enable a very large percentage of people to own their own homes and still provide extensive public housing at modest rates. The end result has been an enormous improvement in social justice. Ordinary people have had a security and comfort never dreamed of in past history, but this is now under threat.

I want briefly to refer to Hugh Stretton's recently published 'Political Essays' where he deals with this cruel paradox that has come into being so far as public housing and the provision of private homes is concerned. At page 115 he states:

> Through the 1980s the cruel paradox persisted. The Fraser Government reduced resources for public housing. The Hawke Government increased them, but not to the real levels provided by the Chifley, Menzies or Whitlam Governments. The Fraser Government changed from cost renting to market renting public housing to charge the tenants more. The Hawke Government changed back to cost renting with a formula which charged them more still. The Fraser Government abolished low-deposit, rental-purchase and subsidised some richer homebuyers. The Hawke Government subsidised different homebuyers but did not restore rental-purchase (though some of the States did, on a small scale). Both Parties contributed to deregulating the financial system. Nominal interest on housing loans rose above 14 per cent, real interest above 6 per cent.
>
> In 1980 the South Australian Housing Trust could build a family house to pay its way and repay its debt at a rent of $70 a week. By 1986 bipartisan Commonwealth policies had turned that into an impossible $170 a week. Meanwhile home ownership levelled off at about 68 per cent. New buyers now needed some capital, or an income in the top 40 per cent or so of incomes, or (commonly) two incomes—Australian workers' children now had the choice of a home or a mum, but not both. There were more pensioners, more unemployed, more single parents, more homeless youth to swell the public housing waiting lists.
>
> By 1986 the South Australian Housing Trust had the longest waiting lists in its history. Where about 7 per cent of its tenants had needed rental rebates in 1970, 70 per cent of new tenants and 60 per cent of all tenants need them now. Outside public housing the larger groups in housing hardship are these: young families with children and only one breadwinner; households whose breadwinners are unemployed; households depending on welfare incomes with no breadwinner; single parents and their children; many of the 20 per cent of aged pensioners who don't own their houses; many Aborigines; some people in outer suburbs short of jobs and services; teenagers away from home, homeless by their own or their parents' wishes; some transient people without jobs; single, old, poor men.

The fact is that we do have a very major problem in the area of supplying housing, both in the private and public areas. Generally, I do not favour public inquiries as a means of developing policies but, in this area of such great complexity and technical difficulties, it is perhaps the only answer. In the era of major difficulties with our financial system in the 1930s, banking royal commissions were established and I believe that in the 1980s the time has come to establish a royal commission of inquiry into our housing situation.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Until yesterday I had every intention of making a rather conventional response to the Governor's address and I am sure that my constituents had every right to expect that. However, having heard the contributions yesterday from the members for Kavel and Mount Gambier, I have changed my mind. After all, I think that the future of the world is rather too important a topic to pass up and I want to spend some time this afternoon on that. Yesterday, the member for Mount Gambier proudly

claimed that he had stood on a fast breeder reactor in France wearing nothing but his galoshes and a plastic mac.

The Hon. H. Allison: It was Scotland.

Mr ROBERTSON: I beg your pardon, Scotland—and he made the claim that there was nothing wrong with him. I submit that that event occurred only several weeks ago, so I would welcome his being able to stand up here in two or 20 years time and say the same thing. The great fear is that he would not be able to do so.

In advocating uranium enrichment as 'the safest part of the nuclear fuel cycle' the member for Kavel seems to want to add about 500 megawatts to the South Australian baseload generating capacity and thereby to pump another couple of hundred tonnes of carbon dioxide into South Australian skies every day. If he does not want to do that, quite clearly he wants to use some of the fuel rods produced by that enrichment process to generate electricity by nuclear power, or perhaps, even if he follows the lead of his colleague the member for Mount Gambier, he wants to build a fast breeder reactor in South Australia. If that is the case, I would like him to spell out just where he wants that nuclear facility to be. Where does he want the fast breeder, where does he want the conventional power reactor, and where does he want the enrichment plant?

Yesterday was not a particularly auspicious day to start advocating that South Australia should follow the nuclear path, because it marked the day on which the rest of the world began a formal retreat from nuclear power. Indeed, yesterday was the day on which the first of the decommissioned power reactors in the United States was begun to be demolished. After sitting idle and unused for 14 years and having cost hundreds of millions of dollars, the Americans have begun to dismantle their own nuclear power program.

So, yesterday was not the day to advocate that we go down that path. Only eight or 10 orders remain in the United States for new power reactors, although several hundred are operating. Most of the other orders have been withdrawn, and there have been literally hundreds of cancellations. Mind you, had the Deputy Leader been on his toes yesterday, he would have observed that the gas centrifuge separation method which is now being used is something like 20 times as energy efficient as the gaseous diffusion method previously used, and indeed that the atomic vapour laser isotope separation process promises to lower the cost and increase the efficiency even further.

Nevertheless, I would submit that nuclear power is not the way to go, notwithstanding the several advances to which I have just pointed. I think it is illusory and useful to the House to point out just what the nuclear power program is that we are talking about, and just how big is the world's nuclear power programs. At the end of 1985 there were 374 nuclear reactors connected to electricity supply grids in 26 countries. These nuclear power stations had a generating capacity of 348 000 megawatts and produced 15 per cent of the world's electricity. Very impressive! But we must consider that only 35 per cent of the energy used in the world is actually in the form of electricity and we must also consider that, because of the inefficiencies in the process, nuclear power accounts for only 5 per cent of total energy used. Because of heat loss during power generation, that can be cut back to 2 per cent or 3 per cent to the end users.

So, in fact, we have a situation where this much vaunted nuclear power that was trumpeted loudly from the other side yesterday accounts for less than 3 per cent of the world's energy usage. By comparison, hydro-electric power, the power generation method that rates least in conversations about future power prospects, generates 70 per cent more energy than the nuclear power program on a worldwide basis. It is much more significant. So, we are not talking about the great salvation, the great saviour; we are not talking about the technology that will save the world from the greenhouse effect and the accumulation of carbon dioxide; we are talking about a very minor technology that is quite clearly in absolute retreat at a great rate of knots.

What we need to address is the fact that the 2 per cent to 3 per cent has to be replaced if nuclear power is to be wound back. How do we replace that? And if the problem of carbon dioxide and the greenhouse effect is as great as many would have us believe, how do we replace conventional thermal power? It seems to me that the alternatives lie in two directions. First, they lie in the direction of energy savings. Since 1974 the efficient use of electrical energy by industry has increased quite significantly, so the amount of energy per GDP in the Western world at the moment has actually fallen by 13 per cent since 1974.

Houses are much more energy efficient than they used to be. Houses currently being built in Sweden use only one-quarter of the energy that houses used in 1970. Technologies have changed. The promotion of gas instead of electricity by governments around the world, including our own in South Australia through the Housing Trust I am happy to say, is another factor. Natural gas is three times as efficient as electricity generating low grade domestic heat, and there has been a major swing in those countries that have natural gas to the production of domestic heating from gas.

Technology such as co-generation, which has been amply promoted by the member for Mitchell, the former Minister of Mines and Energy, and the use of surplus heat from high grade operations, has been promoted around the world and has led to part of the increase in efficiency of industry throughout the world. Co-generation is a technology which can be exploited a great deal more. There has been a tendency of late to use even electricity more efficiently. The increased use of reverse cycle air-conditioners and the recent development by Siddons Industries in Melbourne of a reverse cycle water heater which has a thermal efficiency of about 250 per cent will aid in that kind of transition and conservation.

The second major method by which it seems to me we can meet some of the challenges of getting rid of nuclear power safely and scaling down the use of fossil fuels lies in some of the existing and new alternative energy technologies. Fuel cells, which have been around for a number of years, operate at 85 per cent efficiency. They generate electricity at 85 per cent efficiency compared to a persistent 35 per cent on the part of conventional fossil fuel fired power stations with steam turbines.

The good part of this is of course not only that they are almost three times as efficient but that the waste product, if one happens to use a hydrogen powered fuel cell, is good simple water—not carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, but simply water. That is marvellous technology.

United Technologies in the US produces a 40 kilowatt unit and the Japanese have produced a 4.5 megawatt unit fuel cell. Indeed, there are plans by that Japanese company to produce 35 000 megawatts worth of fuel cells by the year 2005. Wind energy has also been around for some time and by the year 2000, the Californians claim, they will have 21 000 megawatts installed. Increased efficiency of such things as the Darrieus rotors and high speed two-blade machines with a wing-tip speed of about seven times the wind speed have improved the efficiency of wind energy machines considerably, to the point where the power coefficient of both the Darrieus generators and—

Members interjecting:

Mr ROBERTSON: We will take that up later, thank you. The Darrieus technology and the two-blade technology now operate at a power coefficient of about 50 per cent. That means that 50 per cent of the available wind energy is being tapped and utilised as electricity. That is far better than conventional thermal power.

Solar ponds are the form of electricity generation pioneered by the Israelis, who have a 5 megawatt power station at present and who plan to build a 20 megawatt power station within the next few years. Indeed, they have sold the technology to the Californians, to the Edison Company, which produced a 14 megawatt station for the Californian grid. They in turn plan to move to a 48 megawatt station in the near future.

Other solar technologies include tracking mirrors and parabolic reflectors are predicted to be producing 200 megawatts of electricity by 1995 worldwide. Again, the Israeli firm of LUZ International in Jerusalem can produce industrial process heat using that technology at 250 degrees Celcius, 10 per cent cheaper than the process heat generated by thermal means, such as the burning of coal.

The technology in respect of photovoltaic cells has been around for a number of years. By 1995, 5 000 megawatts will be connected to the US grid and the Australian company Solarex is able to mass produce cells that are 12 per cent efficient. That is a great improvement on the former technologies and it is going even further. The Joint Microelectronics Research Centre at the University of New South Wales last year produced a cell of 21 per cent efficiency and it is able to mass produce cells with an efficienty of 18 per cent, which is much better than the unit currently produced by Solarex.

The Japanese have introduced the amorphous cell technology used in digital watches, calculators and the like which brings down the cost of electric power considerably, beyond the cost of conventional crystalline silicon cells and that takes the capital cost of making solar cells from $10 000 per kilowatt of installed capacity to $700 per kilowatt.

Even within the field of high quality silicon crystal production, in 1975 the cost of the Czochralski process of producing electricity by photovoltaics in a conventional way was $75 000 per kilowatt hour. Now using technology pioneered by Siemens and Union Carbide, which incidentally involves purification of the quartz by chemical sollution and recrystallisation to remove the impurities, the cost has been brought down from $75 000 per kilowatt hour to about US $1 500 per kilowatt hour at the 1985 rate.

Indeed, the addition of copper into the process to replace silver in the electrodes, and the like, has also been a major part of the economy achieved in the production of photovoltaic cells. This figure of $1 500 per kilowatt hour installed is very close to the ballpark figure for conventional thermal power stations, where the cost given at the moment is something of the order of $1 100 per kilowatt of generated electricity. So, that photovoltaic cost of $1 500 is very close, even as we stand here today, to the cost of thermal power stations.

Another avenue that has been pursued—wave power, using such things as Lancaster bags and Salter ducks—has, I am told, the potential to generate 30 000 megawatts in Britain alone, but the cost of installation of those technologies is rather high. Tidal power, on the other hand, is not futuristic: there are at least 25 sites surveyed worldwide with the potential, I am told, to produce 15 000 megawatts of electricity. Indeed, the La Rance station in Brittany has been producing for over 10 years, and an extensive survey in the last two years of the Severn Barrage in the United Kingdom indicates that that site would be able to produce 7 200 megawatts of power. It seems to me that if that is accurate for the Severn Barrage, given the quite large tidal range there, we might expect that the figure that I quoted earlier of 15 000 megawatts would be an understatement. Indeed, we may be looking at a potential worldwide, on those 25 sites, of more in the order of 150 000 megawatts of installed electricity. In addition, the Bay of Fundy in Newfoundland and the Kimberley Coast of Western Australia have been extensively surveyed for tidal power and hold certain possibilities.

Biomass energy is another technology that has been explored. In China there are 7 million methane digestors and, of course, the Indians, who pioneered the Gobar methane process, have several million digestors of their own. They are small scale but they produce an enormous amount of power because there are so many of them. Ethanol, from sugar cane in Brazil, has given Brazil self-sufficiency in the production of motor fuel. Coconut oil is used in the Philippines for the same thing. Gopher weed in Arizona and water hyacinth in Florida produce ethanol. In Japan, rice has been used to produce hydrogen for fuel cells. Another form of alternative energy—geothermal power—is extensively used in Rotorua, in New Zealand, and Potzuoli in Italy, which is close to Vesuvius. Indeed, at Mulka, on the Birdsville Track, a scheme funded by the South Australian Energy Advisory Council and the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council, pumps water from the Great Artesian Basin a distance of up to 27 kilometres from the bore and, into the bargain, generates power for the Mulka homestead.

Just when the rest of the world has abandoned nuclear power, the Opposition wants to take it up. I am sure that the members for Kavel and Mount Gambier had a lovely time overseas during the past few months, but I am afraid that their reconversion to faith in nuclear power is out of place and out of time. Once again, it seems to me that the Opposition has come at the wrong time: they are all dressed up but they have nowhere to go.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I refer to the South Australian community ship, the sail training vessel, *One and All.* The original dream and concept of this vessel came from Dr John Young, who founded the Jubilee Sailing Ship Project Incorporated in 1980. The decision was made by the committee of this body to build a sailing ship to be given to the people of South Australia as a 1986 Jubilee Year birthday gift. The committee was set up with Sir James Hardy Kt, OBE, as its President, to make Dr Young's dream become a reality. A great deal of research preceded the preparation of a brief for the designer of the *One and All*, Kell Steinman.

The committee studied at great length modern sail training ships built in other countries from both steel and timber. The decision was made to build with timber, and the ship is almost completely built of Australian timber, the only foreign timber in the vessel being used in the top mast and spars, which are made from Canadian sitka spruce. The keel assembly is made from massive pieces of straight grained

New South Wales iron bark and Tasmanian blue gum. The ribs are made from laminated Western Australian karri and the 65 millimetre thick hull planking consists of three types of timber.

The bottom planks are jarrah, the planks to the water line are Tasmanian celery top pine, and the top sides are made from Tasmanian huon pine. The keel was laid on 31 October 1982 at North Haven by Sir James Hardy and, although as we all know financial problems plagued the project over the following years, she was finally completed, commissioned and sent on her maiden voyage by the Premier on 5 April 1987 from No. 1 dock Port Adelaide. A massive crowd of 10 000 people attended this function, which was a rousing success. Captain Colin Kesteven was given the responsibility of command of the vessel, not only for her maiden voyage but to Tenerife in the Canary Islands and around the world with the First Fleet Re-enactment vessels. The building of the *One and All* has provided employment and skill training for hundreds of people of all ages, and in this respect the contribution of the project has been of enormous significance to the State.

In addition, it has ensured the survival of certain trade skills which should not be allowed to be lost. Shipwrights came out of retirement to work on the ship and to train young people in shipbuilding skills. Volunteers, office workers and fundraisers gave of their time to assist. These were the people who cared; they cared about the young people of South Australia. Nowhere in the world has a community group built a purpose designed sail training ship such as the *One and All.* Once again South Australia leads the world, as it has done in so many cases in so many different areas in the past.

I will now speak briefly about the future use of the *One and All* as a sail training vessel. The future of the ship will be in the hands of the Executive Director of the *One and All* Training Ship Association of South Australia, Mr John Anderson. Mr Anderson is an excellent person, very experienced in sail training and yacht racing and is tailor made for the position. He has outlined to me the concept, the main thrust and the aims of the sail training venture and how it will be run here in South Australia.

Because an article written by John Anderson for the *One and All* official magazine, *Tall Ship*, explains and captures the concept and aims of the sail training venture here in South Australia so much better than I could describe it, I will quote directly from parts of his excellent article. It states:

> Most people find it hard to believe the objective of sail training is personal development, not teaching people to sail. They find it even harder to believe it is necessary to spend some $2 million to $3 million to build an 'old' sailing ship to make the process work well . . .
>
> I must ask the reader to believe me when I say:
>
> Sail training does work.
>
> It works best with an 'old' sailing ship, and in time South Australians will recognise the topsail schooner *One and All* as a valuable community asset.
>
> A *One and All* sail training voyage will start with the formation of a trainee complement of young people which reflects a full social spectrum; males and females, students and workers, capitalists and unionists, immigrants and native Australians, whatever their colour. Ideally they will be strangers to each other. The Master will welcome them on board and present them with a challenge, to sail *One and All* across 750-1 000 nautical miles of ocean.
>
> Ten days later the trainees will step ashore having met the challenge and sailed the required number of miles. Some will have become competent seamen. Others will not wish to repeat the experience. But they all will have changed.
>
> They will have more confidence; a healthier respect for themselves. They will have greater sensitivity; more understanding of others and increased awareness of the environment, and a willingness to accept responsibility for their role within a community. They will have matured and developed more positive attitudes.
>
> People will say: 'What a load of idealistic garbage. How can a voyage on a sailing ship have this miracle effect on young people? How can all these wonderful things be achieved in just 10 days?'
>
> The truth is it does happen. The proof is the development of civilian sail training programs throughout the world since the 1950s. Hundreds of thousands of young people have benefited from the sail training experience. And the success of programs in Europe, North America and New Zealand has prompted others to follow.
>
> Civilian sail training grew out of the Outward Bound movement. It shares three key elements with other forms of adventure training:
>
> - Adventure—the catalyst which attracts trainees
> - Challenge—the stimulant, and
> - Risk—the element which extends the trainee.
>
> It is also a 'real' situation, dealing with 'real' challenges. It is not a contrived classroom exercise.
>
> I believe one feature makes sail training unique: one cannot walk away from a problem at sea.
>
> The trainees find themselves in an unfamiliar environment, with an unfamiliar group of people. They face obvious challenges like climbing into the rigging and steering the ship. There are also less obvious challenges like adapting to life in an isolated community. When presented with a problem they don't like, they can't escape it. There is nowhere to go.
>
> Then there is the sea, a challenge in itself. Trainees quickly learn they must adapt their lifestyle to cope with the sea. They must always be alert to the forces of nature and prepare themselves and the ship to cope with the eventualities. Whatever the situation they must be ready to take action whenever the sea dictates action. A mariner's life is an exercise in self-discipline.
>
> By a combination of instruction by the crew and peer group pressure the trainee complement sorts itself into a close knit team. The trainees become inter-dependent. They become dependent on others and dependable to others. The question is often asked, 'Why go to the trouble and expense of building a sailing ship? Why not go sail training in yachts?' Many sail training programs are conducted in yachts, but experience shows square-riggers offer significant advantages.
>
> Sailing ships have more complex rigs than yachts. They hold the interest of the non-nautical trainee longer. The rigs demand team work, but, at the same time, only simple, basic skills are required to work them. The most important factor is the size of the ship. Square riggers provide a safer working platform and allow for a greater number of trainees to perform a greater number of tasks.

Sail training is all about self-discipline, self-discovery, self-confidence, character building and gaining a real sense of responsibility. South Australian waters are ideal for sail training as there are the relatively sheltered gulf waters and the challenging Great Australian Bight. There are many sheltered areas along the South Australian coast where refuge can be sought during very rough weather. The State's transport infrastructure is based on the gulf ports. It is therefore relatively easy for trainees to make their way to and from the ship.

Another very pleasing aspect of this ongoing sail training program in South Australia is that all young South Australians will benefit, not just the privileged and the rich. Earlier this year, it was my privilege to see the Australia Day celebrations in Sydney Harbor. I was very proud and very pleased to see the *One And All* take part in the sail past. Although not the largest ship by any means, it was certainly the most beautiful. As a South Australian, I was very proud. I also pay tribute to those who contributed to such a beautiful vessel.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the House, and particularly the Government and the Premier, the extremely difficult plight that is facing the ratepayers of the Stirling council. Members would be aware that a considerable amount of media coverage has been given to this problem in the Stirling District Council area. The problem is two-fold. The first part relates to the massive rate increase of some 23 to 25 per cent for this year.

As a ratepayer of the Stirling District Council I share the concern that has been expressed, and I am very much aware of the anger in the community about the rate increase. As all members of the House recognise, the setting of the rate is the direct responsibility of the council and the State Government is not able to interfere in that decision.

The increase came about particularly because of legal costs for a case that is currently before the courts, and that matter is *sub judice* and cannot be discussed. A public meeting held last Monday night was attended by 1 000 to 1 500 Stirling ratepayers. It was difficult to estimate the exact number of people there, but it was a massive crowd. It was the largest public meeting that I have ever attended.

Mr Tyler: Were you there?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I was there, and I was invited to be there. That meeting made me aware of the anger in this particular council area. I point out that the Minister of Local Government was also invited: she was not present but had a spokesman representing her. The main reason for the increase in the rate was put down to the legal costs associated with the test case that is currently before the courts. The second part of the problem relates to uncertainties about the future. No-one knows what the outcome of the case will be, but we are advised that whatever the outcome there will be an appeal. We recognise that that could go on for a long time and there is no doubt that that will be an extremely expensive process.

We have been informed—and members will know this if they peruse the Local Government Act—that if the council reaches a stage where it is not able to pay back its debts, even as a result of selling its assets, the responsibility falls on ratepayers. That is why there is considerable concern about the future.

Earlier this week I visited the Minister of Local Government and was pleased with the frank discussion we had where I was able to point out my concern. However, I was particularly disappointed with the reaction of the Minister through the media where it was made perfectly clear that the Government is backing away from the plight of Stirling ratepayers. I see that as being grossly irresponsible. It is inconceivable that the Bannon Government is ignoring the Stirling council ratepayers who now face massive financial problems resulting from the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfire. It is high time that Premier Bannon made a firm commitment to the Stirling ratepayers who face this problem through no fault of their own. I am a ratepayer who moved into the district only some three years ago, while the major problem presently before the court was experienced some eight years ago (when the earlier decisions were made). Stirling ratepayers are in an impossible situation and the Bannon Government must accept some responsibility and act swiftly. It is not a time for the Minister of Local Government to be carrying on about the question of local government independence.

If she wants to make a point about that issue, she is at liberty to do it and she can do so at some other time. However, the present situation within the Stirling council area is far too serious to be concentrating just on that side of it. The Stirling council area is far too often seen to be an affluent area. However, I point out that vast numbers of people will face extreme difficulty in attempting to pay the enormously inflated council rates. These ratepayers also face the threat, as I said earlier, of further exorbitant costs at a later stage when we know the outcome of the litigation and the compensation costs.

If every Stirling ratepayer is forced to pay massive legal costs plus compensation on behalf of the council, the ramifications, I suggest, would be catastrophic. In the worst circumstances, if the Stirling council is forced to sell its assets, the district will be left with an ineffectual council unable to carry out any of its most basic duties. Unless the Government is prepared to accept responsibility in these very unusual circumstances, people living in the Stirling council area will be forced to face undue hardship as a result of increased council rates and decreased property values.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that the problems facing the Stirling ratepayers are quite considerable. Many of the problems are unknown at this stage because of the huge question mark hanging over all of the people who reside within that area. Of course, it is the hope of the ratepayers generally that the council will be successful. However, there is the other side of the argument and that is the matter of compensation for the fire victims of 1980. The council and the ratepayers of the Stirling district are facing an incredible problem.

However, I would suggest that, unless the Government is prepared to accept responsibility in these very unusual circumstances, people living in the Stirling council area will be forced to face undue hardship. As I said earlier, the problem of the decrease in property values is just one of the problems being foreshadowed at this stage. When the Bannon Government has run into financial difficulties—and that has been the case on a number of occasions—it has looked to the Federal Government for assistance. How many times have we referred to that fact in this Parliament?

Therefore, the question needs to be asked: why then is it unacceptable for the Minister of Local Government to suggest that it is inappropriate for a council to seek assistance from the State in what are extremely difficult and previously unheard of circumstances? I would suggest that the problem being faced in Stirling is very severe, and I implore the Premier to look at the matter very seriously. There will be considerable representation made to him, and I ask that he give it his urgent attention for the sake of all of the people who live in that council area.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): It is interesting that the honourable member has been talking about local government. I will take a slightly different tack because local government is the form of government closest to the people and a 'Yes' at the referendum in September will guarantee that local government remains a vital part of the Australian federal system.

A 'Yes' vote will ensure that the Constitution recognises that our federal system has three tiers of government working in partnership. Only recognition in the Constitution guarantees local government's role. The States of Victoria, Western Australia, South Australia and New South Wales have each amended their Constitution, in differing forms, to recognise local government. Queensland and Tasmania are the only two States that do not recognise local government in their Constitution.

In Australia, currently in excess of 830 local government bodies have more than 8 400 elected members and employ approximately 144 000 people or 9 per cent of civilian public sector employment. They account for approximately 5.3 per cent of all public sector outlays and 4 per cent of total taxation revenue.

It is quite scandalous, really, that local government has not been acknowledged federally before now because it was not as if local government did not exist when the Constitution was framed in 1901. The first elected Government in Australia was in fact the Adelaide City Council right here in South Australia and that was in the 1840s.

Interestingly enough, councils were sufficiently well organised in South Australia to have already formed the Local Government Association in 1896. At that time local councils would have had, I suppose, few functions beyond building and maintaining of roads and the collection of rubbish. So, in fairness, local government would not have featured prominently in the minds of the framers of our Constitution back in the 1890s considering that they at that time were preoccupied with protecting States rights in the new federation of Australia. So it is unlikely that in 1901 anyone could have foreseen the growth that has occurred in local government.

As I said earlier, there are now more than 830 councils working to provide a range of services to local communities. During the last financial year these councils spent more than $6.5 billion and were responsible for physical infrastructure worth in excess of $40 billion.

This referendum question does not give extra powers to Canberra at the expense of State powers, as has been argued by some members of the Federal Opposition. Privately, the network in the State Liberal Party has been saying the same sorts of things. On the contrary, it will actually strengthen the system of decentralised community based government. How and where local government operates can still be decided by State Parliament. A 'yes' vote at the referendum will not mean the establishment of a network of regional governments across Australia. The terms of the referendum proposal put any prospect of a Commonwealth imposed system of regionalism for Local Government out of the question. The role of the States has been specifically spelled out.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I would ask the member for Mitcham to just hold his tongue for a few minutes. I am going to get to what members of his party have said about local government. A 'yes' vote will not affect financial matters such as grants, loans, Government revenue and borrowings. These questions are for resolution at the political level and not in the Constitution. Mr Speaker, you will recall that in the last session the State Parliament clearly defined those matters of finance and we gave councils greater flexibility to be able to manage their financial arrangements. The Federal Opposition's stated the reason for not supporting the constitutional recognition of local government is that it is tokenism. Local government itself does not see it as tokenism, and has been actively campaigning for years to have this amendment to our Constitution.

It is quite interesting that in a letter to the *Advertiser* on Thursday, 14 July this year, Councillor Kenneth Price, President of the Local Government Association, pointed out that Mr Howard in his address at the opening of the Local Government Centre on 26 February 1987 said:

> The coalition Opposition supports and will continue to strive for constitutional recognition for local government at the earliest opportunity.

Obviously Mr Howard does not think that the referendum is the earliest opportunity. I just wonder where he is. Councillor Price also noted—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I would ask the member for Mitcham to wait a minute while I get to his mate Ian Sinclair. What did the Leader of the National Party, Ian Sinclair, state? Councillor Price also pointed out in his letter to the *Advertiser*, that Ian Sinclair stated in 1986:

> In principle I support constitutional recognition for local government. This depends on a successful referendum.

Councillor Price concluded his letter by saying:

> Many loyal Liberal Party supporters, like local government through Australia, were led to believe that past statements were a true reflection on the Liberal Party's stance on this issue. But we were not to account for the blatant opportunism of a political Party that saw its chance better served by coming out with a uniform 'No' campaign for all four proposals. Now local government is forced to endure a series of misleading statements while the Federal Opposition tries to justify its position. We can call this politics or, as did the *Advertiser's* editorial, 'sheer opportunism'.

Speaking of opportunism, the master of the art is the Opposition in this State, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition. I had the pleasure of representing the Minister of Local Government at the inaugural meeting of the new District Council of Crystal Brook-Redhill a few weeks ago. At that meeting, very publicly the Vice-President of the Local Government Association asked the Leader of the Opposition several questions relating to constitutional recognition of local government. He asked the Leader of the Opposition to stand up alongside the prominent Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the Liberal Leader in Queensland, and even the Liberal Leader in Victoria.

These people have come out publicly supporting constitutional recognition of local government at the September referendum. In relation to the Opposition Leader in this State, I decided to go back and have a look at a bit of the history of this matter and to see what the Leader of the Opposition had to say, particularly at the time when the Hon. Murray Hill introduced the Bill to grant local government recognition in the State Constitution. I shall quote comments made by Mr Olsen, the then member for Rocky River.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: This relates to the present Leader of the Opposition. Members opposite are trying to howl me down. However, the now Leader of the Opposition said:

> I support the Bill. I support the principle that local government ought to receive encouragement and ought to be fostered by the other two tiers of government, State Government and Federal Government. It is pleasing to note that the Federal Government has taken some initiatives in this area.

A little later on, when he was talking about the tax sharing arrangements, and after replying to an interjection by Mr Russack, he said:

> Yes, it is the acknowledgment of a promise; it is a promise that has been honoured by the Federal Government in terms of giving contributions to local government and a basis by which it can participate at a greater level in the affairs of this nation. To establish it, rather than as the poor partner in government, as a partner of some significance, an equal partner, ought to be the desire in the long term.

A little further on Mr Olsen said:

> I believe that both State and Federal Governments have taken some initiatives to involve local government in a more meaningful way for the future. I believe that it is but only a start and that in many other areas it certainly can be included. Hopefully, this will be a start.

The present Leader of the Opposition made those remarks in 1980 in support of local government recognition in our State Constitution. I know that the member for Mitcham is out there stirring up local government, as is his counterpart in the southern suburbs, the Federal member for Mayo. They do not support local government. I can assure members opposite, as I can assure the Local Government Association, that on referendum day, 3 September, I will be out there handing out how-to-vote cards supporting local government, as I am sure will most of my colleagues on this side. The attitude of the Leader of the Opposition as indicated on radio this morning that it is purely a State matter is absolute nonsense.

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

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Mitcham study closely some alterations that were recently made to the Standing Orders regarding the events that might transpire in the course of the adjournment debate.

Motion carried.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 11 August at 11 a.m.