HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 24 August 1989

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN COMMISSION

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to publicly guarantee its share of the estimated $1 000 million required by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to rehabilitate the basin within the next 10 years.

The purpose of this motion is to obtain a commitment from the Bannon Government that it will support the Liberal Party's financial program which will provide the necessary funding for the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin over the next 10 years. There is no argument that the Murray-Darling Basin is Australia's greatest environmental issue today. When one considers that the resource has been claimed by successive Federal Governments to be worth about $10 million annually to the nation's economy, then it is very easy to establish that this resource is of incredible value to the nation and it must be protected at all costs.

However, the condition of this resource has deteriorated to such an extent that it is a national disgrace. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission knows what has to be done, but it is frustrated by inadequate funding and lack of long-term financial commitment. The new Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the ministerial council have been established. Further, the new agreement relating to the Murray-Darling Basin as as whole has been set in place. The only remaining problem is the inadequacy of the funding available to the ministerial council and the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to get on with the job. It has been conservatively estimated that $100 million will be needed annually over the next 10 years in order to rectify the problems of salinity, both man-made and naturally occurring. In order to fund a $100 million program we believe that it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide $70 million annually and the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, $10 million each annually, making a total of $100 million annually and a $1 billion commitment over the next 10 years.

The problems of the Murray-Darling Basin can and must be rectified. The problems can be resolved in the following broad terms: first, on-farm improved irrigation practices, and that includes overhead sprinklers, low throw sprinklers, micro jet sprinklers, drip irrigation and, where soil types permit, dead level irrigation. The degradation of the Murray-Darling Basin must be attacked at its source. One of the greatest problems at the source is inefficient irrigation. It is necessary to upgrade the irrigation distribution systems, in other words, engineering works have to be undertaken, such as the rehabilitation of irrigation distribution systems and groundwater interception schemes.

This can be done by pipelines in place of channels, where appropriate. Water on demand will enable efficient on-farm improved irrigation practices to be implemented. As I suggested, one of the major problems is the inefficient irrigation on farm, but one cannot have an effective and efficient irrigation on farm unless one has modern irrigation distribution systems in place which provide water to the farmer virtually on demand. Following the commitment of improved irrigation practices on farm and the rehabilitation of irrigation distribution systems, reafforestation of the Murray-Darling Basin must be put in place.

That must be done both on and off farm to combat high water table salinity and dry land salination. When the essential works to which I have referred have been put in place and are effective, in other words, when improved irrigation practices on farm are having their effect in reducing the groundwater tables and improved irrigation distribution systems are cutting down on the wastage and seepage from those distributions, then we reach the point where, following reafforestation, what is left and what cannot be handled in any other way, that remaining saline effluent should be transported to the sea by way of a major pipeline system.

That has been proposed in recent days and a consultancy has been let to engineering consultants to determine the feasibility of carrying out such an engineering undertaking whereby the residual salinity can be dealt with. I refer to it as residual salinity because, if we are to try to transport the total saline effluent going back into the river system, the pipeline will have to be enormous and the ongoing cost of pumping would be totally prohibitive. If we carry out the program that the Liberal Party suggests, we will reduce the amount that will ultimately have to be transported to the sea by 60 per cent or 70 per cent, and that would make the plan a good proposition.

The Draft Salinity and Drainage Strategy paper clearly sets out much of the work to be undertaken, but I would suggest that the capital costings for the listed interception schemes are significantly understated for works that will be environmentally acceptable. For example, in the Woolpunda scheme now under construction, under table 4 in the strategy the estimated cost of the scheme is $10.9 million, but the present estimated cost is $22.9 million. Therefore that strategy is much understated in costs in respect of the program's implementation, but the strategy should be adopted as a basic minimum program for the immediate implementation and should not be considered as a maximum over the 10 years. Other interception works not listed and requiring urgent attention are: Lock 4 to Kingston-on-Murray, Pike River/Mundie Creek; south-west corner of Lake Bonney; Ral Ral Creek from Calperum to Jane Eliza; Salt Creek from Ral Ral Creek to the Murray; Cobdogla Flats. Over the border there is a developing problem along the lower Lindsay Creek, and a probable future need for interception right back to Marbein. North of the river a similar situation exists from Chowilla to Tareena upstream past Lake Victoria to Wentworth. Further upstream, Nangiloc has no community disposal scheme, and there is a serious deterioration of the flood plain. Interception and diversion are urgently needed in this particular area.

For many of these situations a method other than tube wells or well points is needed for rapid and cheap installation over the very long distances involved. Deep 5 metre agricultural-type plastic drains with pumped disposal, as proposed by J.V. Seekamp, need to be researched, and further funding is required. Also needed is salinity reduction in Lake Bonney and Lake Albert. In the Mallee zone, from Swan Hill to Meningie, private irrigation areas have virtually no disposal available for drainage effluent. Further upstream, in the Torrumbarry irrigation area, drainage installation is limited, or inhibited, by the lack of disposal capacity, and many millions of dollars need to be spent there to facilitate on-farm collection and off-farm disposal. There is an urgent need over the whole area to export salt. A similar situation exists in the Goulburn/Murray irrigation area.

Further north, the Murrumbidgee irrigation area, north of the Murrumbidgee, is coping with its immediate disposal needs, but little consideration is being given to the major problem developing south of the river in the Coleambally

irrigation area. This situation is repeating itself in other New South Wales areas north of the Murray and south of the Murrumbidgee. At this stage, disposal to the sea has become urgent. The salt balance for the whole of the Murray-Darling Basin continues to be extremely unfavourable. While the river conveys 1 million to 1.5 million tonnes of salt to the sea each year, more than 2 million tonnes falls with rain over the whole basin. Added to this, thousands of millions of tonnes of residual salt is stored underground, which can never be feasibly transported to the sea. Maximum use must be made of land management and tree planting to stabilise the historically dormant residual salt load.

In most discussions on basin salinity there is usually no mention of the related problems of turbidity. The tonnes of suspended matter carried by the river is about double that of the dissolved solids. Turbidity is the result of upstream erosion and land degradation, and constitutes a problem comparable to or even larger than that of salinity.

Reafforestation of the Murray-Darling Basin, to combat high watertable salinity and dry land salinisation, can be achieved on-farm with the provision of financial incentives and seedlings of proven species. Off-farm, consideration should be given to utilising the potential work force that is available—with those people currently receiving unemployment benefits. This action would be consistent with the stated Liberal Party policy in this regard. I suspect, too, that the people involved in such work, which would be meaningful work, contributing to the overall benefit of Australia and which would enable these people to learn a skill and a trade, would gain enormous benefit from it.

I refer to the United States experience with the almost insurmountable salinity problems of the Colorado River, which has demonstrated beyond doubt that the States have neither the financial capacity nor, in many instances, the will to resolve these problems. This is why the Liberal Party has come to the conclusion that it is necessary for the Federal Government to contribute the major proportion of the funding needed for work on the Murray-Darling Basin, principally $70 million annually, with the three States making up the remaining $30 million. It is conservatively estimated that a $1 billion program over the next 10 years will be required in order to come to grips with the salinity problem and the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin. I urge the Government to support this motion and to indicate to the public of South Australia that it will provide (if still in Government) its share of the $1 000 million required under the program to undertake the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY CHANGES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of the House, before any changes to local government boundaries recommended by the Local Government Advisory Commission are considered by the Government, the reports on such should be open to public comment for a minimum period of two months and in the event of conflict a democratic poll of electors of each affected area should be conducted by the Government and if the proposal is rejected by any one group of electors, it should not proceed.

The reason for this motion is obvious. It is but one of a number of initiatives taken by the Liberal Opposition as a result of the debacle surrounding the proposed changes to the Mitcham boundaries and the proclamation that resulted therefrom. I will address this matter very briefly, in order to allow other private members business to proceed today, but I want to talk about the principles involved in achieving boundary changes to local government areas which are in keeping with the changes that should take place.

One of our great concerns with the legislation since the 1984 amendments is that there has been no right of appeal. The judgment of the Government has been that the five members appointed to the Local Government Advisory Commission somehow have the talents and expertise to make decisions in the best interests of other people, but there is no right of appeal if that body gets it wrong. Later I will detail the deficiencies contained within the commission's report.

I believe that anyone outside the system, who did not have a vested interest in the Mitcham debate, would conclude that the commission was totally inept in the way in which it drew its conclusions. The information in the report shows quite clearly that no change should have taken place or been recommended. However, after reading through some fairly indifferent material, we find at the end of the report the recommendation for the dividing of Mitcham. Since that report was produced and since the proclamation was made by the Governor, we have seen the anxieties expressed by the residents of Mitcham; we have seen three rallies by the citizens of Mitcham, clearly demonstrating to the Government and to the State at large that the changes as proposed are not on. I would like to address one very important principle in the short time I have this morning, that is, the role of a politically appointed commission to make decisions against which there is no appeal.

Mr S.G. Evans: It's disgraceful!

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is absolutely disgraceful, as my colleague the member for Davenport suggests. I recommend that people read through the honourable member's contribution of last week, because it demonstrates the absolute inadequacies of the system and some of the twisting and turnings of this Government—and there is more to come. I will talk about why five people who are appointed by the Government should make decisions on behalf of other people. It is interesting to note in this Mitcham situation that the five people somehow diminished to three people, and this decision was made by three people.

People do not need to be reminded that the three people were Mr McElhinney, the Chairman; Mr Dunnery, the AWU representative; and, of course, Mr Taylor, the local government nominee. As soon as we have a smaller group, a significant potential for bias creeps into the situation. I will address the question of bias, because I believe that the result in Mitcham was predetermined prior to the results being known. I say that for a very good reason. I will not cast reflections on the composition of the commission, but I will talk about one particular member of that commission—Mr Dunnery.

The AWU representative has a very interesting history; everybody in the AWU knows that Mr Dunnery has been out of sorts with his members at the Mitcham council depot for some considerable time. I have some correspondence which is very interesting, and I will give an example of the problems that Mr Dunnery has experienced with some of his members at the Mitcham depot. A resolution that was passed on 30 August 1984 states:

That this meeting of the Australian Workers' Union members employed at the Mitcham council works depot, express our complete confidence in the integrity of our union rep., Brian Dermody. We reject and condemn as shabby mischievous electioneering the completely untrue accusation made by branch President John Dunnery at the Trades Hall, on Friday 24 August, 1984 that Rep. Brian Dermody had 'scabbed' during one of our industrial stoppages some years ago. We call on branch Secretary Allan Begg and the branch executive to instruct branch President

John Dunnery to make an unequivocal withdrawal of his imputation against representative—

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to the relevance of the material that the member for Mitcham is raising. It concerns an internal AWU matter and has nothing to do with the formation of the City of Flinders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to give the Chair a chance to consult the original motion. The honourable member for Mitcham does seem to be canvassing matters at large. It would be appreciated if he would link his remarks to the actual motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will certainly link them to the resolution, as I thought I had. The member for Fisher has been remarkably silent on this whole issue. In fact, nobody can find him when they want a statement. It is importnt to understand that if three people from a commission of five are to make a decision, and if one person has demonstrated bias in the past towards a particular body, namely the Mitcham council, then indeed we have the potential for the result that actually occurred in Mitcham. For example, we know that there is a large number of people out in council depots who are unhappy with Mr Dunnery. There can be no justice in the system if a person has a particular interest in that matter. The importance of an independent authority is that it has to be 'hands off', completely divorced and independent from the body it is studying—in this case, the Mitcham council. I will cite a little more, and this comes from the AWU Rank and File Committee, part of it being reflected by the AWU membership within council areas. It states:

Once again the South Australian branch of the union finds itself involved in legal action in the Federal Court. John Dunnery has made charges against Neville Thompson the branch President and others which had been considered by Justice Northrop in arriving at his decision last year. Dunnery accepted Justice Northrop's decision at the time, as is evident from this extract from a circular issued by Dunnery and posted out to union representatives and members, dated 6 February 1989, as follows . . .

And I will not read the item referred to. The document continues:

There will now be the normal ballot for all positions this year and Dunnery, along with all officials must face the membership. No-one has a divine right to any position in the union and members could well decide to weed out unsuitable officials. Here are some examples of Dunnery's actions since being an official.

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, again the member for Mitcham has entered into debate on Mr Dunnery and matters affecting the AWU.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TYLER: It has nothing to do with notice of motion No. 2—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TYLER: —which refers specifically to reports of the Local Government Advisory Commission being made open to public comment for a minimum period of two months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It has everything to do with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members that they should use parliamentary privilege very judicially in referring to members of the public. The honourable member for Mitcham initially linked his remarks to his resolution in making comments about a particular member of the Local Government Advisory Commission. Nevertheless, he is starting to deviate from merely discussing matters that are closely related to his resolution and is spending a great deal of time on one particular aspect, perhaps at the expense of other matters that he may wish to raise before the House. I ask him to ensure that he links his remarks to his motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I presumed that I had, Mr Speaker, but I will make it quite clear so that everybody understands. I have proposed a mechanism whereby people can achieve some form of democracy and can have a right, a say—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The motion has come forward because I believe that bias has come into the findings of the Local Government Advisory Commission. It is important to understand some of the background, to know why the results actually happened. Some of the people of Mitcham are those who support this motion, and Mr Dunnery knows it. The document continues:

Here are some examples of Mr Dunnery's actions since becoming an official: first act on appointment as a temporary organiser was to want the branch executive to pay out an $8 000 mortgage on his house.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Mitcham has used the motion to carry out a vicious attack on a member of the public—not as a member of the advisory commission but as a member of the general public—and his role within the trade union movement.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The document also states:

In 1980 'ratted' on Allan Begg and Bob Mack after pledging support for the Allan Begg ticket in that ballot.

Ms GAYLER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule that the matters being raised by the member for Mitcham are entirely irrelevant to the Mitcham council boundaries issue and the Local Government Advisory Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are times when the honourable member for Mitcham does not seem to be addressing the motion before the House but rather is addressing a motion which is a personal attack on a member of the public. However, if he is able to link his remarks to his motion, he may continue.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In this material I am seriously questioning, first, whether Mr Dunnery should have been in that small select group of three and, secondly, whether he should have been part of the Local Government Advisory Commission. The document continues:

In 1982 played a leading role in 'ratting' on a ticket he had pledged to support and which led to the defeat of Jim Doyle in that ballot.

Everyone knows where Jim Doyle stands on Mitcham.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Government members are taking points of order for the very clear reason that the member for Mitcham is using this motion as an attack on a private individual. The member for Mitcham is now relating to the House allegations—they are only hearsay—about what took place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has ruled on this particular matter. The honourable member for Stuart will resume his seat. Parliamentary privilege creates the opportunity for members to make quite unfortunate remarks about members of the public, who are not given parliamentary privilege in order to respond to those allegations. It is a privilege that should always be used very judiciously. However, the Chair cannot intervene to prevent members using that parliamentary privilege. Members must accept the consequences, whatever they may be, of the application of speaking under parliamentary privilege. Provided that the honourable member is able to link his remarks to his motion, he can continue.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, your ruling allows the honourable member to put on the record of this Parliament any scandalous allegations about a private member of the community and then he will try to link, or not link, those comments to his motion after he has made the allegations. It should be quite clear that it is his responsibility—before he makes those allegations—to ensure that they are relevant to the motion. In this case he has not been able to do so, and I ask you to rule that the honourable member has not been able to do so.

The SPEAKER: I have ruled that the honourable member is responsible for his own utterances, whatever they may be, in respect of his use of parliamentary privilege.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will try to complete my contribution. The document continues:

Withheld information from the union that Kevin Tinson was fraudulently collecting ballot papers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Mitcham is completely ignoring your instruction to the House. He is introducing information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher may or may not have a relevant point of order, but the Chair is unable to hear him.

Mr TYLER: The motion moved by the member for Mitcham does not talk about the composition of the Local Government Advisory Commission. To single out one individual and to imply that he is not a desirable person to hold a position on the commission is completely irrelevant to the motion. I also put to you, Mr Speaker, that he is flouting your previous ruling.

The SPEAKER: The question of linking remarks to a particular motion and the question of relevance are always very subjective. However, I make this ruling for the member for Mitcham: provided that the matters he is canvassing at the moment constitute only one aspect of his contribution to this House, and are regularly in the course of his remarks linked to the motion, he can continue. However, if he continues in this vein of dealing with this particular matter to the exclusion of all other points that he could raise in relation to the motion that he has moved, I will rule that he is becoming irrelevant.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If we had not had so many points of order, I would have gone on to my next contribution on this subject, because it is totally germane to the question that we are considering here. It is a matter of whether the Local Government Advisory Commission can function effectively and with the confidence of the people of South Australia. It is totally germane to the composition of the board, the way in which those people are appointed, and the way in which they come to their findings. I will finish this contribution. Information was withheld from the union. Kevin Timson was fraudulently collecting ballot papers from Australian National at Port Augusta, addressed to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms GAYLER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair hopes that members are not unnecessarily taking up the time of the House.

An honourable member: They are.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will decide that.

Ms GAYLER: Standing Order 154 provides:

No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule that the member for Mitcham has digressed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order for the very reason that I gave in my last ruling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The document continues:

. . . collecting ballot papers from Australian National in Port Augusta, addressed to transient members employed by Australian National and with voting slips from their undelivered tickets, casting fraudulent votes—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: The member for Mitcham is now referring to a gentleman by the name of Mr Tinson who is not a member of the Local Government Advisory Commission. The matter being raised has no bearing at all on Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 2, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule that the member for Mitcham has breached Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Mitcham was referring to one particular person in the context of his remarks about another person whom he was, I believe, linking to the motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The document continues:

. . . in union ballots, Dunnery shared the 'benefits' from this unlawful action. In April 1987, along with Kevin Tinson, used a union car to travel to Sydney to attend executive council and then both claimed and were paid first-class air fares of $650 each.

Received a 'gift' of a truckload of 'pavers' to pave around his swimming pool—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I rise on a point of order. Although my point of order may not be covered by Standing Orders, as the responsible Minister in this House at this time I am well aware that some of the comments being made by the member for Mitcham are creating a situation among members on this side of the House, as they can see what he is saying for what it is—a vicious attack on a person in his private capacity.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister come to his point of order.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: What is happening this morning is typical of the way in which Standing Orders are framed. They are framed to protect individual members in this House, and we cannot digress one inch from Standing Orders. But, when there is a vicious attack on a member of the South Australian community that has nothing to do with his job on the Local Government Advisory Commission, the member for Mitcham is getting the protection of the Standing Orders—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. The Chair cannot rule on the fairness or otherwise of the honourable member for Mitcham's contribution. Provided that he falls within the ambit of relevance, which he will do by not spending a disproportionate amount of time on a particular aspect, and by continually linking his remarks to the motion, the Chair cannot do other than uphold his right to continue. Members who strongly disagree with the material being put forward by the member for Mitcham will have an opportunity to reply in due course.

Mr TYLER: I rise on a point of order. The member for Mitcham is quoting from a document that was circulated for internal political purposes within the AWU.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will not read the full content of the article because I am sure that members on the other side

have it, too. That is why they are so upset and why they do not want anything on the record. Before I seek leave to continue my remarks, I will make one more point about this document of the AWU rank and file. It states:

> . . . used his position as branch President to prevent any action being taken against industrial officer, Terry Cameron, who was using the union office as a business address, using union telephones and facilities, and a union car to run a real estate and building company business.

And it goes on. I would say that there are huge doubts, first, about the capacity of the gentleman whom I have just mentioned being part of the Local Government Advisory Commission and, secondly, being one of the select three who finally made a determination on Mitcham. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The member for Fisher just referred to the member for Mitcham as 'a gutless scum'. I believe that that is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not hear the remark, but I have no reason to doubt the word of the honourable member for Coles. I require the honourable member for Fisher to withdraw those words.

Mr TYLER: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913. Read a first time.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to remove from the Places of Public Entertainment Act the restrictions on holding sporting fixtures and other public events on Sundays. These provisions are totally inappropriate in modern times and only serve to inhibit Sunday trading and the various social and sporting activities enjoyed by South Australians on their weekends. As the provision to be deleted itself reveals, it had its genesis in the attitudes prevailing early this century, when Sunday was regarded much more widely in the community as a day of rest and quiet on which people generally should not be required to work, and on which religious observances ought not to be unduly interfered with.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 20. Section 20 now provides that a place of public entertainment cannot be used on a Sunday morning (that is, before 1 p.m.) without the permission of the Minister. Films and theatrical performances cannot take place between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. on Sunday evenings without permission. It further provides that sporting fixtures cannot be held or attended on a Sunday without a permit. These bureaucratic controls are cumbersome, costly and no longer appropriate.

It should be noted that deletion of this provision does not in any way affect the operation of the Act in relation to the regulation of places of public entertainment. It should be further noted that while section 20 is retained in the principal Act and enforced, it means that all places of public entertainment which seek to open on Sundays before 1 p.m. are in accordance with charges levied on such places now subject to permit charges of $18 per day totalling $936 per annum.

Taking that point a little further, the financial burden now being applied by way of circular warning to proprietors, managers and operators of such premises is placing an incredible financial burden on those sites. It is a figure required of permit applicants week by week and not one that can be provided on a monthly or annual basis, hence the collective sum of $936 per annum which accrues over the period of requiring to be open on each Sunday prior to 1 p.m.

These permit fees are in addition to the ordinary registration and/or licensing fees of the premises; they are in addition to the premiums payable on public risk policies and all those other associated costs, and are considered to be more than unreasonable—indeed, outrageous. The provision in the Act, from my research, indicates that there was no intention of this action being for the purposes of substantial revenue raising by the State authority, but to ensure that proper activities occurred on site and that no other persons were interfered with or harassed as a result of such activities taking place.

However, the application of that section in recent times by way of demand circular and intent to police it has caused the matter to be drawn to my attention and that of others in this place: hence, our desire to have that offensive, unnecessary and now quite historic section removed from the Act, and all the other important sections and objectives of the Places of Public Entertainment Act preserved. I seek the support of members in this place in the passage of this Bill.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW BILL

Mr Oswald, for **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of a committee of the Legislative Council to be entitled the Statutory Authorities Review Committee to provide for the review of certain statutory authorities by the committee; and for other related purposes. Read a first time.

Mr OSWALD: 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

There are approximately 278 statutory authorities operating in this State. In a modern parliamentary democracy it is essential that the Parliament takes an active role in examining the operations of statutory authorities. The only effective and efficient way this can be carried out is by having an appropriate committee system to examine and report to the Parliament, therefore, informing all members of what is taking place in these particular authorities. Many of them have not been examined by the Government or Parliament since they were established. I believe that when they were originally set up, there would have been very good reasons, but some of them may no longer be required and some may be carrying out functions that are now obsolete and may only need their terms of reference altered to be more in tune with today's community.

It is essential in a parliamentary democracy that the members are aware of what is taking place in the Government and the only way this can be achieved is to have a number of committees. The Public Works Committee plays an important role although there is always room for improvement. The same could be said for the Subordinate

Legislation Committee. The Public Accounts Committee, for example, has a fine record as it is important for past action to be examined and reported to Parliament.

The design of such reporting should not embarrass or make life difficult for the Government, but make constructive inquiries, examinations and recommendations which will benefit the Government and its citizens. I believe a committee of this nature will be of great assistance to the Government and should not be seen as a committee to annoy, harass or embarrass the Government. From my experience as a member of Parliament, every piece of legislation that has ever been referred to a select committee has been improved.

The Federal Parliament is currently moving towards an improved committee system. I therefore believe members of the South Australian Parliament will be carrying out a most productive and effective role on behalf of the citizens of this State by investing more of their time in a more effective committee system. Many of these authorities absorb large amounts of money in providing facilities that are expensive in order to conduct effective inquiries which influence the lives of citizens. It is important that Government resources are spent in the most effective and efficient manner and this review will make sure that those sentiments are carried out.

The object of the Bill is to establish a committee of review for statutory authorities, to ensure that Government corporations, commissions and trusts are reassessed by a parliamentary committee requiring them to justify their continued existence and effectiveness. Before deciding on this approach to a statutory authority review process, a detailed investigation of interstate and overseas experience was undertaken, also, it was necessary to clarify what is a statutory authority and what is the extent of their operations.

I am concerned at the apparent large increase in the number of authorities in South Australia in the past 15 years. There are now approximately 278 stautory authorities operating in this State. Because of the autonomous nature of these authorities there did not seem to be adequate parliamentary scrutiny over their borrowings, annual budgets, or overall programs. Increasing indebtedness of statutory authorities and the apparent lack of accountability to Parliament and in some instances the Government itself, clearly indicates that a statutory authorities review committee would play a vital role in examining and evaluating their functions.

During its term in office the Tonkin Government worked on improving the accountability of statutory authorities and reviewing the operations of other authorities. During that time the Government, through the combined efforts of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (Research Branch and Deregulation Unit) and the Public Service Board, with the cooperation of other departments:

1. Compiled a comprehensive list of statutory authorities categorised into those with separate corporate status and those without separate corporate status, and also categorised the authorities by Act of Parliament and responsible ministerial portfolios.

2. Surveyed during early 1980, by way of questionnaire, all authorities to provide information on board membership and fees paid, financial matters including borrowings enabling legislation, objectives and achievements, and annual reporting.

3. Undertook comprehensive reviews of fees payable to board members with particular reference to public servants serving on boards.

4. Established a semi-governmental borrowings committee to review all requests for borrowings and to consolidate the Government's borrowing program for presentation to Cabinet for smaller authorities.

5. Undertook major reviews of some statutory authorities in accordance with stated Government policy to either wind up or restructure the authority.

The success of that work is clearly demonstrated by the action taken and discussions implemented. Action taken includes:

1. The abolition or restructuring of the following statutory authorities: Monarto Development Commission, South Australian Land Commission, South Australian Meat Corporation, Apprenticeship Commission and Red Scale Committees.

2. Borrowings by statutory authorities under the semi-government borrowing program have been rationalised and geared to meet the needs as they arise. This action has resulted in vastly improved overall financial management, savings in interest charges against revenue budget and less pressure from Government on the capital market in South Australia.

3. Fees paid to board members of authorities have been rationalised and a decision taken to phase out fees being paid to public servants serving on these boards during working hours.

4. These initiatives, combined with the background work undertaken, as mentioned earlier, have undoubtedly contributed to increased awareness amongst the management of statutory authorities for the need for tighter financial control, cutting red tape and improved accountability to Parliament and Ministers.

While this background work was progressing, a detailed investigation was also undertaken into the alternatives available for a review mechanism for statutory authorities. A study was carried out of overseas experience in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, particularly by the Public Review Committee in Victoria. The alternatives considered were:

1. Sunset clause in Acts creating authorities.
2. Independent review body or commission.
3. Administrative process through Government departments.
4. Auditor-General or special commissioner.
5. Parliamentary committee.

It was decided upon the establishment of a parliamentary committee to review the justification for the continued existence of statutory authorities for the following reasons:

1. A sunset clause for all statutory authorities would overload Parliament with Bills to permit authorities to continue to exist after the sunset date. A five-year review period for example would average 50 Bills per year.

2. Additionally under the sunset clause proposal—

(i) A formal structure or committee would still be required to make recommendations to Parliament, but would find it impossible to review objectively each authority with so many subject to a sunset date review each year.

(ii) Also, by declaring a review date in advance the statutory authority concerned would have several years' notice of review and there would be a tendency for authorities to spend considerable time and effort justifying their continued existence.

3. The Government desires greater parliamentary scrutiny of the affairs of authorities and accountability to the Parliament. A parliamentary committee with Government

and Opposition members appears the best alternative to achieve this objective.

4. The powers of a parliamentary committee and the requirement to publish its findings will ensure public confidence in the recommendation concerning the future operations of authorities reviewed.

5. A parliamentary committee will be able to utilise the expertise existing in the Public Service, from, say, the Auditor-General's Office or Public Service Board as required by arrangement with the Minister concerned. Additionally, subject to budgetary constraints, private consultants could also be utilised by a parliamentary committee.

These are the major reasons for proposing a parliamentary committee to review the need for the continued existence of South Australia's statutory authorities. A sunset clause will still be considered in other legislation where appropriate. The committee will not overlap the work of the Public Accounts Committee but rather complement the work the Public Accounts Committee does in the area of Government departments via the Auditor-General's Report. The Statutory Authorities Review Committee will have specific objectives quite distinct from those of the Public Accounts Committee as detailed in the explanation of the Bill.

Considerable attention has been given to defining which authorities come within the jurisdiction of the committee. Single-person authorities which include some Ministers and Commissioners are excluded as are the Houses of Parliament, the courts and tribunals. To further clarify the situation, authorities subject to review will need to be listed in regulations provided for by the Bill. It should be clearly seen that the committee is an appropriate function for an Upper House. It will give appropriate and proper power to the Upper House to review the functions of statutory authorities.

There is no doubt that statutory authorities should be reviewed by a separate body whose major thrust is looking at the rationale for their continued existence, the way in which they continue to operate and indeed whether they need to operate at all. The committee would comment on and, if necessary, criticise the specific operations of authorities where it was considered their efficiency and effectiveness could be improved. Where the committee recommended the abolition of an existing authority, it would report this to Parliament. Such a committee would result in an increased accountability to Parliament—and, therefore, to the public. The bipartisan nature of the committee would mean more likelihood of parliamentary acceptance of its recommendations.

The Bill provides for the committee to comprise six members of the Legislative Council, of whom three shall be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council. The one certain conclusion is that there is a massive amount of Government regulatory legislation which is in need of review and reform. The Parliamentary Liberal Party believes that this is an essential piece of legislation and in the unfortunate event of the Government not agreeing to this measure, it will be a high priority for an incoming Liberal Government after the next State election.

I commend the Bill to the House and ask all members to give it their careful consideration as I consider it will greatly enhance the standing of the Parliament, provide great opportunity for better administration and the possibility of redirection of scarce public resources.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 is an interpretation provision. The central concept of a 'statutory authority' is defined as a body corporate that is established by an Act and—

(a) has a governing body comprised of or including persons or a person appointed by the Governor, a Minister or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown;

(b) is subject to control or direction by a Minister; or

(c) is financed wholly or partly out of public funds,

but does not include—

(d) a council or other local government authority;

(e) the State Bank of South Australia;

(f) the State Government Insurance Commission;

(g) a body whose principal function is the provision of tertiary education;

(h) a body wholly comprised of members of Parliament;

(i) a court or a judicial or administrative tribunal;

(j) any other body excluded by regulation.

Clause 4 establishes the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. It consists of six Legislative Council members appointed by the Legislative Council, three (and not more than three) from the group (excluding Ministers) led by the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council and at least two from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council. Membership is for the life of the Parliament in which the member is appointed.

Clause 5 provides for removal from, and vacancies of the office of a member of the committee. The Legislative Council may remove a member from office. One of the grounds for an office becoming vacant is if the member becomes a Minister of the Crown.

Clause 6 gives the Remuneration Tribunal jurisdiction to determine the remuneration of members of the committee.

Clause 7 provides that a vacancy in the membership of the committee does not invalidate the acts or proceedings of the committee.

Clause 8 requires the Governor to designate one of the members as the presiding officer of the committee.

Clause 9 deals with the manner in which the committee is to conduct its business. A quorum is three members, one of whom must be a member who was appointed to the committee from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

Clause 10 provides for the central function of the committee—to review statutory authorities. The committee may carry out a review on its own initiative and must do so at the request of the Governor, the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council.

Clause 11 sets out the purpose of a review of a statutory authority—whether or not, in the opinion of the committee, the statutory authority should continue in existence. In carrying out a review the committee may inquire into—

(a) whether the purposes for which the statutory authority was established are relevant or desirable in the circumstances presently prevailing;

(b) whether the cost to the State of maintaining the statutory authority is warranted;

(c) whether the statutory authority and the functions it performs provide the most effective, efficient and economic system for achieving the purposes for which the statutory authority was established;

(d) whether the structure of the statutory authority is appropriate to the functions it performs;

(e) whether the work or functions of the statutory authority duplicate or overlap in any respect the work or functions of another authority, body or person;

and

(f) any other matter it considers relevant.

Clause 12 gives the committee certain powers to ensure that it is able to get information needed to properly carry out a review. A person appearing before the committee need not give answers to questions tending to incriminate him or her. The statutory authority under review and the responsible Minister are entitled to appear personally or by representative before the committee and to make submissions to the committee. The committee must meet in private (unless the committee decides otherwise). It is not bound by the rules of evidence. Persons appearing before the committee may be represented by counsel. The committee may, in its discretion, allow the statutory authority or responsible Minister access to evidence taken. The committee may authorise a member to enter and inspect, at any reasonable time, any land, building or other place.

Clause 13 provides that a review being carried out by a committee which comes to an end when a Parliament lapses may be completed by the committee established during the life of a subsequent Parliament.

Clause 14 compels the committee to prepare a report on the completion of a review, containing its findings, its recommendations as to the continuance or abolition of the statutory authority and its reasons for those recommendations.

In respect of the continuance of a statutory authority, the committee may further recommend—

(a) the time at which the statutory authority ought again to be reviewed;

(b) any changes that ought to be made to the structure, membership or staffing of the statutory authority;

(c) any changes that ought to be made to the powers, functions, duties, responsibilities or procedures of the statutory authority;

(d) any provision that ought to be made for the reporting, or better reporting, of the statutory authority to its Minister and to Parliament;

(e) such other matters as the committee considers relevant.

In respect of the abolition of a statutory authority, the committee may further recommend—

(a) the time at which, and the method by which, the statutory authority ought to be abolished;

(b) the administrative or legislative arrangements for implementing the abolition of the statutory authority, and for dealing with any matters ancillary or incidental to that abolition;

(c) such other matters as the committee considers relevant. A copy of the committee's report must be laid before each House of Parliament.

Clause 15 requires the Minister responsible for a statutory authority to respond to the committee's report on the review of that authority within four months of the committee's report being laid before Parliament. A copy of the response must be laid before each House of Parliament. The response must set out—

(a) which (if any) of the recommendations of the committee will be carried out;

(b) in respect of recommendations that will be carried out, the manner in which they will be carried out;

(c) in respect of recommendations that will not be carried out, the reasons for not carrying them out;

(d) any other response which the Minister considers relevant.

Clause 16 prevents further reviews of a statutory authority for a period of four years, unless such further review was recommended in the committee's report or both Houses of Parliament resolve that the statutory authority should be further reviewed.

Clause 17 provides for staff and other resources of the committee.

Clause 18 provides that the office of a member of the committee is not an office of profit under the Crown.

Clause 19 provides that the money required for the purposes of the measure must be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

Clause 20 provides that an offence against the measure (see clause 12 (2)) is a summary offence.

Clause 21 gives the Governor general regulation- making power.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ANTARCTICA

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I move:

That this House strongly supports the principle of Antarctica becoming a World Heritage Wilderness Park and opposes the notion that Australia should become a signatory to the Antarctic Mining Convention; and further, this House supports the Federal Government proposal to negotiate a comprehensive environmental convention for Antarctica.

In moving this motion, I am fulfilling a couple of obligations, one to myself and the other to many people throughout the conservation movement in this State and country who have long held the view that the region of Antarctica should be a world park and be immune from any further mining activity. The motion is three-barrelled. It picks up on support for the proposition of Antarctica becoming a world wilderness park, it opposes the CRAMRA convention, and it supports the Federal Government's move for an environment convention to cover the land mass and surrounding icefields of the great continent of Antarctica.

This matter was first brought to my attention many months ago when talk about the mining convention became commonplace in the newspapers. I took the step in June last year of asking the Parliamentary Library to do a search of literature on the subject. My reading of that literature convinced me that all three aspects of this motion were valid and worth pursuing and we, as a country, should not be continuing to talk about even supporting the CRAMRA convention.

I shall digress briefly over the history of the original Antarctic Treaty. In 1961, 12 member nations signed the Antarctic Treaty, and by that treaty the whole continent was dedicated to scientific research. It was done on a co-operative basis, and it had the effect of freezing—without stretching a pun—claims made by a number of countries to that area. The treaty is due to be reopened for negotiation in 1991. The countries signing the original treaty were Australia, Argentina, Britain, Belgium, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, the Soviet Union and the USA.

Since 1961, when that treaty was signed, 10 more nations have become consultative parties, and in all there is a total of 39 parties to the Antarctic Treaty. One would have assumed that it would give Antarctica reasonable protection. However, international mining being what it is and multinational companies being what they are it was not enough. Indeed, pressure was brought to bear on a number of countries, more particularly the signatory countries to the Ant-

arctic Treaty, to consider signing CRAMRA—the Convention for the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activity—which was a fairly thinly disguised scheme to allow mineral exploration in the continent of Antarctica. Those who know anything about the geology of the Gondwana continents will know that Australia, India, South America and Africa were once linked to Antarctica in the continent of Gondwanaland. Indeed, one can trace aspects of the geology of South Australia to the Antarctic continent. The Flinders Ranges, if one extrapolates backwards for about 250 million years, are contiguous with mountain ranges in western Antarctica.

It is clear that if there are mineral deposits to be found in the Flinders Ranges—and clearly copper deposits and a number of other mineral deposits are found there—why not in Antarctica? The mineral companies argued this and wanted to search there. It is reasonable that they should want to do that. The only problem is that the continent remains subzero for most of the year and any biological material that is dropped there tends to last almost for ever. It follows that any oil spills or debris left by mining companies and their activities, or even tourists, will be there for ever and a day. In my view, that is an untenable situation.

The requirements of the CRAMRA treaty suggested that all seven principal claimant nations (that is, the nations claiming part of the territory of the Antarctica) must have signed the CRAMRA treaty and that the 16 consultative parties under the original treaty must also have signed. Given the need that all 23 claimants must sign, it seems reasonably unlikely that the CRAMRA treaty was destined to succeed in the first place. I have to say that, because I do not want to over-dramatise the significance of Australia's decision not to sign it. Nevertheless, a lead was required, and that lead was given by this country.

The CRAMRA treaty as proposed by American multinationals and others had a number of deficiencies. Because it is a mining treaty, mining would have been allowed in the first place. The treaty did not prevent cross-subsidisation of the companies that mined there. In fact, under the treaty, it would have been acceptable for mining companies to subsidise their activities in Antarctica by activities elsewhere; in other words, under the treaty mining did not have to be economic in order to be pursued. One would assume that mining in sub-zero temperatures would place additional physical constraints on the mining company. The treaty did not require that mining obey any normal economic criteria.

Limited provision was also made for liability for damage. The treaty did not adequately cover damage caused by an oil spill, inappropriate mining, or no restoration of the area. Further, no provision was made for emergency procedures in the event of natural disasters, for example, blizzards, glaciers and the various other natural hazards of that continent that could affect mining operations. In fact, such situations were not even foreseen. The fact that a number of glaciers in the ice fields move at something like one kilometre a year was not taken into account.

Under the provisions of the treaty, mineral companies were to be given complete confidentiality, in other words, members of the general public and other nations were not to be told what was going on, and it has been claimed that environmental safeguards have been watered down. They are but a few of the deficiencies of the CRAMRA treaty and they are the reasons ultimately why the Australian Government decided to take the stand and lead opposition to that treaty.

I want to spend a little time also on the counter proposal which Australia has now presented for a world park in the Antarctic region. Initially, that idea did not emanate from Australia but, rather, it was first raised in 1972 by the New Zealand Conservation Movement and, indeed, was floated by the New Zealand Government as early as 1975. However, as the major signatory nation under the original treaty, Australia was the country to take it up and translate it into action. One should look at what will be achieved by a world park proposal as suggested by Australia.

The Federal Government's decision not to sign the CRAMRA treaty has subsequently been endorsed by France, and that is to be applauded. India and Belgium have also indicated some support for Australia's initiative and its alternative proposal to develop a comprehensive protection convention to look after that continent. Support was forthcoming for a number of reasons. The idea of providing for an environmental protection convention related to the fact that there would be a complete ban on mining. This is consistent with the provisions of the original Antarctic treaty, but of course contravenes the provisions of the CRAMRA treaty. Under the proposal to establish an environmental protection convention there was also a stipulation that the Antarctic would continue to be used forever for peaceful purposes.

Also proposed is the prohibition of nuclear explosions in the great continent of Antarctica and the disposal of nuclear waste and various other biproducts of the nuclear industry and, indeed, the nuclear testing program. Further, there is a proposal for freedom for scientific research to continue, with a provision under which scientific research based on that continent can be interchanged between signatory nations. A proposal exists which allows for on-site inspection by observers from convention nations to see what is going on.

If one wants to look at the kind of results that can occur from mineral exploration—and, in particular, oil exploration—in areas such as the Antarctic, one has only to turn to the case of the oil industry in Alaska, particularly to the incident surrounding the *Exxon Valdez*. That vessel, which was grounded in Alaska shortly after taking on a cargo of oil from the Alaskan oilfield, was sailing in clear contravention of every agreement made by the Exxon company to conduct its activities in an environmentally sound way. In 1972 Exxon guaranteed that, if it were allowed to explore for oil in the Arctic, it would use double-hulled ships and that every effort would be made to ensure that no accidents would result. The *Exxon Valdez* was a single-hulled ship, with a crew of 19 instead of the required 33 on board; the captain was drunk and in his cabin; and the officer in charge of the bridge was a junior officer who was not qualified to be driving the thing.

The error was compounded when the vessel ran aground because, when the captain was finally woken from his drunken stupor and dragged up to the bridge, he recognised he was in some trouble, decided to ignore the fact there was a 10 m gash in the ship's bow and simply backed off the rocks and sailed away. That did not work too well, because it allowed many millions of litres of oil to escape into the Sound and, in trying to cover his tracks, all the captain did was create a monumental disaster which it took the Exxon company some two weeks to getting around to try to remedy, and which was never successful in any event, because vast areas of the Sound still required to be cleaned up. The behaviour of the personnel and of the company in that situation was fairly typical of the kind of cowboys who occasionally drive this sort of technology: one only has to look at the cowboys who were driving the Three Mile Island reactor when it malfunctioned and, more particularly, the Chernobyl reactor, where unauthorised practices were being followed. There are striking parallels between the *Exxon*

Valdez incident and the various nuclear accidents. Reasonably good failsafe conditions have been put in place which have been ignored by the operators. In the case of the *Exxon Valdez*, Exxon most certainly ignored the provisions put in place to prevent incidents of the kind that occurred. I believe that the Antarctic is in need not only of the environmental protection convention proposed by Australia but also of interim World Heritage listing in the meantime.

I would urge Australia to go one step further than simply proposing the convention and in fact nominate the Antarctic for World Heritage listing. That will clearly give it additional protection in the meantime, before the convention can be negotiated, and it will stress the imperative that Antarctica should be a world park forever. If one needs to look at the reasons why Australia should support a proposal of this kind, one has to look only at the historical legacy which people like Scott and Amundsen and, more particularly, Douglas Mawson, left behind.

Douglas Mawson discovered the location of the South Magnetic Pole in 1907 and was involved in a number of expeditions after that event. Dr Phillip Law, who is still very much alive and kicking in Melbourne, led 11 expeditions to the Antarctic under the Australian National Antarctic Research Expedition (ANARE) program and he participated in a further 28 excursions to Antarctica between 1949 and 1966. There is a vast amount of Australian historical and geological heritage tied up in our exploration of the Antarctic and in fact the ANARE expeditions mapped 2.6 million square kilometres of that continent and 6 400 kilometres of the Antarctic coastline.

If one needs to look any further for reasons to declare the Antarctic a World Heritage park and to preserve it not for mining but for scientific exploration, one has only to look at the success of the various astronomical and atmospheric expeditions that have operated there. The most recent and successful has been the scientific expedition which led to the discovery of the ozone hole, based on research back in 1984. The great pity of that is that we had to wait until 1987 and 1988 for confirmation of the results first found in 1984 for the world to realise that there was a ozone hole and a significant danger to life on this planet as a result of ozone depletion.

Further reasons why we ought to be considering a complete preservation of Antarctica relates to the uniqueness of its wildlife. There are six different species of Baleen whale in and around Antarctic waters; there are two species of tooth whale, which comprise the majority of whales in the oceans of the planet. There are five species of penguin, and I think that includes every species on the face of the globe. By contrast with the various marine mammals and birds, there are only two flowering plants in Antarctica and, under the CRAMRA treaty, they would have to share the 2 per cent of the land mass that is free of ice with tourism, mining and every other human activity that one would want to place there. I believe that there ought to be, and in fact the conservation movement believes that there ought to be, no mining in Antarctica, because all of the plants, animals, scientists, tourists and all the mineral exploration, including the ancillary activities such as runways, roads and rubbish dumps have to compete for 2 per cent of the land area of Antarctica, which is all the area that is ice free—the rest is under a couple of kilometres of ice.

Much of that ice moves at speeds of up to a kilometre a year. It is clear that all of this activity has to be crammed into 2 per cent of the space. My answer to the proposal that CRAMRA should be signed is 'No, it should not'; we do not need mining in Antarctica. To the Australian Government, I say, 'Well done, in taking the stand that you have taken.' I encourage that Government to move ahead with proposals to institute the world park in Antarctica, preferably by way of World Heritage listing. I am confident in moving this motion today that it will have the uncritical and unequivocal support of the Opposition and members of the Upper House. I look forward to this motion being disposed of in short order, and I am sure that members of the conservation movement will join me in the hope that this House and another place will support the motion and declare to the world and the conservation movement that South Australia opposes mining and supports the world park proposal.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNDERGROUND POWERLINES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That ETSA should establish a fund of 5 per cent of revenue to progressively underground powerlines in strategic areas in cooperation with local government to prevent mutilation of trees.

I, like the honourable member who preceded me, am quite sure that the resolution will have the unanimous support of the House. I refer to what has been described as the 'greening of Adelaide'. I am absolutely amazed when I go to the top of tall buildings or, as I did on Sunday, to the top of a quarry in the Adelaide Hills, to look down to the metropolitan area and see just how green Adelaide is. One does not see many houses but literally a forest of trees. Indeed, when I was on top of the ETSA building not long ago, looking out over the suburbs, again, the whole vista was one of trees. That has added greatly to the attraction and beauty of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And it has helped the climate.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, indeed, it has helped the climate. Unquestionably, a greening program in Adelaide has for many years resulted in the planting of street and household trees, which has made the suburbs and city of Adelaide very attractive.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister suggests that he has planted some trees. I have surrounded my home with trees, and I am sure the Minister will do his bit and support the motion enthusiastically when it is put to a vote in due course. I now refer to the history of ETSA's efforts. Several years ago, there was a deliberate program to establish a fund for the very purpose of installing underground power lines. Unfortunately, that policy seems to have disappeared for some reason. Successive Labor Governments have been far more interested in taxing ETSA to the tune of 5 per cent of its turnover.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: That fund has lapsed under this Government, has it?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it seems to have disappeared, but the fact is that this Government took $35 million from ETSA last year by way of direct taxation, let alone by way of interest hikes and so on. That was an enormous slug. I am not suggesting anything terribly radical in terms of how ETSA should spend its money. The Government has already lifted $35 million from ETSA. One of ETSA's programs in the transmission of its powerlines was the development of the stobie pole, a unique South Australian invention. It was greatly lauded, because it replaced many of the earlier wooden poles which were not durable, had a limited life and were quite expensive to replace. When

the stobie pole was invented by Mr Stobie it was widely applauded as a great move forward and must have helped greatly to contain the cost of ETSA's distribution system.

Most people who are environmentally sensitive regard these stobie poles and the overhead power lines strung around suburban streets as ugly. The stobie pole has lost much of its original appeal, which was purely economic in those early days. One can think of other decisions made purely on economic grounds. Adelaide's electric tramcars were discontinued and their lines torn up and replaced by motorbuses simply as the result of an economic decision. It was more economic to transport the public by bus than by tram. In hindsight, I think that was unfortunate.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It was not a very good use of energy.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it was unfortunate. There is no doubt that electric tramcars do not pollute and that they represent a reasonably efficient use of energy. In terms of pollution, that decision was not sound. However, it is no good crying over spilt milk or blaming people who made economic decisions which sought to put this State on its feet. The end result of the existence of stobie poles and the tree-planting program is that the trees, which are now of a significant size, and attraction, are subject to a program of mutilation undertaken in the name of safety. Unfortunately, many trees are being mutilated through heavy pruning programs. There is no other word to describe the effect on these trees; they indeed have been mutilated. Travelling along, say, Glynburn Road and around various suburbs of Adelaide, one sees that on many occasions half a tree has been cut away. Of course, a great deal of the beauty of a tree is in its shape. Often half a tree has to be cut away in order to accommodate power lines strung between stobie poles.

People have now become more sensitive to the environment—I suggest that this applies to the majority of the population now—and they see things which they did not see 10 or 20 years ago. I guess their minds were on other things. But the fact is that people are now more aware of their surroundings and they observe things that they did not notice 10 or 15 years ago. I think the mutilation of these trees is a case in point. It is probably a very good thing that we have become more aware of our environment. There is more to life than the bottom line economic sum. Of course, the question of bottom line economics is fundamental, if we are to provide a lifestyle acceptable to the community, particularly the poorer members of the community. One must ensure that the economy of the State is in good shape, but nonetheless, there is now a healthy emphasis on our lifestyle and on the things that we recognise as adding beauty and colour to our lifestyle.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And economic value.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And of economic value, yes. On coming down from the Hills into the suburbs of Adelaide one realises that a lot of those lovely green trees across the metropolitan area as viewed from the Hills have sustained a lot of damage simply for the purposes of reticulating power around the suburbs. This is something that needs to be addressed.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Not my area.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister might be fortunate to live in an area where all the powerlines are underground—and that is fine. This realisation has come to the fore, and I think most new subdivisions have the powerlines underground. The powerlines have been put underground along the main street of Hahndorf.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That was a very good initiative.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it was a good initiative.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It was done in about 1981, if I remember correctly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. We are trying to promote Hahndorf as being a heritage town, as an attraction to visitors to this State from interstate and, indeed, overseas. Obviously, people would not be too impressed to see half the canopy of the magnificent street trees there cut away in order to accommodate power lines. Even I have noticed that the powerlines have been put underground at Hahndorf. I must confess that I did not realise it was done in 1982—obviously, another good Liberal initiative when the fund for this was operative and there was a program.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And while you were Minister!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Indeed; I share the credit with my colleague, the member for Heysen. However, I do not want to prolong these remarks. I simply want to put on record my belief that ETSA has to get its priorities right and the Government has to give a lead in this regard. I have referred earlier in this House to the inquiry of the Industries Assistance Commission into ETSA and its operations. ETSA's productivity has declined since 1982, under the present Government. It has declined, although it has taken on more staff. It has kept obsolete plant operative simply to keep people in jobs. The IAC report points that out quite clearly. If a more businesslike approach, such as is now being adopted in the Eastern States, is taken to the economic operations of ETSA—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Which we will do.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, we will do. The General Manager is trying hard to institute these sorts of reforms, but he has some hurdles to jump with the Labor Government. If we do not put so much emphasis on maintaining something that is not serving a useful purpose in an organisation such as that and if we look at the Labor Government's taxing policies of just creaming off 5 per cent of turnover and raking in $35 million per year and then turn our attention to efficiency, ETSA will be able to afford to put aside .5 per cent of the revenue which, from the turnover last year of $678 million, would be $3.4 million a year. That would soon build up to a very useful fund for an undergrounding program.

In cooperation with local government, priorities could be set. Some of the more magnificent trees that are currently being mutilated could be saved. An agreement could be struck, with ETSA's bearing most of the load, and I believe it should. In cooperation with local government, this fund should be re-established and set at that figure, and a program should be undertaken. I commend this motion to the House.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN ECONOMIC POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its sustained and deliberate policy of using high interest rates in its attempts to bring Australia's balance of payments under control, notes the role of the Premier as Federal President of the ALP in helping to frame and support this policy and calls on the House to repudiate the abject failure of the policy and its cruel effects on home owners, potential homebuyers and young families.

(Continued from 17 August. Page 385.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In moving this motion last week I referred to four principal factors in relation to the high interest rates that are crippling this country and this State. I stressed the responsibility of the Premier as Federal President of the Australian Labor Party for Labor monetary policy. I traced the history of overspending by Australia and Australians, resulting in an accumulation of debt, which has risen from $10 billion in 1980 to over $100 billion in the current year, almost one-third of the value of our annual production.

I documented the increase, on an annual basis, in interest rates from 12 per cent in September 1983 to an unprecedented 17 per cent in June this year. Finally, I recounted some of the suffering being experienced by South Australian families as a result of these intolerable interest rate increases. There is no doubt that there are people in South Australia today who cannot sleep at night because of the worry of interest rates. Families are breaking apart because of the worry of interest rates. There are children whose childhood will be indelibly influenced as a result of the strains their parents are under because of the high interest rates.

It is worth noting that these people are in a category that is bearing the whole burden. Why should young families, in the main, who are in the process of buying their homes be the principal victims of the monetary policy developed by the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the President of the Federal ALP, who is the Premier of this State? Why should this whole burden of trying to bring Australia back into line with our trading partners fall on this particular group? It is a cruel policy; it is a deliberate policy; and it is a policy that focuses virtually the whole of the burden on this one group—the group who can least afford to fight back unless it does so politically. It is interesting that this group is, in the main, found in the marginal State electorates.

For example, in the electorate of Fisher, 72 per cent of voters are in households repaying home loans; in Bright, the figure is 56 per cent; in Newland, it is a very high 67 per cent; in Hayward, it is 38 per cent; in Norwood, it is 27 per cent; while in Unley, it is 32 per cent. Those figures reflect electorates that have an older population. However, the older population is by no means immune from this struggle and burden. The simple reason is that grandparents are very much concerned with the future of their grandchildren and with the burdens that are being endured by their sons and daughters. In my own electorate I have noticed that grandparents, being just one step removed, apparently feel more free to discuss the troubles that beset the families of their sons and daughters. Many a grandparent has come up to me at a shopping centre and said, 'My daughter simply cannot afford to feed the family every night of the week. She is bringing the children across to my place on Fridays and Sundays so they will get a decent meat meal.'

Mr Meier: That is terrible.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As my colleague the member for Goyder says, this is terrible, and it is something that should never be allowed to happen in a country which is supposedly prosperous but which has really been brought to its knees as a result of this monetary policy. It is also noteworthy that this older generation, who were brought up to abhor debt, find the notion of their sons and daughters surviving from week to week, month to month on bankcard, absolutely untenable, and that is one of the reasons why these people cannot sleep at night. It is indeed untenable to attempt to solve debt by getting deeper into debt and going on this everlasting merry-go-round of bankcard and other credit cards.

It is remarkable that a Labor Government is forced to assist people earning more than $35 000 a year or $700 a week because they cannot afford to meet home loan repayments. Surely the alarm bells should be ringing for members opposite. Surely they should be saying to their Leader, who is the Federal President of the ALP, 'Put a stop to this; alter the policy; ease this monetary policy and the interest rate burden that is cripping people,' but no, nothing whatever of that kind has happened. The fact that the policy clearly is not working appears not to matter to those members opposite. There is no doubt that the policy is not working.

We have an opinion from no less a person than Sir Arvi Parvo, the country's most prominent industrialist. In an address to the Council of National Interest in Perth earlier this month, Sir Arvi attacked the Federal Government's economic policy as doing nothing more than lowering living standards and keeping the nation in a permanent state of recession. In an article in the *Weekend Australian* of 12-13 August, Sir Arvi is reported as saying:

> Australia faced financial ruin unless supreme efforts were made to regain national solvency.

He continued:

> The community will have to understand that the consequences of not succeeding in making ends meet will be no less than loss of Australia's economic independence.

He stressed:

> We must produce more, for both domestic consumption and export. There is no other permanent solution.

Certainly he did not adopt the solution of forcing people to spend less rather than to produce more. In its editorial of 19 July 1989, the *Australian* drew attention to the fact that, whenever there are bad trade figures, the Treasurer excuses them as part of adjustment, but he greets good figures as the hail of a new recovery. The fact is that the annual total deficit has been a further nail in the coffin of the Australian Government's economic strategy. The article continued:

> The annual total spells imminent economic crisis for Australia and political disaster for the Government.

The Treasurer, supported by the South Australian Premier, harps about getting the fundamentals right. He keeps claiming that this means bringing inflation and interest rates into line with our trading partners, yet he does nothing whatsoever to achieve that goal. There are ways to achieve that goal, and those ways have been spelt out by the Federal Leader of the Opposition, Mr Andrew Peacock. He has stressed the need for improvement of productivity to keep our trade deficit down and improvement of policies that promote local production. That would mean using both labour and capital more effectively in the future than it has been used in the past; developing a highly skilled work force; improving educational standards; targeting skills; and basing industrial relations and wage determinations at the enterprise level—a policy that is endorsed by major employers and financial institutions. Only the Labor Party insists on a central wage fixing system, which is locking us into across-the-board wage increases, which are in turn feeding inflation and ensuring that the Treasurer and his cohorts, including the Premier, keep interest rates high. The cycle is vicious and the victims are those who are least able to help themselves.

I have demonstrated, both last week and today, that irrefutable evidence exists that we can improve both the social and the financial adverse effects of the Government's interest rates policy. The House must condemn the Federal Government. It must recognise the Premier's role in developing and implementing the interest rates policy, and it must repudiate that policy. Too much suffering has occurred

for too long, and it is likely to continue unless interest rates are brought down. It is essential that that occurs.

The Premier has a central role to play in ensuring that interest rates are brought down. After all, he is the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party. If anyone can bring influence to bear on the Federal Government, he should be able to. Why is it not happening? Nothing has been said by way of criticism of the monetary policy of the Federal Labor Government by the Premier. On the one hand he has defended it and, on the other hand, when he was asked at the time of the Premiers' Conference what was the answer to high interest rates, his response was, 'I don't know'—an incredible admission. That is what we heard from the Federal President of the Party that is governing this State and this nation. His response, when asked for a solution, was, 'I don't know.' It is more than time that the Premier found out.

Plenty of people are willing to tell the Premier that high interest rates are not the solution; in fact, they are part of the problem. It will not be possible to improve productivty and achieve the other goals that I outlined while key sections of the electorate and the work force are so demoralised and despairing as a result of the financial burdens under which they are labouring, that there is very little chance for them to get up off their knees and assist an economic recovery. I call on the House to support the motion to condemn the Federal Government and the Premier of South Australia, and to repudiate the interest rates policy of the Labor Party.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Ted Chapman:

That the Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Adelaide Entertainment Centre dated 5 July 1989 be remitted to the committee advising that in the opinion of the House, the report is in breach of section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927 and requesting that the report be corrected in accordance with the Act and relodged with the Speaker for tabling in the House as a matter of both urgency and importance.

(Continued from 17 August. Page 396.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I rise again to speak on this motion, moved by my colleague the member for Alexandra and, particularly, to respond to the scurrilous allegations made by the member for Briggs in this place last week. The member for Briggs has brought into this House the standards he was once well known for outside. He is the fabricator, the forger and the fiddler. That was his reputation as the press secretary to the present Premier and the former Premier. He still has that reputation and he deserves it following his contribution in this debate last Thursday. The member for Briggs inferred that a member of the Opposition accepted a bribe from the Basketball Association of South Australia in relation to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre project. That allegation was repeated in this House yesterday by the Minister of Public Works. He talked about a free trip to Melbourne. Neither the member for Briggs nor the Minister of Public Works was prepared to put a name to this allegation.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Or to provide any evidence.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, nor did they provide any evidence to support the allegation. The member for Briggs did not say specifically which member of the Opposition he was accusing, but that is typical of his sleazy style. So familiar with his behaviour has the media become, that no journalist supported or reported this allegation, even though the honourable member tried desperately to get someone to take notice.

The problem faced by the member for Briggs is that journalists now know only too well what he is like. They remember the time when he, as press secretary, was party to a campaign by former Premier Dunstan to divide South Australia over the uranium issue. So keen was the member to vilify the Roxby Downs project that, on one occasion, he deliberately tried to mislead the media about the viability of the project. He did that by ripping off the last page of the report which contained the conclusions, which were contradictory to what he and the Labor Party were trying to do at the time, that is, to block this project for which they now claim credit.

I now turn to other allegations made last week by the member for Briggs. The honourable member alleged that pressure from members of the Liberal Party had put the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, the member for Peake, in hospital. Again, this is the snide suggestion coming from the member for Briggs. If anyone is guilty of putting pressure on the member for Peake, it is the Government, which insisted that he follow its political timetable to get this entertainment centre project approved. Whilst the member for Briggs in here says complimentary things about the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, the Opposition knows how much the honourable member has tried to blacken the name of his Caucus colleagues in corridor discussions with journalists, hoping that would help him into the Ministry. At the recent Cabinet reshuffle, when the honourable member had his ministerial driver picked out in the expectation that he would be selected, he was disappointed again, because there is now no more distrusted member of Parliament than he.

The member for Briggs has the trust of no Caucus colleague because he has indulged in a campaign of denigration at their expense to boost his own political ambitions. Rightly, that has failed. The member for Briggs last week also alleged that a member of the Opposition Leader's staff had briefed journalists about the committee's deliberations over the entertainment centre project. Again, no names were mentioned. He cited this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the motion before the House, which he does not seem to be doing at the moment.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I intend to link my remarks to the entertainment centre and to the motion before the House.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am replying to the allegations that were made by the member for Briggs last week in this House on this motion. Last week the member for Briggs alleged that a member of the Opposition Leader's staff had briefed journalists about the committee's deliberations over the entertainment centre project, but again no names were mentioned. He cited this 'as a fact', but gave no further evidence—he did not, because he could not. The fact is that the member for Briggs organised to brief journalists; on occasions he did it himself and on other occasions he told the Premier's press secretary, who passed on the information. This was all designed to make political capital out of the entertainment centre. I have mentioned the member's vicious bribe allegation. The Premier stands guilty of using the entertainment centre as a bribe at the 1985 election to seek the youth vote. What we have seen in recent months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been difficult enough for the Chair to hear with all the interjections from the member for Briggs and the member for Mount Gambier. Now that that duo has been joined by the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Deputy Leader it has become impossible.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In recent months we have seen a deliberate attempt by the Government to use the entertainment centre for its own political purposes. The Government had the project rushed through the committee. It had television cameras down at Hindmarsh when we took evidence on the site—and I have no doubt that the member for Briggs was involved in that exercise as well.

The Government has treated the Public Works Standing Committee with contempt. The Government was never interested in an objective analysis or in determining whether there were other ways to meet the community's needs for adequate entertainment facilities that did not become an undue or unnecessary burden on taxpayers. The Government would not consider the Beverley option because it had to protect the Premier's political credibility. The Government gives greater priority to this than it does to the taxpayers. The member for Briggs must protect the Premier, so he returns to the fabricating and forging activities that he once employed as a press secretary. There is no doubt that the member for Briggs is running around suggesting that the Liberal Party is opposed to an entertainment centre. We continue to hear that, and we heard it again yesterday—those allegations from the member for Briggs. That is all that he is about, with the misrepresentations and untruths that he uttered in this House last week. The member for Briggs' day of reckoning is coming. South Australians have had enough of the style of government that cares little, if anything at all, for the truth—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that there is far too much audible conversation in this Chamber, and I cannot hear the member for Heysen.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is one point of order that I most enthusiastically uphold.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That point of order emphasises the Minister's interest in this matter—it is very little at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has the floor—no-one else.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The taxpayers of this State and South Australians in general have had enough of a style of government that cares little, if anything at all, for the truth or for responsibility in the management of taxpayers' funds. The member for Briggs typifies the Government's attitude that a cheap headline is better than an honest approach to government. He will have to live with his own reputation. The member for Briggs has failed to recognise that being a member of Parliament carries with it certain basic responsibilities. Nothing demonstrated this more than his speech in this House last week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Briggs and the Deputy Leader to order.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I rise to support the motion. In so doing I believe it is regrettable that what is merely a domestic matter within one of the parliamentary committees should be subjected to the forums of this Parliament. Clearly the committee has worked in a very effective and bipartisan way in the past.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TYLER: In recent months in this State we have seen the Opposition trying to tear down our parliamentary system. It has abused the powers and confidences that it receives in a variety of committees. We saw it first with the member for Hanson and the Public Accounts Committee. We saw it again with the Industries Development Committee, and now we see it yet again through the Public Works Committee. It is a tragedy because we have a unique system that works well and effectively for the benefit of the people of South Australia. This motion is about politics and has nothing to do with the procedure or the report that the committee presented to the Parliament.

This motion is an indication of how desperate the Opposition is in this State. It realises that it made a mistake. It opposed the motion to give approval to the entertainment centre. It realises that it has made a mistake. The mistake was made largely because the Leader fired off a press release some time ago saying that the State could not afford the entertainment centre and that the Opposition would go into a complex with the South Australian Basketball Association. The Leader of the Opposition made that statement during the committee's deliberations—trying to pre-empt the findings of the Public Works Standing Committee. He was not prepared to wait to see what the report to the House had to say on the viability of and need for an Adelaide entertainment centre.

The hypocrisy of the Opposition is quite astounding—it never ceases to amaze me. I looked at some of the press clippings and at some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition and his Party have been saying about the entertainment centre. I draw members' attention to early 1985, when the Leader of the Opposition, in a grand announcement, stated that if he became Premier after the 1985 election he would build an entertainment centre at the Memorial Drive tennis courts. That was the Liberals' great plan. A few months later the Premier announced that the Hindmarsh site was the preferred option for the next Bannon Government. Once the election was out of the way we heard nothing more from the Liberals about the entertainment centre for a short while, but then they started making a few noises.

I draw members' attention to articles that appeared in the Adelaide *News*, written by Robbie Brechin under the headline 'Centre row grows—Bannon pushed to make a decision'; the report quotes the Opposition Treasury spokesman, Mr Davis. I am not sure whether Mr Davis is still the Opposition Treasury spokesman, but the Hon. Legh Davis from another place was demanding that the Premier get on with his commitment and build an entertainment centre.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, I challenge the relevance of the debate. We have been asked as a Parliament to vote on whether the report is a breach of section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act and whether the report should be corrected and returned to you, Sir, as Speaker. The honourable member has strayed well away from the substance of the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr TYLER: I am trying to reply to the allegations made in this Chamber by members of the Opposition. I am quite astounded that members opposite would raise that point of order. Again, in the *Advertiser*, the Hon. Rob Lucas demanded that the Government come to some decision

about the entertainment centre. The Opposition even said that we would walk away from the entertainment centre. During deliberations of the committee the Leader of the Opposition circulated a press release which stated that the Liberals would axe the concert centre.

I draw members' attention to the *News* of 31 May where the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying that a Liberal Government would call a halt to the project—that is what he said. During deliberations of the committee members of the Liberal Party who were members of the committee followed their Leader's instructions and voted against the report. They realised that they had made a mistake, and wanted the report sent back to the committee so that they could change their mind.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Come on!

Mr TYLER: That is exactly what happened. I must say that, to be attacked in the vicious way that he was by the member for Heysen, the member for Briggs must be a very effective member of the Government. They were scurrilous allegations. The member for Heysen said that the member for Briggs accused the Opposition of forcing our Chairman, (the member for Peake) into hospital, but that is not true. The member for Briggs said that it was a cowardly attack by the Opposition on a honourable member who happened to be the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee and who also happened to be in hospital. That is what he said. He also said that a member of the Opposition had bragged about the fact that he had received a free trip to Melbourne. That is true, because I witnessed that conversation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order. I draw your attention, Sir—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: —to that short schedule attached to the Public Works Standing Committee Act. That schedule relates to the motion before the Chair in that it imposes an obligation on all members of that committee to keep confidential the practices of that committee. By disclosing more and more about the committee's activities which are unrelated to this motion, the honourable member is further breaching the Act. It has nothing to do with personalities.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that I can uphold the point of order. I believe that the Chair could say, reasonably objectively, that a great deal of the debate from members on both sides has not been very closely linked to the motion, but I do not point the finger at any one individual member, including the honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: I am astounded by that point of order, because I am replying to criticisms made by the member for Heysen when he alleged—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I am quite astounded by that interjection. I was merely replying to the member for Heysen's allegations. He accused the member for Briggs of misleading the House because the member for Briggs said that a member of the Opposition had claimed that he had accepted a free trip to Melbourne.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You tell us who it was.

Mr TYLER: I am merely telling the House that I was a witness to that conversation, and I am aware of whom the honourable member is and that it was said. I have no idea whether it was said in jest, or whether it was somebody beating their own drum. But the conversation took place.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: I think it was a boast.

Mr TYLER: It may have been a boast, as the member for Mitchell states. This motion is purely and simply about politics; it is about the Liberal Party acknowledging its mistake. It has got it wrong. It has obviously done some polling and found that the entertainment centre is popular, particularly amongst young people in South Australia. Members opposite have looked at that poll and now say, 'The kids of South Australia will hold this against us if we continue to have more and more headlines such as that in the paper which said "Liberals to axe concert centre".' What we find is that they try to have a bob each way. The member for Alexandra told us in this Chamber that he had a personal opinion about the entertainment centre—that he did not think it was justified. He said he believed the money could be better spent in some other way. Members opposite wanted to scurry the report back to the committee so they could change the report.

The facts remain: a mistake was made in the final drafting of the report. Members voted against a motion by the member for Alexandra during the deliberations on the findings of the report. The Government successfully moved an amendment in the committee, and that defeated motion should have been contained in the final report. No argument about that is coming from this side of the Chamber; obviously our Chairman made a mistake, and that is freely acknowledged.

The member for Alexandra made another serious allegation in this Chamber. He said that the acting secretary of the Public Works Committee, Mr Graham Burns, had lost his job over the mistake which occurred in this report. That is an absolutely scurrilous allegation. The member for Heysen did not even address that point in his contribution today because he knows the true story surrounding that.

Mr Rann: He was on the selection panel.

Mr TYLER: He was on the selection panel which decided to appoint someone else to that permanent position as secretary. I understand that he supported the person, who was nominated and who was successful. The member for Heysen has not addressed that issue. What he should have done is reprimand his own colleague because that was a scurrilous, disgraceful and baseless allegation. That acting secretary has done a good job at a time when our committee has been under a fair amount of pressure, a solid load and a lot of political heat surrounding the entertainment centre. I believe the acting secretary has done a very good job during the time he has been in that position. For the member for Alexandra to slur that public servant in this cowardly way in this Chamber is an absolute disgrace. He ought to apologise. He ought to do so not only in the Chamber but also to Mr Burns personally.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I support the motion. I refer to what the member for Alexandra said in his point of order. We are talking about a technical matter. The motion says that the report is in breach of section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927. I have had that matter investigated, and people who are well versed in the Act have said that it is in breach of the Act. I have acted quickly and properly, and I congratulate the committee in meeting as soon as possible to correct the report. I applaud the Deputy Chairman, the member for Briggs, for the way in which he reconvened that committee.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money out of Consolidated Account as were required for all the purposes set forth in the Estimates of Payments for the financial year 1989-90, and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Random Breath Testing in South Australia—Operation and Effectiveness Report, 1988.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal—Report, 1988-89.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMPANY INVESTIGATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Victoria, during Question time on 16 August 1989, asked me to advise the House of the outcome of an investigation ordered by the Attorney-General into a possible breach of the Companies Code by Mr Geoffrey Sanderson. The Attorney-General undertook to commence this investigation as a result of a question of the 14 April this year by the honourable Mr Lucas in another place. The report of the Attorney-General was forwarded on 17 July 1989 to the honourable Mr Lucas. However, I am happy to provide the member for Victoria with a copy of the report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE RESOURCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: During Question Time yesterday, the member for Heysen alleged that I had used outdated figures in making a claim that South Australia had the best resourced Police Force of any State. Given that I did not to my knowledge use any figures on Tuesday to support my claim, it is difficult to understand how the member for Heysen could make such an allegation. The claim that I made on Tuesday was based on figures provided by the Police Department for the year ended 30 June 1988—exactly a year later than the figures quoted by the honourable member.

The police will update these ratios when revised population numbers are made available by the Australian Bureau of Statistics for the period to the end of June 1989, and similarly when the various Police Forces make available their end of year numbers. The member for Heysen also sought to back up his claims on police ratios by quoting from the 1987-88 Grants Commission figures on spending on police services by the various States.

However, as is often the case with the Opposition, the honourable member got it wrong. I will leave it to the House to decide whether the error was due to lack of comprehension or selective use of statistics. The table that the honourable member quoted from does two things: it lists a 'standardised' figure on police spending by each State and it lists an 'actual' spending figure. The standardised figure is, if you like, based on a model police force, and it lists the costs in each State of delivering that standard model. South Australia leads the States in this column by delivering the standardised model for $89.97 per head of population. This is the lowest cost of any State and indicates both lower costs and greater efficiency.

The table also lists the expenditure by each State on police services, divided by the population numbers, to give an actual spending figure per head of population. As the member for Heysen pointed out, South Australia's actual spending figure was $97.41 per capita. However, that raw figure tells us very little. The real meaning of these figures relates to how much each State spends per capita above the standardised figure. If this calculation is done, South Australia again leads the States with spending of $7.44 per capita above the standardised figure. This compares with $3.18 above the standardised figure in New South Wales; $3.83 in Tasmania; and $3.06 in Western Australia—referring to the three States mentioned by the honourable member.

The only State that comes anywhere near that in relation to South Australia is Victoria, with spending above the standardised figure of $6.86 per capita. Members may also be interested to know that in Queensland—that bastion of law and order—actual spending per capita is $21.05 below the standardised figure. While the member for Heysen might believe my claim on police resources was based on figures used in one of the publications released on Tuesday, I can assure the House that he is wrong. My claim was based on figures supplied by the police for a different period, and this is backed up by the figures of the Grants Commission—the same figures that the honourable member failed to understand or chose to misinterpret.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr HAMILTON brought up the sixtieth report of the Public Accounts Committee relating to the annual report of the committee.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

PILOTS' DISPUTE

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Because the major domestic airlines will operate only two of a normally scheduled 28 flights out of Adelaide today and because Adelaide is not as well served as most other capitals by the international airlines which are prepared to carry domestic passengers during the current pilots' dispute, has the Premier sought assurances from the Federal Government that Adelaide's needs will be given high priority in the scheduling of RAAF flights while this dispute continues and, if not, will he immediately do so?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The situation is being assessed at present. It is certainly true—and something that is being taken up with the Federal Government in relation to the emergency arrangements that are being made—that they do seem to concentrate more heavily on the eastern coast. Understandably, of course, the Melbourne-Sydney route will get special attention, but Adelaide, I believe, has particular needs that should be addressed. At the moment we are not sure what can be done in this difficult emergency situation, but I am certain that all members would fully support the stand of the Federal Government in this matter. We cannot

see the wages accord and the determinations of the industrial tribunals blown out of the water by a group that is seeking to go its own way outside the system.

I would have appreciated a much stronger affirmation from the Leader of the Opposition that he supports that position. I realise that he may have trouble with it because the industrial policy of the Opposition, in this State and federally, is for so-called enterprise bargaining and individual agreements. What is happening here is an example of the industrial future of Australia if we ever have the misfortune of seeing Opposition policy applied in either South Australia or nationally.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Albert Park.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham does not have the call.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My apologies, Sir, I could not hear you for the noise. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government seek advice from the Crown Solicitor on the following: can a council which sets its rates subsequently send out amending rate notices after receiving amending valuations from the Valuer-General? I have been approached by a number of angry constituents who are ratepayers in the Woodville council area. They are concerned because they have been issued with rate notices and later forwarded amended notices asking them to pay an amount over and above the original amount. I am advised that a large number of other ratepayers are in the same situation.

The extra amounts required are apparently based on reevaluatons or amended valuations put out by the Valuer-General's office. Under the Local Government Act, a council may adopt the valuations of the Valuer-General for rating purposes. Section 171 (3) *(a)* provides:

> Where a council adopts valuations of the Valuer-General, the most recent valuations available to the council at the time that the council adopts its estimates of income and expenditure under Part 9 will govern the assessment of rates for the financial year.

I am advised that the date of adoption of the Woodville council's income and expenditure estimates was 13 June this year. I am further informed that the amending rate notices were based on valuations received by the council from the Valuer-General's office after 13 June. I am also told that charging a rate based on a valuation received by the council after that date may breach section 171 of the Local Government Act.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will certainly refer that question to my collegue the Hon. Anne Levy in another place and bring back a report for the honourable member.

Mr ESMOND MOOSEEK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether South Australian police have interviewed or have any plans to interview Esmond Mooseek, who is now in custody in the Philippines, and who, according to the late Mr X in his evidence given to the police last year, was responsible for a heroin distribution network established in South Australia in 1985?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am quite sure that the police are anxious to interview anybody who can shed any light on any of these matters. I do not keep a running tab on the police to find out whether they are actually interviewing person A, B, C, D or E. However, if the honourable member is dead keen on getting a reply to this question, I will get one for her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

RESIDUAL CIRCUIT DEVICES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy investigate the possibility of making the installation of residual circuit devices mandatory in all new buildings? RCVs cut the flow of electricity within 20 milliseconds when a short circuit occurs. The potential for the prevention of serious injury and loss of life is enormous and it would be highly desirable for all buildings to be so equipped.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question about this important issue of electrical safety. The issue of wider use of residual current devices or earth leakage circuit breakers, as they are perhaps better known, is under active consideration. Members would be aware that this year the use of ELCBs in the building and construction industry was made compulsory. This was in recognition of the special hazards which exist on building and demolition sites, where temporary wiring, portable hand tools and perhaps wet environments are common.

It was also recognised that, because most building work is short term, it is more likely that the periodic tests to ensure that ELCBs remain functional will be carried out. Finally, because safety is a high priority on construction sites, it is probably more likely that the users of equipment in those circumstances will be aware that ELCBs are an additional line of defence, rather than something which is absolutely failsafe. ETSA is planning seminars for the general public, designed to improve public knowledge and understanding of the additional safety which can be provided by these devices. When we believe there is a general understanding of the pros and cons of ELCBs in the public arena, I think we will be in a better position to address the question of making them mandatory in all new buildings.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Agriculture now give top priority to establishing why loans are no longer available through the State Bank under the Loans to Producers Act, and do something about it?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, we did have a late night. The Minister's presence made it longer. Yesterday, the member for Chaffey gave an example of a company in the Riverland—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister listening? Yesterday, the member for Chaffey gave an example of a company in the Riverland that had loans approved under the Act, only to be told that that approval had been withdrawn because no funds were available. Yesterday, members of a Hills cooperative, who had experienced similar problems, came to see me. In March they were told that a loan of $24 000 had been approved. The documentation was drawn up, but about a month later they were told that no funds were available. In the meantime, they had gone ahead and bought a grader for the fruit cooperative operation, which, as I said, cost $24 000. The cooperative was then told to go to a bank to arrange a bridging loan—

at an interest rate of about 22 per cent. They have now been told that there are no funds available this financial year under the Loans to Producers Act. The extra interest is about $1 300. These two examples indicate that companies have had loans approved, but no money is available, and it does not look as though that money will be made available. I point out that this Act has been operating successfully for 60 years, providing this essential service to these producers. What will the Minister do about this situation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In the first instance, I take offence at the suggestion made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I was holding up the debate on the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill last night. If anything, I was trying to be as accommodating as possible to the House. The other point is that I will certainly follow up the question raised by the honourable member and have the report brought down as soon as possible.

FOUNDATION SA

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health say how much is being spent by Foundation SA on its 'Healthy State' advertising campaign? Has Foundation SA made any assessment of the impact of the campaign? What themes will be featured in future advertisements, and is the Minister satisfied with the comparative amounts being allocated to advertising and arts and sport sponsorship?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is a lot of detail in the honourable member's question on which I will have to seek advice and bring back a full report. This very important body, which was set up by legislation in this Parliament, monitors very closely the effectiveness of its promotional advertising. I believe that the balance of the funding between the arts, sport and recreation and health promotion areas is about right. It will be subject to further examination by the foundation as time goes on.

It is important that we keep in mind that one of the principles laid down by the Parliament during the passage of the legislation was not only that there should be replacement spending by the foundation for those sport and art bodies subject to tobacco sponsorship but also that there should be assistance for the signage industry (if that is the proper term) which itself had relied fairly heavily on tobacco advertising. The thrust of the 'Eat less fat' type hoardings that one sees around the streets not only is to ensure proper health promotion—as important as that may be—but also is part of the replacement expenditure that previously flowed to that industry from tobacco advertising. I am quite satisfied.

I believe that most people are satisfied with the thrust of the foundation's programs to date. Obviously it is only sensible to continue to assess promotional campaigns aimed at smoking, eating behaviour that leads to obesity and those sort of things to ensure that the money is being spent wisely and that that will continue. However, I will obtain information on specific expenditure for the honourable member.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR MANUFACTURING

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology investigate whether confidential company information given to the tripartite committee of the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing has been passed on to trade unions improperly? I have been approached by a company director who last year sought assistance through the Centre for Manufacturing under the National Industry Extension Service (NIES). The centre is the delivery agency and point of contact in South Australia for assistance under this service, which has the main aim of assisting companies in the pursuit of international competitiveness and export success.

I understand that a tripartite committee administered by the Centre for Manufacturing, involving employer and union representatives, considers all approaches for assistance in South Australia. Information is provided to this committee by interested parties on the understanding that confidentiality is guaranteed. However, the company director to whom I have referred and who contacted me expressed serious concern about the disclosure of information given by his company to the committee.

He became aware of its unauthorised disclosure after being approached by a union official who told him that his application to the National Industry Extension Service would be approved if the company allowed union representation of its work force. What concerns this company director and me is that information about the application to NIES could have come only from the tripartite committee. He believes this experience suggests that all South Australian applications to NIES may be filtered by the trade union movement to ensure that only companies that employ union labour receive this assistance.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly ask the Centre for Manufacturing and the NIES State Advisory Committee to provide a report on the allegations made by the honourable member. The honourable member is quite correct in his statement that any information provided to the NIES State Advisory Committee is done so on a commercial in-confidence basis and should not leave that committee. A couple of comments were made to me earlier about concern regarding the commercial confidentiality of that committee, but people who made that comment, when it was further pursued, said that they were quite comfortable with the way the committee operated. The honourable member is making a separate episode, which I will have fully investigated.

The Centre for Manufacturing produces quarterly reports. Those reports come to me as one of the two beneficial shareholders in the Centre for Manufacturing and, with the approval of the board of the Centre for Manufacturing, those quarterly reports are circulated to the management committee of the Manufacturing Advisory Council, which is also a tripartite body on a commercial in-confidence basis. Names of companies are sometimes included in those quarterly reports, although no details of the applications being approved and being processed are given. I will certainly obtain a report for the honourable member.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In relation to Saudi Arabia's rejection of live sheep shipments from Australia, have any shipments from South Australia been rejected and what steps have been taken to protect this State's investment in the export trade? Up to one-third of Australia's annual live sheep exports have been loaded through the Port of Adelaide. It has been estimated that this injects about $44 million annually into South Australia's economy. It has also been estimated that about 1 000 non-farm jobs depend on this trade. Number 1 berth at Outer Harbor was upgraded at a cost of about $3 million in order to handle live sheep. Considerable expense was also incurred in providing water to feed lots in the Virginia area for this live sheep trade.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question and this is a serious issue for the livestock trade in South Australia. Five shipments have not been permitted to land in Saudi Arabia as a result of claims made by the Saudi authorities that there were infected sheep amongst the sheep that were to land there. I use the word 'claims' quite deliberately, because we do not accept that these sheep were infected or the claims of blue tongue infestation or sheep pox infestation, because those diseases simply were not amongst the sheep in Australia.

When the first two shipments were rejected, we said that the Saudi authorities should send samples, I think to Redford, in the United Kingdom, so that tests could be carried out. The information could then quickly be obtained and the sheep could be removed from the ship. That suggestion was not accepted. However, I can affirm that the sheep have not been allowed to stay on the ship; they went further up the gulf to Kuwait, where they were disported in Kuwait and sold. These incidents could have a very serious impact on our trade. Obviously, we have to return to a proper understanding about how we identify, in real terms, whether or not there is any infection amongst the sheep. We must be guaranteed here that we are not the victims of a trade related mechanism—an on tariff measure—of which frankly this incident seems to reek.

A delegation arrived in Saudi Arabia last weekend. It was organised by the AMLC and the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy to try to sort out the matter. Until such time as it is sorted out, further shipments are to be suspended. However, I noted that a press report yesterday suggested that Dalgety Bennetts Farmers has been requested to supply more sheep. My advice is that, for the next few weeks, the issue will not directly affect shipments from here, because no ships were due to call at the Port of Adelaide to pick up more sheep bound for Saudi Arabia until late September, so we have until then to sort out this matter.

However, the prospect that it may be an on tariff measure to try to block out our trade is a very difficult one indeed and I am not sure how ultimately we can overcome that if this delegation from the AMLC and the Federal Government is unable to achieve success in Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is not the only possible export destination for Australian live sheep. We will examine our relationships with other markets and, if one market is turning sour on us, we will ensure that we have things more comfortably protected in other market situations.

SPORTS INSTITUTE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport received any advice from the Chief Executive Officer of his department in relation to his investigation of the business activities of Messrs Nunan and Craig of the Sports Institute? Is the Minister able to indicate, at the very least, whether the Chief Executive Officer gave these two employees of the Sports Institute any form of permission to engage in business activities in accordance with regulations under the Government Management and Employment Act, and can the Minister say when he expects to report fully to Parliament on this matter?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In reply to a question from the member for Bragg I reported yesterday that I had formally referred the matter to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Recreation and Sport. He is undertaking the appropriate inquiries and following the appropriate steps in accordance with the Government Management and Employment Act.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You're not going to tell us.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It would be inappropriate for me to say anything at this stage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you. The member for Coles said that I have had a week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Premier and the Deputy Leader to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am aware that the Chief Executive Officer, displaying his usual confidence and skill as an administrator, will no doubt be undertaking all the appropriate steps in accordance with the provisions of the Government Management and Employment Act. He has obviously consulted the appropriate officers in other departments with regard to the conduct of any inquiry. I am sure that he will proceed with great speed to ensure that the inquiry is conducted properly and finalised.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I hope this is not a witchhunt, but I get the distinct impression that the member for Coles is again embarking on one of those witchhunts for which she is renowned. It concerns me to see the Opposition impugning the activities of Parliament by embarking on such a witchhunt. The necessary steps will be taken by the Chief Executive Officer, in whom I have full confidence, and when I receive the report from him I will deal with it appropriately.

PARALLAM TIMBER

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Forests. How does the Canadian developed timber product parallam compare with the Australian developed scrimber product soon to go into production at the new factory in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. While there are some similarities between parallam and scrimber, there are also significant differences. Parallam is manufactured in a process which starts with high quality veneer taken from peeler logs and breaks the veneer down into a multitude of thin section strips. The individual strips are oriented in the same direction, adhesive applied and the conglomerate is compressed and cured in a press. Scrimber is manufactured from immature forest thinnings which are crushed longitudinally and turned into a mat of interconnected fibres. These mats are then glue-coated and thatched one on top of the other before hot pressing.

Parallam is designed as a high strength, structural timber having properties and characteristics not unlike those of LVL and laminated beams. In structural terms, it is stronger than scrimber, but it has three major disadvantages relative to the South Australian product. First, it is manufactured from high cost, high quality peeler logs whereas scrimber is a process which converts low value, low quality forest products into high value, high strength structural beams. Secondly, the price of parallam is around three times that of scrimber. Thirdly, whereas scrimber uses eight to 12-year-old plantation forest timber, parallam is consuming 50 to 100-year-old forests.

In simple terms, scrimber will serve markets which require large section, long length material of predictable strength, having been produced from relatively young forests. The pressure to fell older, more mature native forests will thereby be reduced, with significant environmental benefits. We

believe that these differences make the development of the scrimber technology much more significant than the development of parallam.

BUDGET

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Premier give a guarantee that this House will have the opportunity to fully assess and debate the budget he is introducing this afternoon?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Davenport is relating back to his old electorate (Fisher) and is fishing for an election date, I imagine. I cannot help the honourable member in that respect.

FISHING GUIDE

Mr RANN (Briggs): My question is also about fishing. Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport request the South Australian Recreation Institute to expand its program of producing recreational fishing guides to help the tens of thousands of South Australians who each week enjoy recreational fishing at locations around our State?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. He is renowned for his fishing. I am delighted to be able to play a part in this announcement, because it is important to the amateur fisherperson, or fisher as the angler is more often known these days. The amateur angler obviously needs as much support, encouragement and information as possible. Having been a poor example of an angler myself, I know how much one relies on the newspapers or the information provided through the television medium. I am delighted to say that, with the support of industry, we have produced what I regard as a useful hand guide for all those people interested especially in fishing in the gulf areas of South Australia, as well as in the Port River, West Lakes, the metropolitan beaches and jetties, and the Onkaparinga River.

I believe that those of us who try to catch the odd whiting or tommy ruff will get valuable assistance from these guides. One thing that the department has identified in the community is that not enough specific information is available about where there may be a reef under a conservation area or a controlled fishing environment, about what controls are enforced, or about the catch sizes that are allowable for each species. That information is contained in the booklet, as well as likely fishing areas, tide information, etc., in terms of an overall fishing guide for anglers.

These anglers' guides have been put together to help in locating and identifying the type of fish, where it is likely to be found, how anglers can best get there, and how they can best achieve the catch, because it is not easy to catch fish. Certainly, with the increase in the number of people fishing in our gulf waters and rivers it is important that they have available as much information as possible.

I wish to thank a number of people who have been involved in getting this group of brochures together. First, I refer to John Huie whose text, photography and editing have been part of the process. The Marine and Harbors Department has prepared the maps for our use. The Got One fishing tackle store has supported the project financially, and that is to its credit because this is an excellent brochure. Indeed, I understand from their comments that people from other States have indicated clearly that it is a useful guide for them when they come to South Australia and do not know our waters. I am delighted to acknowledge these people and to place on record what we have achieved. I hope that we can provide even more information, and I thank the member for Briggs for his question.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Will the Minister of Education say whether the State Government will increase grants from 1990 to organisations funded under the Commonwealth Government's special education services program to make up for the shortfall in funds caused by the Commonwealth Government's decision to reduce funding from 1990?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question on an important issue. Obviously, we in South Australia do not want to see a diminution of effort in the important field of special education. I have made personal representations on this matter to the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training (Mr Dawkins) on a number of occasions, and I am confident that the Commonwealth Government will reverse its previous decision with respect to these programs in South Australia and Victoria.

Already in Victoria the Commonwealth Government has made concessions to that State in relation to the provision of funds to maintain at least the *status quo* on these important programs. The Commonwealth Government has made its decisions in respect of South Australia and Victoria (indeed South Australia has been the harder hit of those two States) on the basis that the standard of services provided in this State far exceeded those in other States.

Therefore, it proposed to take some funding from this State and from Victoria and provide it to those States where it had been assessed that services were not at the required or appropriate standards. We in South Australia reject that philosophy and we have argued that very strongly in our discussions with the Commonwealth. I will continue to debate this matter with the Commonwealth. I am confident that the matter can be resolved. In fact, in the past two financial years we have succeeded in having that decision to cut our funds deferred so that this matter could be further considered. I can assure the House that I will do everything within my power to ensure that there is no reduction of resources to those programs.

URBAN CONSOLIDATION

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning tell the House what are the implications for South Australia of the new Commonwealth guidelines on urban consolidation? The Minister of Housing and Construction has repeatedly outlined in this place details of the efforts of the South Australian Housing Trust to provide quality public housing and to carry out inner urban developments according to the principles of urban consolidation. It is the view of many people in suburbs such as Brighton that the cost of strata titled units and other medium density developments is excessive and that private developers have profited considerably by selectively developing older suburbs to maintain a sellers' market.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. An Australian model code for residential development was released in Sydney on Monday by the Federal Minister for Science, Customs and Small Business (Hon. Barry Jones). The code was developed by a task force on which South Australia was well represented.

The code promises more affordable new houses through, for example, more efficient use of land and through a variety of different sized allotments.

This Government has already adopted many of these ideas, and through the careful balancing of releasing land ahead of demand—in other words, with supply slightly preceding the demand—Adelaide's fringe land prices are the envy of interstate cities. The State Government is successfully protecting first home buyers in Adelaide from the escalating land prices which are crippling their counterparts in other States. The Government and private land developers deserve credit for keeping the price of Adelaide allotments, particularly on the fringe areas, very low.

I want to put to the House some of the statistics which support what I am saying. Between March of last year and this year the average price of land in the fringe areas of Adelaide rose only 1 per cent, to just over $28 500. This compares with $60 000 in Sydney, $38 000 in Melbourne and Perth, up to $30 000 in Brisbane and $29 000 in Canberra.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very interesting that these statistics are causing some discomfort to members on the Opposition benches—and it is because this information has been acknowledged around Australia as highlighting where South Australia's and particularly Adelaide's fringe land prices stand. There are only two capital cities, Hobart and Darwin, with lower average land prices. I do not have to remind Opposition members that both Hobart and Darwin are geographically isolated. The new code—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members not to shout down the Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The truth always hurts the Opposition, sadly, Mr Speaker, but I intend to continue. The new code also promises a greater choice in housing styles, while maintaining the Australian dream of a house and garden in a high quality residential environment. Once again, this parallels many of the ideals that this Government has in its approach to urban consolidation and, in fact, encourages a type of subdivision which South Australians already enjoy.

Golden Grove, for example, is one such innovative subdivision. The model code is a well-presented and well-thought out document and it will provide inspiration and support to a range of users, including local government and private enterprise, in exercising a responsibility towards residential standards. The model code is seen by this Government as a very useful and comprehensive document which supports the overall aims of urban consolidation in South Australia.

EDUCATION DISPUTE ADVERTISEMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. I refer to a half-page advertisement in last Thursday's *Advertiser* urging support for the Government's curriculum guarantee offer to the Teachers Institute which, according to a statement contained in the advertisement, was funded by 'an anonymous donor'. I ask the Minister whether any public funds were contributed to its cost.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I can assure the honourable member and all members of the House that no Government funds were used. The advertisement was not solicited by the Government. I was rather surprised to see that degree of interest and commitment by the major parent organisation in this State towards the package that has been advanced in recent times to bring about very substantial improvements to the lot of teachers in our schools in South Australia. Those members who take the trouble to read the documentation about that package that has been distributed widely will see what benefits it will bring, not only to teachers but also to the educational opportunities that we need and indeed are obliged to provide if we are to accept the very real challenges placed on our schools and the whole education system as we move into the 21st century.

I very much commend the interest and support that not only that particular parent organisation has shown but other parent organisations and, indeed, school councils and parents throughout the State in our education system. Their commitment to education is vital if we are to form a partnership that will provide those educational opportunities that I am sure we all seek.

POLLUTED WATER PURIFICATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Has the Minister for Environment and Planning seen reports that describe the successful use of sunlight to purify polluted water? I am advised that this unique method can be used to reduce or destroy most organic materials such as solvents and dioxins. I draw the Minister's attention to an article that appeared in the *West Australian* newspaper of Friday 11 August. In referring to a Los Angeles report, it stated:

> Sunlight has been successfully put to work to clean polluted water by a unique 'solar scrubber' developed in the United States.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I might explain to the House that part of the reason why I believe the member has asked this question is, as the member for Albert Park, he has the Port Adelaide sewage treatment plant in his electorate and has for some time shown an interest in any new technology which might assist the department in dealing with sewage in this State. I have had my attention drawn to the article in the *West Australian* of 11 August. While the process described is one that exists in the United States, a very similar process to that described in the newspaper article is currently under study in Australia by a group headed by Dr Ralph Matthews, the CSIRO division head of fuel technology in New South Wales.

Information obtained from a member of the research group suggests that under laboratory conditions the process is very effective in the breakdown of a variety of chlorinated organic compounds including trihalomethanes, chlorophenols and dioxins. The process produces hydroxide 'radicals' at the surface of the titanium dioxide catalyst particles by the action of ultraviolet radiation from sunlight.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is a long time since I have done chemistry, I must confess, but it is very interesting to brush up on it from time to time. The radicals oxidise the organic compounds to carbon dioxide and dilute hydrochloric acid. Two patents are held by Dr Matthews for use of this process in a new organic carbon analyser developed by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. The group further intends to investigate the process for the treatment—and this is the relevant point—of sewage plant effluents and industrial wastes. Hence the relevance to my constituent who is, as I said, among other things, the member for the Port Adelaide sewerage treatment plant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

URBAN LAND TRUST

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): My question is to the Minister of Lands. Is the Urban Land Trust planning to purchase by compulsory acquisition about 1 200 acres of land west of South Road in the Aldinga beach area? If so, for what purpose is it making this purchase and why has there been no liaison with the Willunga council in relation to this move? I have been informed that the trust has purchased, or is about to purchase, a large area of land in that region. However, it has also been reported to me that there has been a lack of liaison with the District Council of Willunga. Further, it has been reported that the trust is proceeding as though the supplementary development plan for the area, required in planning for the ill-fated Sellicks Beach marina, has been approved when, in fact, to date it has not.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I think the honourable member might also be referring to what could only be described as a beat-up in an article on the front page of the *Southern Times*, which made a whole range of allegations, including the allegation that the Urban Land Trust was purchasing this huge tract of land at Aldinga to provide a home for a Japanese village—the concept of a multifunction polis was mentioned. But, the whole implication was that the Urban Land Trust was providing the groundwork so that a whole Japanese community could be transported, no doubt willy-nilly, straight into the Aldinga area. If the honourable member had read the article and the response from the Urban Land Trust, he would not have had to ask this question.

The Urban Land Trust, quite properly, is going about its business. I remind the honourable member that the role and function of the Urban Land Trust, as I stated in answer to a previous question, is to purchase land on the fringes of the City of Adelaide to ensure that the supply of land in South Australia is kept ahead of demand. This is part of our success in this State under a number of Governments of both political persuasions in terms of keeping our land prices affordable, particularly for first-home buyers.

I am very happy to tell the honourable member that, as I understand it, the Urban Land Trust is intending to purchase land in the Aldinga area. I cannot cite exact acreage or hectare figures and I cannot tell the honourable member whether there has been detailed discussions with the District Council of Willunga. I would be happy to obtain that information and to provide it for the honourable member. However, I feel that it is important that we acknowledge the role and function of the Urban Land Trust in this State. It is one of the most successful bodies in terms of ensuring that we have an adequate bank of land available for housing at the fringes of Adelaide and that land and housing is affordable.

Whilst members opposite pooh-poohed my statistics earlier, it is a fact that land prices in Adelaide, in comparison with the mainland capital cities—with the exception of Darwin—are the cheapest in Australia. I would have thought that the Opposition might have welcomed that; that they might have for once been positive. They might have said, 'Isn't it good to see the Urban Land Trust performing its role and function so positively and so effectively.'

No, they all had to knock the statistics. Now we have the member for Alexandra asking questions, trying to discredit the Urban Land Trust and the people who serve on that trust. I put on record (and in my capacity as Minister for Environment and Planning) that I am delighted with the role and function of the Urban Land Trust. I am certainly very supportive of what it is doing and I am happy to provide the other piece of detailed information for the honourable member.

CYCLING VELODROME

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House of progress with the cycling velodrome soon to be built at Gepps Cross?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price. His interest in cycling goes back to his early days when he was a champion and distinguished cyclist. I am delighted to have his support for the development of the velodrome, for our academy and for cycling in South Australia. There have been some developments on the velodrome itself. This Government is committed to building the velodrome in this State and the program and planning is well under way for construction, which was due to commence in November this year. We have had some difficulty with regard to the track. We have considered a timber surface. Unfortunately, the only timber surface that would survive with any longevity in our environment would have to be constructed of rainforest hardwood.

As a consequence of the concern within the community and, I am sure, amongst members of this House, about the constant removal of rainforest timbers, and given the Federal Government's announcement and our commitment as a State Government, we find it impossible to make a decision that would mean that hardwood from a rainforest in Malaysia, South America or Russia would be used as a timber surface on the track. The other alternative in the construction of the velodrome at the International Sports Park at Gepps Cross is a cement surface. That is quite acceptable at an international level, because a number of the international tracks are cement.

I understand that competition at world events is regularly on cement surfaces. That is our only real alternative at this point. After discussions with various experts who have been consulted by the architects and the Department of Recreation and Sport we believe that, if we are considering timber, there are grave question marks about durability. There have been serious accidents with timber surfaces. For example, on the Launceston track one of our national riders was severely speared by a splinter of timber.

In order to avoid any question of putting our riders at risk, the Government would have to make a decision to go to a cement surface. I assure the member for Price and the large cycling community in South Australia and nationally that we will be launching into the development of that velodrome. The plans are well advanced and we are in a situation of having to finalise the decision on the surface. Given the imminent announcements, that will confirm our commitment and the cycling community will be reassured. I know that the member for Price and other members accept that we must decide on the surface. The velodrome will go ahead.

South Australia is the centre for cycling nationally and that will continue. The development of services related to the velodrome are being considered so that we can see our cyclists going off to the Commonwealth Games and the Barcelona Olympics and bringing back medals. That will be significant from our viewpoint, because South Australia will be the focus of cycling.

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

Mr BECKER (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Will the total redevel-

opment of the Hindmarsh soccer stadium cost an estimated $15 million and, if so, how much of this does the South Australian Government intend to contribute and within what time frame?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am delighted to be able to respond. The development proposal, which has been agreed between the South Australian Soccer Federation and the Hindmarsh council, basically involves two stages. The first stage will involve the provision of lighting and the development of the western stand and a new eastern stand. The commitment over the next two years will be for $3.9 million. Obviously, the development of stands at the northern and southern ends will be part of any future plans for soccer. We will certainly play a part in such plans, and I hope that any future Government will support such plans and development.

Obviously, the Hindmarsh council is vitally interested in seeing this area developed and, from our point of view, this commitment to soccer will ensure that some very significant soccer events will be held here in the future. The development of the western stand will include increased undercover seating for 1 500 to 1 800 people, 12 corporate boxes, an enclosed media facility, a public bar and a service facility. The initial stage will also involve increasing the lighting to 1 200 lux, so that it is then brought up to international television standards. I hope that that will be completed by early 1990, so that the Hindmarsh stadium will then have international lighting levels.

The proposed development of the eastern stand allows for retail and office facilities under the stand itself. The whole complex will belong to soccer. The revenue from those facilities, which is estimated to be about $700 000 per annum, will be returned to soccer, over and above sponsorship and support received from Government and other sources, and this will enable further development of the stadium complex.

I hope that the Hindmarsh stadium will be not only the home for local soccer but also the venue for events such as the World Youth Cup, and I am sure that the member for Hanson would support that statement. If Melbourne is successful in its bid to stage the Olympics, South Australia will certainly stage one of the group matches—probably the South American group—so perhaps that group or the Oceania-Asian group will be located in Adelaide when that series of matches is played. In that event, the Argentinians, the Chileans or another famous team could be located here for that series of the Olympics. The Victorian Olympic Committee and the Victorian Government have given me the commitment that part of the soccer program will be staged here, and Hindmarsh will be the venue for it. It would be the highlight of the 1990s if Olympic Games premier teams played at the Hindmarsh stadium.

The commitment of $3.9 million over the next two years is a most significant Government commitment to soccer. It will lay the foundation for soccer to go from strength to strength. The stadium will become the focal point for national and league soccer in this State. Of course, junior soccer will also be involved and the soccer administration will have a home there. The two major teams (and it is hoped that Hellas can return to the national league) will be located there, so it will be a total focal point for soccer in this State. Soccer supporters—of whom I am one, as I am sure other members are—will applaud the development of this facility. This is the first significant home soccer has had nationally. There is no ground equivalent, nor will there be, throughout Australia which has this facility. This is a first for soccer in that sense. It will obviously offer a significant opportunity for soccer to develop, both at the league and at junior level.

FOUNDATION SA

Ms DIANNE GAYLER (Newland): My question is to the Minister of Health as the Minister responsible for Foundation South Australia. Will the Minister hold discussions with Foundation South Australia regarding its recreation and sport funding to ensure that the foundation does not overlook the needs of outer suburban areas which have fewer sporting facilities, and which have a greater proportion of young people, along with a heavy demand on limited local clubs?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The legislation makes clear that I have no right of direction so far as Foundation South Australia is concerned, nor would it be appropriate that I should have so. I imagine that Foundation South Australia would be aware that the funds should go where the greatest demand and the greatest need exists. In so far as the development of sport amongst youth is concerned, that would be very much in the direction that would be applauded by the honourable member or any members representing younger constituencies. The best I can do is assure that the foundation is aware of the honourable member's advocacy and for it to make its own decisions.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Will the Minister of Transport review the formula for the allocation of road grants to councils to ensure that a greater provision of funds is made available for catch-up provisions? As all members would have noted the formula for the allocation of road funds to councils is based on a four-fold formula with length of roads, population, area of council and the proportion of council rates that goes into roads. The problem that has been found on Eyre Peninsula is that not enough provision for catch-up has been allowed, so that some of the roads are deteriorating more quickly than they are in the rest of the State. Will the Minister review that program to provide, say, 80 per cent on the formula and 20 per cent on ministerial discretion then some catch-up will be made.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the Minister for his question. I have been waiting for a question from the Opposition for almost a month, and I have been very disappointed. I feel that the member for Flinders is entitled to the most comprehensive response that I can give him. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LIVE SHEEP INDUSTRY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This information has just arrived from the Office of Primary Industry in Canberra. The delegation sent to Saudi Arabia has been unable to reach agreement on suitable procedures and an agreed quarantine practice suitable to us and the Saudis. The proposal was for an independent agency of Australian representatives to be involved in the vetting of shipments to Saudi Arabia.

The delegation has since travelled to several Middle Eastern countries to ensure that they are aware of and recognise Australia's disease free status. This has been acknowledged by various countries visited. What has been recognised by the delegation with respect to the Saudi situation is that we are facing a political rather than a quarantine problem. There has been no reaction yet from Saudis to the ban on shipments. A letter has been presented to the Saudi Minister of Trade who has not previously been involved, and we are now awaiting his answer on the matters raised.

Reports of a ban on a shipment to Qatar are not correct. We are working with Qatar officials following a positive test to a particular infection although this is suspected to be a faulty test result. At this stage, our only problem in terms of turning back shipments remains Saudi Arabia, and that is an issue which has to be taken up at a national level by the Minister for Primary Industry and the Minister for trade. The delegation is still in the Middle East and is ready to respond to any initiative from the Saudi Minister of Trade and/or the Saudi Government.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer, 1989-90 (P.P. 18)
Estimates of Receipts, 1989-90 (P.P. 7)
Estimates of Payments, 1989-90 (P.P. 9)
Economic Conditions and the Budget, 1989-90 (P.P. 11)
Capital Works Program, 1989-90 (P.P. 83)
The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy, 1989-90 (P.P. 30)
The Budget and Its Impact on Women, 1989-90 (P.P. 81)
Certificate Required under Standing Order No. 297
South Australian Government Financing Authority—Report, 1988-89

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of moneys from Consolidated Account for the financial year ending on 30 June 1990; to authorise the Treasurer to borrow money for public purposes; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

BUDGET SPEECH 1989-90

In doing so I present the Budget for 1989-90.

This is a Budget which sets out the priorities for the coming year and for the beginning of the next decade; the right priorities set in the framework of realistic State finances.

It recognises the need to further adjust and realign the activities of Government as necessary for the continuing balanced development of South Australia.

The State is today reaping the rewards of this Government's good economic and financial management.

This Budget continues responsible control of the State's finances, ensuring that spending programs reflect the needs of the community without resorting to massive borrowing or any increases in tax rates.

While Australia continues to face significant economic challenges, in the case of South Australia, our prospects are now brighter than they have been for some years.

We can look forward to the 1990's with confidence.

In achieving this result, we have had to overcome enormous difficulties during a period when Australia has experienced the most severe economic crisis of a generation.

As a State we have had to deal with the biggest reductions in Commonwealth funding since World War II.

However, the last seven years have been a period of recovery and growing optimism.

We have rebuilt the foundations of our economy. Dollar by dollar, we have restored the State's finances.

The 1989-90 Budget confirms how benefits can flow from proper economic management.

In considering this year's Budget, it is important to look at the consolidation of South Australia's finances over the past two years.

In 1987-88 the Consolidated Account Surplus of $34.4 million helped pay back the accumulated deficit of $63 million we inherited from the previous Government.

Last year we achieved a recurrent surplus of $83 million much of which is to be returned in tax concessions for first home buyers and small business.

The last two years have confirmed the fundamental strength of South Australia's finances.

This strength has been achieved through the efforts of all South Australians and in this Budget we intend to use the anticipated recurrent surplus to reduce the borrowing needs of the capital program.

The contrasts are quite dramatic when you consider State finances under the previous Government.

In 1982-83 we inherited a situation where money was being borrowed from the capital account to pay for the day to day expenses of Government. However, this year, by contrast, we are again able to make a contribution from our recurrent account to our capital works program.

This is a strong and flexible Budget, which recognises the need to balance spending and revenue measures throughout the community.

However, as I will outline shortly, we have further realigned our spending to meet the needs of South Australian families for basic services of health, education and transport within the financial discipline that has been developed by this Government.

As I said to the House 16 days ago, we reject the easy solution of reckless spending which would impose debt burdens on our children and generations beyond.

This Budget places high priority on further strengthening our economy, in primary industry, in manufacturing and in the services sector.

All businesses will benefit from real reductions in charges and continuing tax relief.

And the supporting infrastructure for economic development will be strengthened in areas such as skill training.

This Budget places high priority on maintaining and improving basic services for families and others in our community, particularly in health and education.

Services in this State are already, in many cases, the envy of those elsewhere. They will be even further improved in the coming year.

Our commitment to social justice is reflected in better services for those in our community suffering greatest disadvantage.

Opportunities for employment and training will be expanded, particularly to increase the options available to youth.

The availability of concessions and services for the aged will be widened.

This Budget places a high priority on confronting crime.

South Australia is a safe place in which to live. We want this security maintained, through a two pronged attack on crime, with additional police resources and a wide ranging crime prevention strategy.

This Budget places high priority on housing.

Many more families will be assisted in home-ownership, and in public housing.

We continue to place high priority on protection of the environment. This Government recognises the need to preserve what we have, and where possible, restore some of what we have lost.

The Budget is directed at maintaining our record as a low tax State.

I have already announced benefits from a significant cut in payroll tax, relief from land tax and benefits from a cut in stamp duty for first-home buyers. Altogether the rate of growth in State taxes is expected to fall behind inflation by at least thirty per cent.

This is in addition to real reductions in State charges for electricity, public transport and motor vehicle third party insurance.

Budget outlays are expected to fall in real terms.

Budget borrowing will be reduced for the third year in a row.

This reflects our continuing program of careful financial management.

In short, this is a Budget to help South Australia take the lead in the 1990's.

1988-89 IN REVIEW

Mr Speaker, before presenting the Budget in detail, it is appropriate to review economic and financial developments over the last year.

Our economy experienced good rates of growth in 1988-89.

Employment growth in South Australia exceeded the national average.

Growth in housing approvals exceeded the national average.

Construction of offices and other buildings reached record real levels.

Our primary producers benefited from high commodity prices.

Manufacturing industry had a very good year, especially new motor vehicle manufacturing.

The submarine project began to impact on the economy, while the Roxby Downs mine began production.

The unemployment rate is still too high, although there is record employment in South Australia.

Retail sales have been weaker than we would like.

The level of interest rates is a major concern, particularly because of its impact on home buyers.

Nonetheless overall economic performance in 1988-89 was the best for several years, without reaching the unsustainable levels which have been a problem in other States.

The State Government's financial position also improved significantly in 1988-89, reflecting sound management and South Australia's good economic performance.

The 1988-89 Budget planned for a budget financing requirement of $226 million.

As I have already informed the House, the actual result was significantly better.

Recurrent payments were $34 million below the Budget, reflecting the Government's policy of tight expenditure control, together with favourable developments in a number of areas.

Recurrent receipts (excluding the SAFA surplus) improved by $72.4 million, reflecting in particular improvements in Commonwealth receipts, gambling revenue and stamp duty.

As a result it was possible to reduce the SAFA contribution to the Budget to $294 million.

The financing requirement for 1988-89 was $199 million, a 12 per cent reduction on the budgeted figure of $226 million and a reduction of almost 36 per cent on the 1987-88 outcome of $310 million.

In taking account of the broader public sector performance, in addition to the Budget outcome, the State's net debt at the end of 1988-89 was estimated to be 15.7 per cent of Gross State Product, compared with almost 23 per cent at the end of 1982-83. This is amongst the lowest levels of net indebtedness of any State.

Mr Speaker, this is an excellent foundation for the State's future.

By rebuilding the economy and by rejecting the easy option of big spending, we have restored the State's finances.

In terms of financial strength we are already one of the leaders, on a State by State basis.

Considering the difficulties we have experienced this is a major achievement.

THE YEAR AHEAD

We may confidently look to the year ahead.

Growth is not expected to be as high in the coming year, but in South Australia it should at least equal the national level.

This State has not reached the same unsustainable levels of activity, particularly in the real estate and building sector, as is the case in some other States.

Accordingly, South Australia is expected to perform well compared with other States.

We can also be confident in terms of the financial outlook.

Commonwealth funding for this State in 1989-90 is better than for many years.

Overall the Commonwealth has reduced general purpose funding to the States and Northern Territory by $550 million against its forward estimates in 1989-90.

However, South Australia is set to benefit from revisions to the distribution of financial assistance grants between States.

This distribution is based on the recommendations of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, an independent Commonwealth authority.

In recent years the Commission's recommendations have reduced the benefits to South Australia flowing from fiscal equalisation. However, in 1989-90 they will benefit South Australia, reflecting in effect a redistribution of funding from the eastern States, particularly New South Wales.

As a result of this favourable change, general revenue grants for South Australia are expected to virtually remain constant in real terms.

South Australia's borrowing authority under the Loan Council's Global Limits however has been further reduced, by about 19 per cent in real terms, to $224 million.

This will not cause particular difficulties in 1989-90 but this overall trend is a matter for concern.

In general terms, however, Mr Speaker, the outlook for 1989-90 is a good one, as is the State's longer term outlook.

BUDGET OBJECTIVES

The Government has set five objectives for the 1989-90 Budget.

First, to maintain and improve basic services such as health, education and public transport.

Second, to provide additional resources in the high priority areas of economic development, social justice, crime prevention, the environment and housing.

Third, to maintain capital spending for essential infrastructure.

Fourth, to achieve real reductions in taxes and charges.

Fifth, to maintain the State's overall sound financial position.

Each of these objectives is addressed in this Budget.

As I have already announced, there is a major increase in recurrent funding for hospitals of $11.6 million.

The Budget also provides $10.3 million for education initiatives and $1.8 million more for public transport upgrading.

Economic development is a major priority and the Budget provides extra funding of almost $7 million to boost economic development in targeted areas.

Advancement of social justice remains a high priority in this Budget, with total recurrent and capital spending of an additional $50 million across all portfolio areas.

Crime prevention, the environment and public housing have attracted extra resources, in line with the priorities of many South Australians.

Essential infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of developing suburbs, and public sector capital spending for community infrastructure will be maintained in real terms.

Major State charges will fall in real terms in the coming year.

Electricity tariffs have been reduced by around 4.2 per cent in real terms, providing savings of around $30 a year to an average family.

Other savings, in real terms, in public transport and compulsory third party insurance will mean total family savings of around $82 a year against inflation level increases.

Housing Trust tenants paying full rents will also benefit by a saving against inflation of about $130 a year.

There are no increases in State tax rates in this Budget.

As I have already announced, the Budget contains total tax reductions of $55 million.

All of this is to be achieved within a framework of strict and responsible financial management.

Total Budget outlays are expected to fall in real terms.

Recurrent spending is expected to fall in real terms.

And the budget borrowing requirement is expected to fall, for the third year in a row, to $154 million.

The financing requirement for the total public sector is expected to be well below the level budgeted for in 1988-89.

In summary, Mr Speaker, this is a Budget directed to the needs of all South Australians.

OUTLAYS

I turn now to the detail of proposed Budget outlays.

Total outlays of just over $5 billion are proposed.

Total recurrent spending is expected to increase by 6.9 per cent, just below expected inflation for Adelaide of around 7 per cent.

The contribution from the budget to the capital works program is expected to be $610 million, an increase of 6.8 per cent.

As I have already noted, one of this Government's highest objectives is maintenance and improvement of basic community services such as health, education and public transport.

I have already announced an increase in funding for public hospitals of $11.6 million, $46.4 million over four years, comprising:

$4.6 million for increased activity levels;

$5.0 million for expanded elective surgery and equipment programs; and

$2.0 million to re-open beds.

In addition the hospital system will retain the full year effect of efficiency savings made in 1988-89, meaning further hospital funds of $1.3 million.

An additional $1.4 million is also to be provided for social justice initiatives in the health system.

On the capital side, the budget provides for a large increase in expenditure on the construction and redevelopment of hospital buildings, both in Adelaide and in major country centres.

In education the Budget provides almost $7 million for the curriculum guarantee package.

The package provides for a range of initiatives to achieve improvements in the quality of education for all students in government schools.

It will be achieved through career restructuring of the teaching workforce and a range of other measures which will improve working conditions and career opportunities for teachers.

The Government will complete its commitment to the provision of more ancillary staff in schools, with provision for 100 extra staff in a full year with a cost of $1.4 million; a total increase of 400 ancillary staff.

On the capital side, schools will also benefit from the Back to School Improvement Program.

The program is designed to improve the physical learning environment in schools through high priority repair and renovation work.

The amount available this year is $10 million, realised from the sale of surplus properties.

For public transport, the Budget provides $1.8 million which will allow the STA to extend services to Moana South, Noarlunga Downs, Reynella East, Woodcroft, Happy Valley, Craigmore, Sheidow Park, Holden Hill, Modbury and Golden Grove.

Real reductions in public transport fares will further assist those using public transport.

To enhance economic development almost $7 million will be spent to target development across each of the major sectors of the economy.

South Australian rural industries are highly competitive in world terms. While the focus in recent years has been to further develop the secondary and services sectors of our economy, it is important not to neglect our basic strengths.

The Department of Agriculture is establishing a new agricultural marketing and development capacity to promote development of new and existing industries in the agricultural sector. The importance of these products in our export market will be a focus of this activity.

The Department is also investigating the feasibility of establishing a national centre for irrigation technology in Adelaide.

Such a centre could make a significant contribution to improving the efficiency of irrigation and the profitability

of the irrigation equipment industry through local and overseas sales.

Fisheries are recognised as a major export earner for South Australia.

This Budget provides for increased expenditure by the Department of Fisheries.

Particular emphasis is to be placed on research and promotion of aquaculture activities in South Australia.

Aquaculture is recognised as a significant avenue for economic development and overseas experience clearly demonstrates the market potential.

Additional resources will also be devoted to increasing research and reducing illegal poaching activities in the State's abalone fishery.

Mining is another area in which South Australia is competitive in world terms.

The Australian mining industry began in this State and recent years have seen a spectacular revival with the discoveries in the Cooper Basin and at Roxby Downs.

The Government provides support for the mining industry through the Department of Mines and Energy.

This Budget allows $22.2 million for the Department's activities, including $650,000 for drilling to identify possible sources of replacement feedstock for the Port Pirie Smelter.

South Australian manufacturing industry is now highly competitive, out performing its interstate counterparts.

It is also increasingly export oriented. For the first time manufacturing exports now exceed those of mining and agriculture combined.

Our exports include pharmaceuticals, motor vehicle parts, optical components, electrical equipment, tyres and many more.

Our customers include countries throughout the Pacific, Asia, Europe and North America.

South Australian manufacturing is already benefiting from the submarine project and will gain significantly from the Anzac frigate project, with initial work estimated at $500 million in this State.

The Budget provides a total of $21.6 million for the Department of State Development and Technology.

The Department will be concentrating its efforts in promoting commercial opportunities for the State's high technology and defence based industries.

A key area will be provision of services and infrastructure for brain based industries.

$3.7 million will be provided for initial work on development of the Southern Science Park, focused on biological science and medical technology.

Tangible results have flowed from this Government's Australian promotions with over $2 billion worth of projects being attracted to the State.

The Government will continue with this method of attracting investment.

To maintain the momentum of the past few years, the Government will be providing additional internal support for overseas trade staff and will also be conducting trade and investment missions in the priority markets of Europe and Asia.

In particular, South Australia's manufacturing sector will benefit from upgraded State representation in Japan and Europe, including the employment of a Japanese consultant to assist in negotiations with Japanese companies.

The Budget also provides for further development of one of our major industries, tourism.

With a workforce of around 25,000 full-time employees and a further 10,000 part-time, tourism is a big job creator and a key component of the State's development strategy.

Last year's Budget provided for a $1.6 million increase in the State's tourism marketing budget.

This has already produced results in terms of increased visitor numbers to the State.

This Budget provides for a further increase of $1.2 million for tourism marketing, a total increase of over 85 per cent in two years.

Associated with this, the Budget also provides funds for a feasibility study for our bid to host the 1998 Commonwealth Games and increased funding for the Convention Centre, including the Exhibition Hall.

As well as providing direct support to development of specific industries, the Government is determined to promote a favourable environment for State development in terms of transport, training and low taxes and charges.

The Budget provides funds for the Adelaide Air Access Group, with the aim of increasing the State's share of international tourists and exports of goods and services by increasing the number of international flights into Adelaide.

It also provides $2 million for a major upgrade of the Outer Harbour container berth and funds for promotion of increased shipping calls from New Zealand and the West Coast of the United States.

Achievement of additional shipping services into these regions will augment an already growing number of shipping lines from Europe and Asia calling at Port Adelaide.

The economic future of this State largely depends on having a highly trained, flexible workforce.

As I will discuss in more detail later, the Budget includes $5 million for major employment and training initiatives.

In addition the Budget provides for pre-commissioning and commissioning costs in relation to new TAFE facilities.

South Australia has the best TAFE facilities in the country to meet the new industry training challenges of the 1990's.

Workplace reform is closely related to training. The Budget provides funding for the establishment of a Workplace Resource Centre.

The Centre will provide consultancy services to enterprises embarking on award restructuring programs. It will work to ensure that this process brings benefits for enterprises and workers alike.

To ensure that our system of training is co-ordinated with our employment initiatives, the Government has decided to amalgamate the Department of Technical and Further Education, the Office of Employment and Training and the Youth Bureau to form a new Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education.

Another important component of our strategy of providing a supportive business environment is to minimise taxes and charges.

The significant real reduction in ETSA charges, the reduction in the payroll tax and the restructuring of land tax will all provide benefits to industry.

An important part of any program associated with increasing business activity is population growth.

For some years we have conducted a positive and successful program of attracting business migrants to South Australia.

As I mentioned earlier, this will continue with this Budget.

While population growth in South Australia is still below the national average, it has accelerated recently.

We are now one of only three States experiencing positive interstate migration.

Promotion of social justice is a high priority in this Budget.

Members will recall that the 1988-89 Budget provided $25 million for social justice. This Budget provides additional capital and recurrent funding of $50 million.

This includes almost $25 million for recurrent initiatives in the areas of employment and training, responses to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, initiatives for the aged and other social justice priorities.

An important social justice initiative deals with employment and training, with a total cost of $5 million. This is aimed at reducing youth unemployment through increased numbers of public service traineeships, and increased funding for TAFE prevocational training and private sector programs.

The employment and training program also provides just over $1 million to improve the employment opportunities of migrants, Aboriginals, women and other disadvantaged groups.

The Budget also provides the resources necessary to honour the Government's commitment to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody.

The Budget provides total funding of $7.7 million, including $2.3 million of recurrent funding.

This includes funding for programs to reduce Aboriginal imprisonment, to improve procedures within the prison system and to improve supervision of prisoners at key locations.

One of the most important needs of elderly people is transport.

We already have an extensive public transport concession scheme for aged pensioners, costing $8.3 million per annum. From 1 November 1989 this scheme will be expanded to include all retired people over the age of 60. This is expected to cost $1.8 million in 1989-90 and $3.1 million in a full year.

Podiatry services provided by domiciliary care will also be expanded.

A telephone advisory service, the Aged Line, will be established.

And a program for improving the security of our senior citizens' homes utilising home handyman services will be introduced.

In addition to these priorities in social justice, initiatives are also proposed in a number of other areas.

In education there will be a major program to reallocate staff to disadvantaged schools. This will cost $7.3 million this year and $17.5 million in a full year.

$1.3 million will be provided for improved welfare services, particularly in the area of substitute care.

$1.4 million will be provided for health programs.

And over $0.5 million will be provided for social justice programs in provision of children's services.

Crime prevention is another high priority in this Budget.

South Australia has a good record in this area. Grants Commission figures show that in 1987-88 we spent in excess of $10 million more than the standardised six State average on provision of police services.

However, we are determined to minimise crime, both through prevention and through providing additional resources for law enforcement.

This Budget provides $1.25 million for grants for innovative crime prevention projects sponsored by community groups, local government or State government agencies.

In addition, resources will be directed towards the establishment of further neighbourhood watch programs.

The Budget also caters for a total increase over the next three years of 152 police officers, 55 of whom will be posted to community policing.

Environmental conservation continues as a priority of this Government.

I have already referred to soil conservation.

Allied with soil conservation is the need to retain native vegetation.

South Australia has the most ambitious program of this type in the country. To date over 120,000 hectares of native scrub has been protected under this scheme.

Total funding for native vegetation retention last year was $5.6 million. This Budget provides for increased funding of $3.4 million, making a total of $9.0 million.

Better management of dangerous agricultural and veterinary chemicals is also a major environmental issue. This Budget provides $1.5 million for improved management in this area.

This Government has made major improvements in the housing conditions of South Australians.

Since 1982 we have provided 16,000 additional houses through the Housing Trust and 16,300 additional concessional loans through the State Bank. New and innovative programs have also been introduced.

Funding is provided in this Budget for an additional 1,950 dwellings through the Housing Trust.

This will bring the total number of rental dwellings built or acquired by the Trust to almost 18,000 since 1982, the largest increase for any comparable period in the Trust's history.

I have already announced increases in Stamp Duty relief for first home buyers.

The exemption level will be raised from $50,000 to $80,000.

This will cost $4 million in a full year and applies from 9 August 1989.

The benefit for purchasers of houses valued at $80,000 and above is $1,050.

This will make it significantly easier for young South Australian families to purchase their own homes.

Mr Speaker, these initiatives will all make a positive contribution to our goals for South Australia in the 1990's.

We have already come a long way towards achieving these goals.

These measures will take us further, without jeopardising our priorities to achieve real reductions in taxes and to maintain the State's sound financial position.

REVENUE

Total revenue (excluding the SAFA contribution) is expected to grow by 6.6 per cent in 1989-90, a reduction of 0.4 per cent in real terms.

As I have already announced, the Budget offers two major taxation concessions in addition to stamp duty relief.

Relief will be targeted at payroll tax and land tax.

Together with Queensland, South Australia is the only State or Territory which does not impose a payroll tax surcharge on large employers.

This is reflected in Grants Commission comparisons which show that payroll tax is much lower in South Australia than in other States.

We are also concerned to ensure that the exemption level in South Australia remains competitive with exemptions offered in the other States.

The level of the exemption which was raised from $270,000 to $330,000 last year will be further increased to $360,000 from 1 October 1989.

From 1 April 1990 it will then be increased further, to $400,000. The total cost of these two measures is estimated to be $10 million in a full year.

This will be of particular assistance to small business.

It means that the exemption level will have increased by 48 per cent since September 1988.

Relief on land tax will also be of particular assistance to small business.

This Government has consistently worked to lessen the impact of land tax, with relief in each of the last four years.

Rates applying on properties valued between $80,000 and $200,000 will now be halved, while the top marginal rate will be reduced from 2.4 per cent to 2 per cent.

In addition rebates of 25 per cent up to $200,000 and 15 per cent above this amount will be paid in 1989-90.

This further relief for all land tax payers will have a total cost of $41 million.

Allowing for the tax concessions to which I have referred, taxation receipts are expected to fall by 2.6 per cent in real terms.

Taxation in South Australia also remains low in relation to most other States.

Based on 1988-89 preliminary estimates produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, per capita taxes, fees and fines in South Australia were $362 lower than those applying in New South Wales, $265 lower than those applying in Victoria and $127 lower than those applying in Western Australia.

These figures will be revised as actual budget results become known for all States but I expect that the overall relationship will be maintained.

SAFA continues to play a key role in revenue generation.

Of other revenues received, the most important item is the planned increase in the SAFA contribution from $294 million in 1988-89 to $385 million in 1989-90.

The 1989-90 contribution, however, is only marginally above the budgeted 1988-89 contribution of $374 million.

FINANCING THE BUDGET

Mr Speaker, this Budget provides for the initiatives necessary for us to progress towards our goals for the 1990's.

It does so while fully maintaining the financial strength which we have struggled so hard to achieve over the last seven years.

Total Budget outlays are expected to fall in real terms.

Recurrent spending is expected to fall in real terms.

The Budget financing requirement is expected to fall, for the third year in a row, to $154 million.

The financing requirement for the total public sector is expected to be well below the level budgeted for in 1988-89.

And our net indebtedness is expected to fall further in relation to Gross State Product, to about 15.5 per cent.

I noted at the beginning of this speech that we believe in financial responsibility.

This is a prudent Budget, maintaining our financial strength intact.

We have an ongoing commitment to good financial management and in the coming year we hope to further improve our financial management processes by placing greater emphasis on more systematic evaluation of Government programs.

Many programs are of course already reviewed on a regular basis by agencies.

However, over the coming year it is intended to examine the feasibility of regular systematic reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of all programs.

Such a program will further strengthen public sector management and assist in the provision of the highest possible standards of service to the public.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The form of the Appropriation Bill is similar this year to last year.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 1989. Until the Bill is passed expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by Supply Acts.

Clause 3 provides a definition of Supply Act.

Clause 4 provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in the First Schedule to the Bill. Sub-section (2) makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by Supply Acts is superseded by this Bill.

Clause 5 provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

Clause 6 makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament (except, of course, in Supply Acts).

Clause 7 sets a limit of $20 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft in 1989-90.

I commend the Budget to the House, and in so doing place on record my appreciation of all those involved in formulating the Budget and its information papers. The Under Treasurer and his officers should be commended for their work and in particular for continuing to provide the most informative financial documents of any Australian State.

I would like to place on record my appreciation to all those involved in formulating the budget and its accompanying information papers. The Under Treasurer, Mr Prowse, and his officers should be commended for their work and, in particular, for providing financial documents that are the most informative and comprehensive of those provided in any State in Australia. I commend the budget to the House.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 5 September at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS ACT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That, pursuant to section 43 (12) of the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984, this House resolve that section 43 of the

Act shall continue in operation for a further five years; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

The committee should be congratulated for the work it has performed since the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act was proclaimed and the titles were handed over to the traditional owners in 1984. The committee has supported the previous Minister and me in the performance of our responsibilities under the Act.

The committee has enabled matters that relate to the Act and the well-being of the Maralinga people to be considered and actioned in a bipartisan way. The committee has enabled matters that affect the Maralinga people to be reported directly to Parliament. One of the most important aspects of the committee's work has been its direct, face to face contact with the traditional owners of the lands, service providers, administrative and support agencies and, where necessary, directly with other Ministers in questioning the operation of their particular departments in relation to the lands. The committee has reported each year to the Parliament on its activities.

The committee has been instrumental in oversighting the operation of two of the most innovative Acts of Parliament ever proclaimed: the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981, and the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984. In the case of Maralinga, at the time of the handover of titles, there was no settlement or community on the lands. There were no community structures or services apart from a couple of roads put in by mining companies. In addition, many of the people who wished to move back onto the lands to resume a traditional life style had, until then, experienced over 30 years of cultural and social upheaval bordering on decimation in settlements such as Yalata.

The transition back to a traditional life, adapting to new cultural laws and authorities, has been extremely complicated and confusing. However, despite this it has been executed successfully. The committee has therefore served the traditional people at a key point in their long history. The Maralinga people have expressed their wish that the committee should continue. They trust the committee and always warmly welcome the committee onto their lands. Some of the major issues that will require consideration over the next five years include: more people moving onto the lands; the provision of essential services, particularly water supplies; the development of community self-management and control; the clean up of nuclear wastes from the atomic test sites and surrounding areas; compensation claims in respect of the British nuclear testing program; and the overlap of the Woomera prohibited areas and the Maralinga lands. I therefore have great pleasure in recommending the motion to the House.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Briefly, the Opposition supports this proposal, which was originally a Liberal initiative. We are therefore delighted that the Government has seen the wisdom of the ways of the Opposition and will continue with this committee for a further five years. The Minister is correct in saying that the committee has been a success. It has given the Aboriginal communities in the areas mentioned the opportunity to deal face to face with the Minister and a number of members of Parliament—an opportunity that they do not often get. There have been considerable improvements in the lands since the committee first visited the area. It is a process which other Parliaments in this country should follow because it is the first time a State Parliament to my knowledge has taken the trouble to go out onto Aboriginal lands and discuss face to face with the people their problems.

As the local member I am very pleased that the committee will continue for a further five years, because the Maralinga people have made only limited demands on the taxpayers of South Australia. The requests are simple. They are entitled to have access to those people who make decisions concerning their welfare. I sincerely hope that the budget debate we are about to have over the next few weeks will reveal sufficient funds to provide for Aboriginal police aides, which has been another successful program, and to provide the limited resources that those communities want. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion and look forward to participating in the future.

Motion carried.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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

Drink driving remains the single most important cause of road accidents in South Australia. About 50 per cent of fatal and 20-30 per cent of injury accidents involve a driver with an illegal blood alcohol concentration. It is the Government's policy to prevent accidents involving alcohol by deterring people from driving after drinking. Effective deterrence requires both a high risk of being caught drink driving and severe consequences if one is caught. Random breath testing (RBT) was introduced to raise the perceived risk of being caught drink driving. After operating at suboptimal levels, RBT was increased in 1987 and was found to have succeeded in deterring drink driving. However, penalties for drink driving have changed little since 1981, and monetary penalties have not changed at all. Work carried out for the Road Safety Division in 1988 showed that drivers believe the penalties for drink driving are no longer of sufficient severity to act as a deterrent. This weakens the impact of RBT, since there is little point in raising the perceived risk of being detected drink driving, if the penalties for detection are thought to be minor. The objective of this Bill is to raise penalties to a level which is sufficient to act as a deterrent to drink driving.

The most effective combination of penalties for drink driving is accepted as being a fine and a period of licence disqualification. For persistent offenders, rehabilitation and/or imprisonment are options. Licence disqualification periods for first offenders were increased on 1 July 1985 and are in line with disqualification periods in other States. However, the fines have not been increased since June 1981. Since 1981, the consumer price index (CPI) has increased by about 80 per cent in Adelaide. The values of the fines in relation to the average wage have almost been halved which in turn leads to a partial explanation of their perceived lack of severity. The maximum fines which apply in South Australia are low compared with those in other mainland States. In fact the maximum fines which apply in South Australia are lowest or equal lowest for the mainland States.

Simply increasing fines in line with the CPI is inappropriate. A more valid approach is to set maximum fines in

accordance with those accepted and operating nationally. The overall result means that some increases would be slightly less than CPI whilst for the most serious offences, increases would be considerably greater. South Australia has minimum as well as maximum fines for drink driving. Minimum fines act as a message to the public and the judiciary about the seriousness with which drink driving is regarded by Parliament. It is proposed that minimum fines also be raised to approximately maintain the percentage relationship to maximum fines. I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 47 of the principal Act, increasing the fines that can be imposed for the offence of driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs. Clause 2 also removes the reference in this section to the endorsement of conditions on a driver's licence under section 81a of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Section 81a of that Act no longer requires the conditions imposed by the section to be endorsed on a licence.

Clause 3 amends section 47b of the principal Act, increasing the fines that can be imposed for the offence of driving with more than the prescribed concentration of alcohol in the blood. This clause also removes the reference in section 47b to the endorsement of conditions on a driver's licence under section 81a of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Clause 4 amends section 47e of the principal Act, increasing the fines that can be imposed for the offence of refusing or failing to comply with a direction to take an alcotest or breath analysis. Clause 4 also removes a reference in section 47e to the endorsement of conditions on a driver's licence under section 81a of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959.

Clause 5 amends section 47i of the principal Act, increasing the fines that can be imposed for the offence of refusing to submit to the taking of a blood sample. This clause also removes the reference in section 47i to the endorsement of conditions on a driver's licence under section 81a of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act 1926. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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 is consequential to the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 4) 1989. That measure provides for the random inspection of heavy commercial vehicles for the purpose of determining whether the vehicles are roadworthy. By the introduction of a levy on the registration fees of all heavy commercial vehicles, the scheme is to be self-funding and revenue neutral. The levy will be about 1 per cent of the registration fees of all commercial vehicles of an unladen mass of five tonnes or more seeking State registration. The only equitable way to fund a scheme of random inspections is to levy a charge on all vehicles in the class (approximately 11 000 as at 1/1/89). The average registration fee for vehicles in this class is $1 100 (ranging from $397 to $3 654) and hence the average levy will be $11 (ranging from $4 to $37). This Bill enables an amount equal to 1 per cent of those registration fees to be paid out of the Highways Fund to cover the costs of implementing the scheme.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to come into operation at the same time as the Road Traffic Act Amendment Act (No. 4) 1989. Clause 3 amends section 32 of the Act relating to the application of the Highways Fund. The amendment provides that 1 per cent of the fees received for registration of heavy commercial vehicles may be paid out of the fund towards the cost of road safety services provided otherwise than by the police.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 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

Its purpose is to enable the introduction of a scheme for the random on-road inspection of heavy commercial vehicles. South Australia and all other States increased heavy commercial vehicle legal speeds to 100 km/h from 1 July 1988. This followed a recommendation of the National Road Freight Industry Inquiry that speeds of some heavy commercial vehicles be lifted to 100 km/h. The inquiry made other concomitant recommendations, the most significant being that on-road enforcement of speeds be increased and that regular heavy vehicle inspections be carried out.

All road safety authorities have recognised the need to ensure adequate vehicle roadworthiness standards by a combination of engineering, design, enforcement and inspection. The Commercial Transport Advisory Committee which contains representatives of the haulage and bus industries supports the need for heavy vehicle inspection.

A Road Safety Division report on the inspection of heavy goods vehicles considered various ways of introducing heavy vehicle inspections, and concluded that the best initial strategy would be to introduce a scheme of random on-road inspections which would, each year, inspect about 20 per cent of the heavy vehicle fleet. Such random schemes are a part of the inspection programs of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania and the Northern Territory and are effective.

It is timely to introduce such a scheme because of evidence of unsatisfactory heavy vehicle maintenance standards, the need to allay public concern about the increased heavy vehicle speed limits and the requirement for operators to start paying for inspections before they lose sight of the benefits of the increased speed limits.

The increased vehicle speeds were requested by the industry because of the great financial benefits it will receive. The necessary safety controls should be paid for by the industry as a small offset against those benefits. The Bill contemplates that the class of vehicles that may be randomly inspected will be prescribed by regulation. It is intended that the class will include the prime mover portion

of articulated motor vehicles, heavy commercial motor vehicles and heavy trailers.

By the introduction of a levy on the registration charges of all heavy commercial vehicles, the scheme will be self-funding and revenue neutral. The levy to be paid at time of registration will be about 1 per cent of the registration fees of all commercial vehicles that have an unladen mass of more than 5 tonnes seeking State registration. The only equitable way to fund a scheme of random inspections is to levy a charge on all vehicles in the class (approximately 11 000 as at 1 January 1989). The average registration fee for vehicles in this class is $1 100 (ranging from $397 to $3 654) and hence the average levy will be $11 (ranging from $4 to $37). Necessary accounting measures are accommodated in the Highwavs Act Amendment Bill 1989.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 160 of the Act which provides for the issuing of defect notices. The amendment gives police officers and inspectors power to cause a vehicle of a prescribed class to be stopped and to examine that vehicle for the purposes of determining whether the vehicle complies with the Act and can be driven safely (whether or not there is reason to suspect that it is defective). The classes of vehicles to which this power applies are to be prescribed by regulation. The power is in addition to the powers police officers and inspectors currently have under the section to examine a vehicle or to direct a vehicle to be produced for examination where they are of the opinion that the vehicle is defective.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It is intended to provide for technical amendments to the interpretation section 6 (1) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972 to make it clear that references in that Act to the 'Commonwealth Commission' and 'Commonwealth Act' mean the Australian Industrial Relations Commission and Commonwealth Industrial Relations Act 1988 respectively. The amendments are required as a matter of urgency to put beyond doubt the jurisdiction of the Full Commission to entertain a State wage case application following the August national wage case decision of what is now the Australian Industrial Relations Commission.

The provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act that provide for State wage case applications make reference to relevant decisions or declarations of the 'Commonwealth Commission'. The 'Commonwealth Commission' is in turn defined in section 6 to mean 'the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission'. This body no longer exists. Since the Federal Industrial Relations Act 1988 came into operation on 1 March 1989, the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has given way to the Australian Industrial Relations Commission. The Bill has been prepared as a matter of urgency, after consultation with the President of the South Australian Industrial Commission, employer groups and trade unions. Members of the Industrial Relations Advisory Council have also been consulted. All parties agree that the amendments are essential.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. It is proposed to provide that the measure will be taken to have come into operation on the day on which the Industrial Relations Act of the Commonwealth came into operation. Clause 3 replaces the definitions of 'the Commonwealth Act' and 'the Commonwealth Commission' with new definitions that are consistent with the new Industrial Relations Act of the Commonwealth.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill.

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

WAREHOUSE LIENS BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to reform and simplify the law relating to the provision of a lien on goods deposited and stored in a warehouse. In doing so it seeks to repeal the Warehousemen's Liens Act 1941 and express the language of the law in conformity with contemporary drafting principles. In summary the Bill—

- repeals the 1941 Act
- establishes the right of an operator of a warehouse to have a lien on goods deposited for storage in his or her warehouse
- describes the lawful charges covered by a lien
- protects the rights of persons who may have an interest in the goods deposited

and

- prescribes procedures in respect of the sale, and disposition of proceeds of sale, of goods covered by a lien.

The major difference between the Bill and the 1941 Act is as follows. Under the 1941 Act the warehouseman was obliged, within three months after the date of deposit of the goods, to give notice of the lien to:

(a) persons who had notified the warehouseman of their interest in the goods;

(b) the grantee of a bill of sale over goods (that is, in effect the mortgagee of goods); and

(c) any person of whose interest in the goods the warehouseman had knowledge.

By contrast, the Bill abolishes the requirement of a notice of lien. There appears to be no useful purpose for it and it is an extra obligation on business. It seems absurd that the lien is completely lost if the notice is not given within three months.

Instead, the Bill provides for the giving of notice only where the lien is to be enforced (that is, by sale). In that event anyone who has an interest in the goods (of which the warehouse operator is aware) must be notified, as well as anyone who has a registered interest in the goods. Thus,

the warehouse operator would need to search the Bills of Sale Register and the Goods Securities Register.

In this sense, the Bill is less regulatory than the 1941 Act and, if passed, would require considerably fewer regulations to be promulgated under it. In nearly all other respects the Bill reproduces the existing law on the topic. The Senior Judge and Chief Magistrate have seen a draft of the Bill and approved it. The Bill, if it becomes law, will come into operation only after the Senior Judge has prepared appropriate Rules of Court which will regulate proceedings in local courts under the new Act. I commend this Bill to members.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the Warehousemen's Liens Act 1941. Clause 4 defines 'operator of a warehouse' to mean a person lawfully engaged in the business of storing goods as a bailee for fee or reward. Clause 5 provides that the measure does not limit or derogate from any civil remedy. Clause 6 establishes that the operator of a warehouse has a lien on goods deposited for storage in the warehouse.

Clause 7 sets out the charges covered by the lien, namely—

(a) lawful charges for storage and preservation of the goods;

(b) lawful claims for insurance, transportation, labour, weighing, packing and other expenses in relation to the goods;

(c) reasonable charges for any notice or advertisement required under the measure;

and

(d) reasonable charges arising from sale of the goods pursuant to the measure.

Clause 8 requires a person depositing goods for storage in a warehouse to notify the operator of the warehouse of the name and address of each person who has an interest in the goods, to the best of the depositor's knowledge. The penalty provided for non-compliance is a division 8 fine (maximum $1 000).

Clause 9 provides that goods stored in a warehouse may be sold to satisfy the warehouse lien on those goods if an amount has been owing in respect of the goods to the operator of the warehouse for at least six months.

Clause 10 requires the operator of a warehouse to give notice of intention to sell to the debtor, to any person who has served on the operator written notice of a claim to an interest in the goods, to any person who has a registered interest in the goods and to any other person who has an interest in the goods of which the operator is aware. The clause also requires certain matters to be contained in the notice and makes provision for the manner in which the notice may be given.

Clause 11 sets out further procedures required for the sale of goods to satisfy a warehouse lien. If the amount owed remains unpaid, the operator of the warehouse must advertise the sale of the goods in a South Australian newspaper at least once a week for two consecutive weeks. The sale can be held after 14 days have elapsed since the first publication of the advertisement. The mode of sale is to be by public auction unless the regulations specify otherwise. Provision is also made for the opening of packages containing the goods where necessary.

Clause 12 enables any person with an interest in the goods to apply to the local court for an order prohibiting any further steps being taken for sale of the goods. Clause 13 provides that no further proceedings for sale of the goods may be taken if the amount owing to the operator is paid in full. If payment is made by a person other than the debtor, provision is made for it to be recovered by that person from the debtor.

Clause 14 sets out the manner in which the proceeds of sale must be distributed. The lien is to be satisfied and the surplus (if any) must be paid to persons who put in written claims. If the validity of any claim is disputed or if there are conflicting claims, the surplus must be paid into a local court. If no claims are made within 10 days after the sale, the surplus must be paid to the Treasurer. If the operator of the warehouse does not comply with the provision, the operator is guilty of an offence, the penalty for which is a division 11 fine (maximum $100) per day of continued default.

Clause 15 makes it an offence to furnish false or misleading information for the purposes of the Act. The penalty provided is a division 7 fine (maximum $2 000). Clause 16 provides that offences against the Act are summary offences. Clause 17 contains regulation-making powers.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND CARE BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 568.)

Clause 48—'Powers and procedures of Council in appeal proceedings.'

Mr GUNN: I think that my concern has been covered by the appeal provision, so I will not proceed with my amendment on file. The Opposition opposes this clause.

Clause negatived.

Clause 49 negatived.

Clause 50—'Powers of entry.'

Mr LEWIS: The Committee should consider a number of aspects of this clause. Subclause (1) provides that an authorised officer, somebody from the council, the Minister, or a member of the board can, at any reasonable time, exercise any of the stated powers. They can go on the land; they can take samples from the land; they can take photographs; and they can erect markers or photopoints for the purpose of survey or research. 'Research' and 'survey' are not defined. However, I am sure that matter will be treated in a commonsense fashion.

Given the nature of the penalties that apply to the landholder, if they or someone working for or with them happened to remove markers or photopoints, it is only reasonable that the land-holder be asked to provide permission for the erection of those markers or photopoints. In that case, two things flow from my suggestion that the permission of the land-holder should be obtained. First, the landholder will know that markers have been placed somewhere on the property. They will have time to ensure that the markers are not disturbed and that they do not incur a penalty by committing an offence. I am not sure what is used to delineate the position of the markers and photopoints but, in any event, the land-holder will be able to ensure that they are not disturbed.

I am sure that the member for Eyre agrees with me when I say it will be possible to draw a sketch map of the location at which the photo of the landscape was taken. A photopoint can be established at the point at which a photograph was taken to show what is happening. In another instance it can be construed to mean the spot over which the camera is erected and the photograph taken of the ground below. In either case, in consultation with the land-holder, and by obtaining permission from the land-holder, in most instances it will be possible to draw a map of that location. In that event, it will not be necessary to place a peg in a position which could be inconvenient to the land-holder.

Secondly, if it must be marked by a peg, the photopoint will then be known to the landowner and, given that he must provide permission for it to be put there in the first place, care will be taken to avoid disturbing the peg, because severe penalties are imposed if one of these pegs is knocked out of the ground. I move:

Page 20, line 28—Before 'erect' insert 'with the consent of the owner of the land,'.

This amendment should ensure that antagonistic situations do not develop.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I accept that amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Lines 34 and 35—Leave out all words in these lines.

I refer to subclause (3) which relates to seven days notice being given to the owner of the land, but no such notice need be given under paragraph *(b)*, which provision is common sense. It is necessary to check out the situation and it would be silly to have to give notice in regard to subparagraph (i) and I agree with subparagraph (ii). It is important, if an owner has failed to comply, that one can enter the land at a moment's notice. Subclause (3) also indicates that it is inappropriate to give notice.

For that reason, I believe that paragraph *(a)* is irrelevant and is draconian. It is silly to give notices in those circumstances or to expect it. Anyone could say, 'I went on to the land and it was not practicable for me to give notice and there was no urgent need for me to do so.' That is not fair and legitimate and gives too much power to people who are or who may be antagonistic in their demands to go on the land. I do not believe that paragraph *(a)* needs to be there when all the other circumstances are properly covered under paragraph *(b)*.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I cannot accept the amendment. This Bill is amended from the original version by the inclusion of the seven days notice at the request of the UF&S, which believed that that provision should apply. We have included it, but there could be circumstances where a landowner may be overseas and out of contact and it is not within reasonable power to get in touch. Paragraph *(a)* is the exception and not the norm and it needs to be there. For that reason I am unwilling to accept the amendment.

Mr LEWIS: That is a pity—I thought we were getting along so well. I do not believe that the Minister has understood subclause (3). It says that notice must be given, but that notice does not have to get there. Notice must be sent out in the usual course of events. That is how the law applies in other instances. A summons is delivered on behalf of a court either by post or hand delivery and, as long as the court officer says he has delivered it to the premises or place, it does not mean that the landowner got it, but in law he is considered to have had reasonable notice.

It is unreasonable to have given such *carte blanche* access to the land by the people who do not own it, and I believe it will introduce a measure of disquiet and diminish the goodwill of land-holders who otherwise would give respect to the inspectors. Now, if some officious inspectors do not give notice because it is not convenient or practical for them to do so, that will be unfortunate.

Amendment negatived.

Mr LEWIS: Because I was detained outside the Chamber last night, I missed clause 36, so I do not wish to proceed with my amendment on file to line 41 and lines 1 and 2 on page 21.

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 21—After line 7—Insert new subclause as follows:

(6) An authorised officer, or person assisting an authorised officer, who, in the course of exercising powers under this section in relation to any land—

(a) unreasonably hinders or obstructs the landowner in the day-to-day running of his or her business on the land,

(b) addresses offensive language to the landowner or to any other person on the land;

or

(c) assaults the landowner or any other person on the land,

is guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Division 7 fine.

I believe it should be a provision placed in every Act of Parliament in future because most members of Parliament would have received complaints from constituents and from others about people being over-zealous in exercising their authority. Therefore, this places them in the same position as the people they are dealing with.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 51—'Offence of hindering, etc., person exercising powers under this Act.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 21, lines 12 to 17—Leave out subclauses (2) and (3).

In my second reading speech I said that I did not think a person who addresses offensive language to someone else ought to be treated any differently under other legislation than they are now treated under the Summary Offences Act. To use offensive language is an offence. Under that Act as it stands at present, if one person abuses another—a State Transport Authority inspector or bus driver—that person has committed an offence under the Summary Offences Act.

Mr S.G. Evans: Or if you abuse an ordinary citizen.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, if you abuse an ordinary citizen you are guilty of an offence. Under the Summary Offences Act offensive language is the form of abuse we refer to, and I believe the same laws and penalties should apply for uncivil behaviour. In fact, there ought to be an overriding provision here. The same argument is in clause (3) line 15 where someone assaults someone else. If a land-holder, or someone else on a property, assaults a person who is acting in the exercise of their powers quite legitimately—as conferred in the Act—they should be charged under the Summary Offences Act with assault.

I do not care if the fine is more or less or the penalty is heavier or lighter: let the court decide the appropriate penalty. It is no more or less of an offence; let us leave it where it belongs in the Summary Offences Act, otherwise we will come to the point where a whole range of different provisions and legislations are duplicating the law from one place to another. I commend my amendment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will not accept that amendment because moments ago I accepted another amendment from the member for Eyre to insert a new subclause which required certain performance standards of officers when going on to a property. In that context, I believe it is certainly not unreasonable to have the same situation with respect to the landowner. If we wanted a debate about the broader issues, whether or not it should be in this Bill—and I believe it should be—we should have had that on the last amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 51a—'Confidentiality.'

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 21—After clause 51 insert new clause as follows:

Confidentiality

51a. A person engaged in the administration of this Act who, in the course of carrying out official duties, acquires information on the income, assets, liabilities or other private business affairs of an owner of land must not disclose that information to any other person, except as required by law or by his or her employer.

Penalty: Division 4 fine.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I accept that amendment.

New clause passed.

Remaining clauses (52 to 55) and schedule passed.

Clause 13—'Establishment of the Council'—reconsidered.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last night I indicated that I was in a position to accept one of the amendments being moved by the member for Eyre but that there was a difficulty because, by accepting only one and not the three, another item in the substantive clause would have been inconsistent. Therefore the easiest way was to oppose at the time and reconsider when we had the proper wording. I have now had circulated amendments to clause 13 which pick up the spirit of one of the amendments proposed by the member for Eyre, and I acknowledge them as his amendments. I move:

Page 4, line 25—Leave out '11' and insert '12'.

Lines 37 to 40—Leave out paragraph *(d)* and insert paragraph as follows:

(d) two will be persons who have, in the opinion of the Minister—

(i) as to one of them—wide experience in dryland cropping and grazing of livestock; and

(ii) as to the other—wide experience in intensive agriculture in high rainfall country,

selected by the Minister from a panel of three made up of names submitted at the invitation of the Minister by one or more organisations representative of farmers;.

The first part of that amendment is to increase the size of the council to 12, which was the key difference last night.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16—'Procedure at meetings'—reconsidered.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Under clause 16 we have six members constituting a quorum out of a council of 11, and my amendment proposes that that become seven members out of a council of 12. I move:

Page 6, line 6—Leave out 'six' and insert 'seven'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I indicate my appreciation to members during the Committee stage of this Bill. Also, I gave a number of commitments that we would be looking at some matters in another place, and we have been working on that. In the meantime I can give a progress report on some matters. Dealing with the area of definitions, we believe that there should be added in the definition of land managers to cover one who is charged with the management of land and derives an income from that land.

There was an amendment relating to seeking the advice of the council in terms of how money would be invested, and there was the question of the composition of the boards. The proposal is that at least three persons on the board be land managers. We picked that up in terms of the definition I am proposing.

We will propose that it is an essential requirement for appointment to the position of Soil Conservator that the appointee have experience in the field of soil conservation or land management. A couple of consequential alterations to definitions will be required in a clause that we inserted in the Bill last evening. I believe that we are passing a significant piece of legislation that will give us the impetus needed to follow on what is a widespread issue in the farming community and in the community generally, namely, the maintenance of our land resource.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition strongly supports the third reading. I have had more of my amendments accepted on this Bill than I have had in my previous 20 years as a member and I appreciate the way in which the Minister has approached the legislation in this debate. I also thank the people who helped me prepare my amendments, because they entailed much hard work. The Opposition supports the concept of soil conservation and the proper protection and management of our most valuable resource. We look forward to seeing this legislation implemented in the interests of all South Australians. When I was at school, I was taught that good farmers were an asset to the State and I strongly adhere to that principle. When we commenced this debate, I did not in my wildest imagination expect the Minister to accept many of my amendments and I am pleased with his attitude in that regard. If that is the attitude that he intends to adopt towards agricultural legislation generally, we shall not have anywhere near as many differences in this Chamber as his predecessor and I had.

The rural community appreciates the work of all those people who participated in debating the legislation prior to the introduction of the Bill. I believe that this legislation is in a form that will make it more acceptable and work better. It will therefore be a piece of legislation which hopefully will achieve the objective that members want to see achieved, namely, the proper management of land, so that it will help people in the rural community in going about their important task. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I support the remarks of the member for Eyre and congratulate him on the work and effort that he has put into his amendments and on the discussions that he has had with people all over South Australia. I also add my support to his comments about the Minister, who has adopted a constructive approach to the Bill. When the Bill was introduced in its original form, it got the rural community offside. However, by giving the rural people fair and adequate representation and an appeals tribunal where they could air their grievances, as well as agreeing to other Opposition amendments, the Minister deserves to be congratulated on his constructive attitude.

Whether or not we are farmers, it is up to all of us to look after the soils of South Australia and to ensure that we have the support of rural communities in implementing this legislation. As has been said in this Chamber in this debate over the past two days, we will do no good with legislation that antagonises rural people because we will not have their support. I support the third reading and congratulate the member for Eyre and the Minister for the constructive nature of the debate. The Bill before us, which is vastly different from the original draft, is much more acceptable to the rural community of South Australia and I hope that it will operate for the betterment of the long-term future of agriculture in this State.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I am no less an amateur than Mr Baker about the way in which Bills move from Committee to third reading. I still have reservations about the fact that the labour-intensive industries of plant and animal production will not be represented on the council. In due course, the Government of the day may find it legitimate and reasonable that representatives of those industries should be included, as they are large industries that are worth a lot of money and they have particular and different concerns.

I hope that, once the Bill becomes an Act, it will do all the things that we hope and that it will never be used as the basis for compelling land-holders to obtain permits to cultivate generally or in specific instances. That would be ridiculous and a gross intrusion of bureaucracy into the process of the management of rural production. The management of rural property, which must be infinitely flexible,

would become rigid, even more rigid than in Eastern Europe or China. Land-holders would suffer if rigidities were imposed which affected their decisions as to how they should get the best from their land. I appreciate the Minister's objective consideration of the points put to him by honourable members, particularly Opposition amendments.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I thank all members for their comments in what has been an interesting debate. The Bill is a positive piece of legislation and will pick up the divisions in the community about what is expected from the Legislature. I record my thanks to Mr Roger Wickes, Mr Andrew Johnson and other officers of the Department of Agriculture for the significant work they have done and to those organisations that made submissions on the Green Paper and subsequent discussion on the drafting of the legislation. I thank the UF&S, the Nature Conservation Society, the Australian Conservation Foundation and other organisations for their submissions, which have helped us to create legislation that is appropriate to the needs of soil conservation.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 4.33 to 4.55 p.m.]

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I think it was in 1981 when we had the International Year of the Disabled Person, during which time many people decided that they would get on the band wagon and discuss matters pertaining to disabled people. Similarly, there are those people in the community who get on the band wagon in relation to environmental issues.

Since coming into this place in 1979, I have addressed issues of environmental significance in my electorate. Members would recall that, together with many other members, I was elected to this place on 15 September 1979. One of the first issues that I took up in October 1979 concerned the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works. Many members would know my views on this matter and would know of my doggedness in trying to have money spent on upgrading that plant. During Question Time today the Minister of Water Resources alluded to this matter.

I want to refer briefly to some of the issues that I have addressed in the 10 years that I have been in this place. We would all recall the debacle and the saga concerning the lighting of Football Park. As far as I was concerned, in many ways it was an environmental issue, as the proposals were environmentally ugly. The matter was addressed by the Government and it was satisfactorily resolved. Since October 1979, I have addressed the matter of the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works every year through to this year. In fact, today during Question Time I asked a question pertaining to clean water, and in responding to this question the Minister alluded to water treatment works.

There was a noise pollution problem with the Allied Engineering plant at Royal Park and, similarly, there was a problem with a foundry at Woodville West. The Allied Engineering problem was satisfactorily resolved by the Government—in stark contrast to the appalling record of the previous Liberal Government on this matter. There is still a need to address the question of amending the Noise Control Act in terms of dealing with noise pollution in relation to hotels. This relates particularly to problems in the area that abuts the West Lakes Waterway. This involves a very difficult situation, and a unique one, but it must be addressed.

Members would recall the statement made by the new Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to a decision that the Government has made about encroachment on the sand dunes at Tennyson and West Lakes. I believe that this decision should be applauded by all South Australians, as it will ensure the protection of this dunal area environment for posterity. As to the West Lakes Waterway, since I have been in this place I have not relented in relation to the problem associated with the influx of stormwater.

I have addressed problems relating to people fishing in the area and other matters concerning the need to erect warning signs about the influx of stormwater, perhaps imposing prohibitions for up to three days. Also, there is the matter of banning the taking of shellfish from this waterway and the problems with the red algal bloom, which in some cases has been found to be toxic. I congratulate the new Minister of Marine on commissioning the $100 000 hydrological survey of this waterway. It was long overdue, and my constituents and I were pleased with the Government's and the Minister's decision.

Because of the time available I will not address fully the Semaphore/West Lakes beach erosion issue; suffice to say that the former Minister for Environment and Planning provided me with a report on access to public beaches for the elderly and disabled, and I congratulate the Minister on that. Another matter that I and just about every member of this Parliament have addressed in this place at one time or another is the question of stray and feral cats. Since 1979, when I came into this place, I have pushed for trees to be planted along the West Lakes Boulevard extension, and that is now reality. The landscaping and tree planting along that boulevard is well advanced, and this has satisfied the demands of my constituents in the area.

Yesterday, as members will recall, I sought from the Minister of Transport an undertaking that he become involved in the issue of planting trees along the Grange railway line, particularly along the western perimeter of that corridor. I addressed the upgrading of the plantation along Port Road many years before the sesquicentenary funding for that project. Much is yet to be done to complete the landscaping and the enclosing of the drain along Port Road, and I hope that that matter is addressed within the next few years.

I now turn my attention to industrial pollution. Many residents of West Lakes believe that the white mist which comes over the area drifts down from the industrial areas around Birkenhead and Port Adelaide, and this matter is the subject of correspondence between the Minister and me. There is still a need for machines to clean both the Tennyson and Semaphore Park beaches. During the development of Delfin Island the matter of dust became a major problem and, as a consequence of my request, grass was planted, with appropriate watering, to keep the dust down.

Another problem in that area at that time was building waste, particularly cement bags, plastic and other building materials. Since I have been in this place I have addressed at length the problem of visual pollution, and I am still not satisfied that this matter has been satisfactorily resolved. I believe that the Government should penalise those people who put graffiti on Government buildings and so on; they should be made to clean it up themselves. I have addressed the issue of backyard burning in this place, and I believe that the sooner it is completely banned in South Australia

the better. Over the years I have addressed the need for extractor fans and larger exhaust facilities to combat the problem of workplace pollution, especially in vehicle repair shops and the like.

Over the years I constantly addressed the problem of the stone crushing plant at Woodville South when it was in my electorate from 1979 to 1985. Another matter I addressed was the question of arsenic in the soil at Hendon in which, through no fault of its own, in my opinion, the Government became involved through the Housing Trust. I have asked for legislation and look forward to its introduction which will ensure that, when the Government buys land in the future, the soil will be tested to see that it is not impregnated with arsenic or any other toxic materials. I look forward to that time because the Housing Trust's legacy at Hendon is one that all South Australians have been left with for many years to come.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I have received the following letter from one of my constituents. It states:

Please find enclosed a 'Letter of Demand' sent to us by certified mail, from the Transport Workers Union of Australia. This is the second occasion we have received this kind of letter. As we have recently sold our transport business we have chosen to treat this letter with 'ignore'. I would burn it but I think that it may prove of interest to you or a colleague. I find this type of letter and its demands are rather intimidating and even frightening for our country's future.

Having read the letter of demand from the Transport Workers Union, I realise just how ridiculous is our industrial system when a union can put pen to paper and make such demands as these. A selection of them includes:

Transport Workers' Union of Australia
Log of Wages and Working Conditions

1. Weekly Wage Rates
A minimum of $2 000 per week for all employees.
9. Meal Allowance
An employee required to work overtime shall be paid daily $200 for meals.
13. Rest Pauses
Every employee shall be entitled to a rest pause of 30 minutes duration in the employer's time in each hour of his/her daily work.

So, the transport worker works for 30 minutes and rests for 30 minutes. Further:

14. Travelling and Board
The employer shall pay for first-class travelling and accommodation and pay $5 000 per week as a spending allowance for the period from leaving home to returning home.
19. Holiday, Saturday and Sunday Work
Quadruple time shall be paid for all work performed on Saturday . . .

So, a worker earning $2 000 per week would earn several thousand dollars for weekend work on quadruple time. The letter continues:

22. Motor Allowance
An employee required to use his/her vehicle shall be paid $10 per kilometre.
23. Tools
An employer shall provide and keep in good condition all tools. vehicles and equipment which the employer requires the employee to use or, alternatively where an employee uses his/her own tools, he/she shall be paid an allowance of $500 per day.
25. Right of Entry
Any officer of or person authorised by the Transport Workers' Union of Australia shall have the right to interview and conduct meetings on employers' premises with employees. Any officer, shop steward, delegate or member shall be given unlimited paid time to attend any union business, together with phone, office, secretary or any other facility required.
28. Full Time Union Delegates
Union delegates shall be allowed without loss of pay 40 hours per week to attend to union business.

That means that a union official would be on the payroll full-time doing nothing. Further:

29. Washing Time
All employees shall be allowed thirty (30) minutes washing time before meal breaks and knock off time.

All in all, there are 48 conditions (of which I have read a brief selection) which have no affinity whatsoever with reality. I cannot understand an industrial relations system where a union sends to a small employer a document with those sorts of claim. It seems to me that we are making a fair song and dance about the demands of the airline pilots at the moment, yet a document such as this can be sent with some semblance of seriousness to a constituent of mine. It seems to me that the industrial relations system in Australia has well outlived its usefulness.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is in relation to ETSA's activities in its rush to finish the Victorian-South Australian interconnection. I am pleased that the Minister of Mines and Energy is present in the House this evening. I had a phone call from a constituent a week or so ago complaining bitterly at ETSA's activities in his paddock at this time of the year. This would be the least appropriate time one could imagine to be taking 40 tonne equipment into paddocks to instal these towers. A report appeared in the Mt Barker *Courier* recently in relation to what is happening. Briefly, that report states:

The march of ETSA towers across the Hills is causing major problems to property owners along the way.

Mr Dick Cameron of Tepko has 12 of the huge towers on his land.

He is extremely concerned about the effects of erosion by the deep ruts left by the 14-tonne trucks and cranes used in construction of the towers.

In my conversation with Mr Cameron, he said that these vehicles are frequently bogged, heavier vehicles have to come to tow them out, and that only exacerbates the problem. The article continues:

His neighbours, Graham and Brian Pym, have three towers on their land and are also concerned about the damage. 'ETSA has promised to pay for restoration of our land,' Mr Cameron said, 'but it's going to be a costly long-term program.' He pointed out there were other losses, in terms of time and production. 'There will have to be many tonnes of topsoil brought in so the land can be stabilised, followed by replanting or regeneration. 'We were advised some trees would have to be trimmed, but one large pink gum, marked to be trimmed, was removed completely.'

Prior to building the towers, ETSA had to carry out extensive blasting for the footings, due to the very rocky terrain. This caused cracks in Mr Cameron's house and a garden wall. A large mirror also fell down, fortunately not breaking or damaging anything. The new powerline, which runs from Tungkillo to Cherry Gardens, is primarily to benefit the southern area of Adelaide and some rural areas, the South East of South Australia and to provide inter-connection with Victoria. There will be little if any direct benefit to Hills people.

Mr Cameron said the damage has been caused mainly by the work being done at this time of year, when the ground is very wet. 'The only reason it was necessary to work through winter was to meet the interconnection deadline promised some years ago,' he said.

If the Minister gets an opportunity, I should like him to explain what the rush is to finish this interconnection. If there is a penalty clause if the line is not completed by a due date, that might explain why ETSA is pushing on at the most inappropriate time in the wet season and making a terrible mess of my constituents' properties. If that is the case I would like the Minister to tell me. I undertook to raise the matter because if ETSA is concerned with the environment—and we are all concerned about it—it would not be rushing ahead and causing considerable damage to these rural properties. I should like the Minister to look at the photograph in this newspaper to see for himself what is happening in relation to this construction work by ETSA. He will realise then that these people have a genuine cause for complaint.

I suggest that the repair bill that ETSA will have to meet will be considerable. If there is a financial penalty for the line not being finished on time, that may help to explain this situation. I am not aware of any deadline for the completion of the line or of any penalty. If there is, I should be pleased if the Minister would let the House know or let me know so that I can pass it on to my constituents. The only reason suggested to me for the rush was that in a pre-election climate this might be some other occasion on which the Premier or the Minister can pull the big switch and say, 'Here is another project that we brought on stream.' If that is the motive, it is pretty poor. I am not suggesting that is necessarily the reason, but that was suggested to me. Why rush to build the towers in a high rainfall area at the wettest time of the year and do all this damage to the environment? I welcome the opportunity of raising these two matters of considerable importance to my constituents.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I want to talk about a couple of matters relating to sport. As members know, I have a particular passion for sport. I refer honourable members to this morning's *Advertiser*. On the sports page there is an article by Ashley Porter, the *Advertiser's* leading football writer, headed, 'South wants green light from league.' The article states:

South Adelaide wants the South Australian National Football League to commit itself to scheduling league matches if a new multi-sports complex was built south of Adelaide. This follows a request from Sport and Recreation Minister Kym Mayes. The State Government has recognised the need for a multi-sports complex, and has studied options at three sites—Morphett Vale, Seaford and Noarlunga, which is most favoured at this stage.

The league has already commissioned a seven-week long survey of the football needs of the people in the Noarlunga area, as part of its overall study on ground rationalisation and the public's views on where football should be played. South General Manager Bob Bache, Club President and League Director Judge Peter Allan, and club management committee member Graham Geddie, met a State Government subcommittee comprising Mr Mayes, Recreation and Sport Director George Belchev, and the MP for Fisher, Phil Tyler, on Tuesday night.

Bache said South had given the State Government an assurance it would base itself at the proposed sports complex regardless of whether league football was played there. 'I would like to think we would be based and playing league football down there by 1992,' he said. 'The meeting with the Minister was most encouraging and it is obvious he is firmly committed to doing everything possible to service the sporting needs of the people south of Adelaide.

I, too, call on the South Australian Football League to make a firm commitment to South Adelaide Football Club by indicating its intentions in relation to ground rationalisation at the earliest opportunity. It is quite clear from recent events that the league is moving towards ground rationalisation and, I suppose, in fairness, to some extent, ground rationalisation is inevitable. However, the league should always consider that our game is essentially suburb oriented. To eliminate suburban grounds completely would be to destroy the unique character of Australian rules football as we know it. You, Mr Speaker, and other members, would be well aware that the league football clubs are very community oriented. They work exceptionally well in many districts and the playing of league football is only part of their overall community involvement and spirit. To remove league football from an area would be a travesty, because it is unique and it would destroy the character we have with Australian rules football.

Most other sports are based on criteria other than the suburban or community orientation built up by Australian rules league football. The league should always consider this aspect when it moves towards ground rationalisation. I accept the economic arguments that the league directors may put forward—that a move to a two ground system would be the most economically viable alternate solution. However, I suggest that, as a result, we would see further decline in crowds, because it would take away from the local community sport played at its highest level.

In addition, it is important for the league to clarify its position because, to be honest, it is completely unfair to keep the South Adelaide Football Club on tenterhooks when it is working so hard towards establishing a future for its members in the rapidly growing southern area. Approximately 170 000 people currently live between Darlington and Victor Harbor. By the year 2000, there will be 250 000 people. More than one-third of those currently living in that area are under the age of 19 years. I agree with the South Adelaide Football Club General Manager, Mr Bob Bache, when he states that many people in the southern area would go to more league football matches if there was a local ground. There is absolutely no doubt that people from my district, and other districts in the southern area, do not go to league football matches because of the distance they must travel. It is important also to remember that there is no league football venue south of Glenelg oval.

There is a huge distance between the Glenelg oval and the southern area. Of the 116 league football matches played each season, only seven are played south of Richmond Road. It is well known that the State Government is hoping to establish, together with several other sporting organisations, a sports complex in the south. We are hoping that it will cater for league football. The Minister of Recreation and Sport is doing everything humanly possible to make that idea a reality. South Adelaide has indicated its commitment to the concept. Now it needs an indication of the league's intention. This proposal has tremendous potential for the development of league football and the playing of matches in the southern areas of Adelaide. A physical presence in the area is also needed. South Adelaide has a presence in the area but does not have the tangible physical presence needed to give stimulus to football in the southern region.

First-class facilities of the type we are trying to establish can be the centre of community activity and pride. They will also enable youngsters to see present-day champions play locally, providing enthusiasm and incentive. That is why I first put the idea of a sporting complex for the south into the melting pot by way of a question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this House a few years ago. South Adelaide Football Club is working hard to establish itself in this fast growing area, but the proposal is crucial to its planning. It has to know what the league intends to do about grounds.

I also refer to a *News* article on a completely different subject, although still on a sporting theme. In the *News* of Wednesday 23 August an article on page 3 under the heading, 'Bannon tip for test on holiday', states:

Hopes are high of a cricket Test returning to South Australia on the Australia Day long weekend, the Premier, Mr Bannon, said today. 'We've been campaigning to have the traditional Adelaide Test returned to that weekend,' he said. 'There's hope now of some success, especially for the next Ashes tour in 1990-91.'

The article, quoting the Australia Day Council Executive Director, Ms Anne Hogarth, states:

'We lost the Australia Day long weekend Test match last year because we insisted on having the holiday on the Monday,' she said. 'Sydney get it because they were having their holiday on the Thursday when the Test match started.' Adelaide has not hosted a Test match on the Australia Day long weekend since 1982.

Ms Hogarth ignores the fact that it was a one-off occasion for the bicentenary in New South Wales in 1988. It was clearly made known to SACA in South Australia that it would be a one-off bicentenary test match in New South

Wales between Australia and England. It had nothing at all to do with the holiday being on the Monday. To suggest otherwise is to be quite careless and irresponsible.

The other point ignored by Ms Hogarth in saying that we have not hosted a Test match on this weekend since 1982 is the fact that we have always hosted international cricket on this weekend. The Test match was moved to the first part of the season quite deliberately and the international one day fixtures were moved to January and February. The international matches were moved to the long weekend in January quite deliberately.

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

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.25 to 5.58 p.m.]

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 5.57 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos 1 to 3—

That the House of Assembly no longer insists on its disagreement to these amendments and that the Legislative Council make the following consequential amendment to the Bill:

Clause 3, page 2, lines 3 and 4—Leave out '(referred to subsequently in this section as "the relevant principles")' and substitute '(the precursor of subsection (1))'.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

The Legislative Council intimated that it agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The managers of the House of Assembly put the arguments, on behalf of this place, to the conference and it is with regret that the views of this place were not acceptable to the managers from the other place. The managers from this place feared that the rights of prisoners would be put above the overall rights of the community, particularly with respect to their own security and, indeed, the administration of the criminal justice system of this State. We live in a community that places great importance on the proper administration of criminal justice and it was clearly expressed on our part that the attitude of the other place was placing that important principle at risk.

Well over 100 and as many as 300 appeals are likely to be brought before the courts. Given the precedent already established, that may well result in a reduction in sentences for a number of those prisoners, many of whom are serving long prison sentences for very serious offences. The Government was faced with the dilemma of losing this measure altogether and, obviously, that would have been a most undesirable and irresponsible course for the Government to take in these circumstances. At least the law for the future is now settled, in the view of the managers, and it has been agreed that a statement will be made in the other place with respect to the certainty of the law and the intention of the South Australian Parliament with respect to the issues that have brought about the need for this amending legislation.

I wish to place on the record the form of words which express the will of the Parliament, as follows:

It is the intention of Parliament that subsection (1) should be interpreted in accordance with the judgment of the Full Court in the *Queen v Dube* and the *Queen v Knowles* (1987) 46 SASR 118 and that sentencing authorities be required to take the remission provisions into account when determining the duration of the head sentence and the non-parole period in accordance with the principles and effect of this judgment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the Minister of Education has pointed out, agreement was reached at the end of the day and after considerable discussion about the principles of the Act and the changes that should take place. I would like to put on the record that agreement was reached, principally as a result of serious thinking about what I believe are two different sets of principles, first, with respect to whether we take the law back in time. We all know, for example, that the law is interpreted by the courts and that, because of those court judgments, subsequent changes take place, and as far as I am aware no changes of this type have taken place before, where the law has been interpreted contrary to what the Parliament intended.

It should also be noted that the extent to which 100 or 300 people will appeal against the sentences handed down is as yet unknown, because it may well be that, during the hearing of the first case, the principles will be sorted out by the courts. No-one in this Parliament can predict the passage of those appeals. In addition, no Government member seemed to know exactly what jurisdiction would be exercised by the courts in respect of judging whether they had total regard to the remission when they handed down those sentences and, indeed, that was against the principles of sentencing.

A number of complex issues are involved. It should be noted that, when the Parliament has slipped up in the past, when the courts have interpreted the will of the Parliament differently from the Parliament's intent, retrospective legislation has not been introduced. That is quite clear. In these circumstances two cases actually succeeded on appeal. They were two very special cases where the judgment was made that the courts had used a basic formula and applied it. We do not know, and the Government could not tell us, whether those same circumstances pertained in every one of the cases heard since 1986. We do not have that information. The Opposition stands by its resolve on this matter. It is an important principle which must be upheld. If the Parliament does get it wrong, the normal course of events is that the legislation is amended so that it does not happen again. That is exactly what we are doing under these circumstances.

Mr Duigan: Letting them out.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Adelaide chortles on. If he wants to talk about principles, I will refer back to 1983 when the Government let all these criminals out of gaol. There was no concern for the citizens. We traced some of these people and found one or two murders, rapes and bashings. That is different from the courts having to interpret what will occur under these circumstances—totally different. These criminals were let out of gaol willy-nilly—set free—and now the Government says it is different and that it wants to show concern because it is an election year. That is simply not on.

If we look at the two cases being considered, we see that the reductions in sentences have been exceptionally minor, because it has not been clear that the principles which the High Court threw out and which we put into the Act have

been interpreted by the courts in the way the High Court thought. The joint statement agreed at the conference states:

It is the intention of Parliament that subsection (1) should be interpreted in accordance with the judgment of the Full Court in *The Queen v Dube* and *The Queen v Knowles* (1987) 46 SASR 118 and that sentencing authorities be required to take the remission provisions into account when determining the duration of the head sentence and the non-parole period, in accordance with the principle and effect of this judgment.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I support the decision of the conference.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Good show.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader says 'shame'.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I said, 'Good show.'

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If you are going to interject, do it properly. Don't mumble! I support the decision of the conference, because the alternative was too unpalatable. The alternative was made clear to the managers of the House of Assembly that, unless we bowed to the Legislative Council, it would allow the Bill to lapse so that not only would the approximately 300 prisoners who have been sentenced since December 1986 get the additional time up but from now on all prisoners would have low sentences.

This Government has fought long and hard to increase sentences in this State by about 50 per cent—a huge increase on what the sentences were previously. We have until now been successful but, because of the total intransigence of the Legislative Council, we could not confirm those sentences for about 300 prisoners sentenced since December 1986. That prospect was too frightful to contemplate. We could not have a position, as the managers for the Legislative Council told us at the time, where from now on sentences were reduced by 50 per cent.

I say this to the Chamber: about 300 prisoners have been identified by the Legal Services Commission who, it believes, have a right to appeal. At this stage over 100 appeals have been lodged. The cost of those appeals, leaving aside the principle of letting prisoners out early, to South Australian taxpayers will be about $200 000. So, $200 000 of taxpayers' money will be spent on relief of sentences which everyone in this Parliament agreed were proper. There was no dissent.

This was a simple problem. The law as it stood before December 1986 was acceptable to Parliament, as it was from 1986 until this recent High Court decision. Moreover, the same law will be acceptable to Parliament from proclamation of the Bill. There is no argument that the system is the proper system, and the statement that has just been read out by the Minister of Education and the member for Mitcham confirms that. Everyone agrees with the system—even the prisoners agreed with it—except for this one appeal.

Where is the logic in what has happened? The principle of retrospectivity was cleared up early in the conference—there was no principle of retrospectivity. Irrespective of who is in Government, this Parliament has passed retrospective legislation from time to time as and when it deemed it appropriate. The Legislative Council did not think it was appropriate in this case because it said it might traduce the rights of prisoners. Prisoners were sentenced within a sentencing structure with which everyone agreed. There was no query.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You will have your chance in a moment. There was no query about that whatsoever. What will happen in the next few months is perfectly clear. Further appeals have already been taken and some have already been heard. One prisoner has had two years reduced from his sentence—an armed robber. The Government has gone to court: the Attorney-General, Crown Law and prosecutors have gone to court to get substantial sentences and have had much success but, because of this nonsense, one armed robber has already had two years taken off his sentence.

The member for Mitcham claims that these are relatively minor changes. It does not seem to be minor to me. A two-year reduction in sentence is not minor to me. Not one day should be reduced, and a commonsense arrangement to bring about a solution to this problem was all that was required because the principles of sentencing have always been confirmed and agreed to by this Parliament, without dissent.

I regret what the managers of the conference for the Legislative Council have done to the people of this State. I think that, quite properly, the people of this State will be outraged that 300 prisoners will be released from prison early and at the taxpayers' expense. I think that the people of this State should be outraged by what has occurred. The Liberal Party should expect about 300 thankyou cards from some of the most hardened criminals in this State.

Because of this decision that has been forced on the Government, when Barry Moyse applies to have his sentence reduced, and if that application is successful, which is quite on the cards, I hope that everybody in this State will appreciate why such a situation has occurred. I am quite sure that the media will draw to the attention of the public that people such as Barry Moyse, and other prisoners, such as armed robbers and drug dealers will be released early because of this decision. I do not support the decision because I had an alternative; rather, I support the decision because I had no alternative and I do not want this farce to continue.

Mr LEWIS: I did not want this to have to happen.

Mr Tyler: You're a friend of Barry Moyse, are you?

Mr LEWIS: You, you little sluggard, interjecting out of your place.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Hon. G.F. Keneally): Order!

Mr LEWIS: Well, you call him up.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee should resume his seat. First, I refer to a procedural matter and that the honourable member must not refer to another honourable member as 'you'. Secondly, I heard what the member for Murray-Mallee called the honourable member for Fisher, and I ask the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw. I am not asking the honourable member for Fisher to ask him to withdraw: I am asking the member for Murray-Mallee to withdraw what was a totally unparliamentary comment. I ask him first to withdraw.

Mr LEWIS: The word I used was 'sluggard', spelt s-l-u-g-g-a-r-d. I did not know that that word was unparliamentary and I have not previously been advised that that was the case. No other honourable member has been compelled to withdraw it if it has ever been used in the past.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not the word that the Chair heard. There may well be some debate about the word used, but the word I heard was significantly different. There is only a small emphasis, but it makes it significantly different. In any event, I have asked the honourable member to withdraw. I do not want to direct him to withdraw, but I ask him to withdraw because I found that statement to be unparliamentary, and that is my request at this stage. I advise the honourable member that, if he does not withdraw, I will direct him to do so.

Mr LEWIS: I withdraw, and I will thank the member for Fisher to shut his mouth. I did not want this debate to proceed, but the contribution just made by the Minister compels me to set the record straight on a few points. The first one is—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Fisher should cease interjecting. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: If the measure lapsed, that would have been on the Government's head. Quite clearly, the Government always knew that it was possible to reach an accommodation about this matter. It knew that it was possible for the conference of managers to amend the legislation in prospect and at the same time to cover the position as it stands up to this stage.

The statement that has been made by the lead speakers of the conference of managers in both Chambers, in this instance by my colleague the member for Mitcham, and in the other place by the Hon. Trevor Griffin, clearly indicates what Parliament and members of the Parliament believe was the case. Government Ministers know that. Members of the Government who attended that conference, whether they come from this place or the other place, agreed on the decision in an amicable fashion, but members of the Government return here now and catcall across the Chamber.

The Minister has proclaimed that other managers in that conference did not take their work seriously. He has blamed the Opposition for a position that was not adopted by the managers. In addition, he threatened to take the matter to the public. That situation has so enraged me to the point where I am compelled to stand and deny that what he said was in any way a representation of the truth of the outcome of our deliberations—it was not. It is a concoction on his part to suit his convenience for the sake of the public record. It is a slight against me and other participants in the conference. That sort of behaviour is typical of the way in which the Minister has conducted his personal life—do it first and fix it later; that is what he gets on about.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I beg your pardon?

Mr LEWIS: You know what I am talking about. I wonder how you arrived here.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I hope you explain it.

Mr LEWIS: The honourable Minister, who has had his go and implored me to give him a fair go while he spoke, seems unwilling to give me the same courtesy.

Mr Tyler: Yes, but you're being personal.

Mr LEWIS: And so is the member for Fisher. Regrettably, he does not understand that I can at least request your protection, Mr Chairman, whilst I have the call. Retrospectivity is always a bad remedy. What is more—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Explain your reference to my personal life. Don't be a coward.

Mr LEWIS: Are you going to shut him up, or am I?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Before I call the Minister to order, he will have the opportunity again to participate in the debate, but not at—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Sir, the member for Murray-Mallee has said that I conduct my personal life in a certain way. I find that an interesting comment. I believe that such a comment, if it is not out of order, at least demands an explanation. I will be happy to hear about this interesting personal life.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If it is not a point of order, I apologise for interrupting the debate. Nevertheless, if the member for Murray-Mallee has any guts at all, he will explain his reference on the public record. If he does not have any guts, he should apologise.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable Minister will have the opportunity to respond. I ask the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to make his remarks relevant and not to reflect upon the personal integrity of people within the Chamber. He can address his remarks to the conference without the need to make personal reflections, and I insist that he should do so.

Mr LEWIS: I regret that he was allowed to reflect on my integrity as one of the conference managers.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I will be very unhappy if this situation continues. It is for the Chair to determine whether or not direct reflections have been made. It is my recollection that what the Minister said was not a reflection on any House of Assembly members participation in the conference. It did not reflect on our delegation to the conference, in which I take it the honourable member participated.

Mr LEWIS: I seem to recall his having reflected on members of the Opposition in that context, although I will not pursue that point. He made the point that the Legal Services Commission will now proselytise amongst the prisoners who are presently in gaol.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: How many times does he get a chance to interrupt me while I am trying to make a point?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member's contribution is being influenced adversely by interjections, those interjections should cease.

Mr LEWIS: In his remarks the Minister made the point that the Legal Services Commission would now reallocate $200 000 of its limited resources to finance these appeals against the sentences of up to 100 prisoners. That is an assumption on his part, and I do not think that it helps the situation. It is a speculation about what might happen. If it does happen, then the Government should direct that these resources be used more sensibly, rather than wasting them on a spurious exercise in futility that will end up not changing the sentences of those prisoners. That is a fact because of the way in which we have agreed to put on the record our statement about what that law is intended to mean and was intended to mean when it was first drafted.

We have now left it beyond all doubt from this moment forward. We have made Parliament's intention clear as to how it should be applied and how it will be applied in the future. We made the agreement in good faith as managers of the House in conference with the Legislative Council. I thought that that exercise was a sensible and honourable one.

The honourable Minister also said that everyone agreed with the law before Their Honours from the High Court decided to overturn it—all the prisoners and all the people from the general public agreed. That is patently absurd, and the flaw in the argument is exposed by two points. The first is substantive, and that is that there was at least one person, the person who took the appeal to the High Court, who did not agree that that is what the law meant. That is why that person took it to the High Court and why he took the trouble, and succeeded in doing so. If it had not been that person, how does the Minister know that there was no other person? That is the second point I make.

Several other people might have been prepared to test the validity of the law before the High Court: we do not know that. Just because one did does not mean that everyone agreed. One certainly did not agree, and there might have been others who did not agree.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That is what I said.

Mr LEWIS: No, it is not. With respect, the Minister said everybody agreed.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That is one exception.

Mr LEWIS: That is one exception that went to the High Court—but not all have to. We now know that that is the interpretion of the law, so any others who might not have

agreed do not have to go. That has been tested. We do not know what is or was in the mind of other people, and it is not appropriate for us to speculate. The law of sentencing has been appealed and found to be wanting. Regardless of how we as individuals may feel about that, we as a Parliament now have expressed a view about it. As managers from each of our respective Houses, we came to agreement about what that expression of agreement ought to be. That was a substantive sticking point, finally, to the resolution of the problem. For the Minister now to take advantage, as it were, and misrepresent what the conference managers did in good faith is, to my mind, as much a reflection on him as on anything else.

My final point is that, if everyone thinks it was fair, no-one would attempt to go to an appeal now. They would accept the way in which the sentence was passed at the time, because they accepted that if what the Minister argues is so. If they do not think it fair, they will waste public money (and the Government will allow them to waste public money from the Legal Services Commission) and each of them who is so inclined will take the case to court and have the matter of the sentence reopened for examination on appeal and try to have it reduced in some way or other. But the resolution of both Chambers of Parliament that we agreed this afternoon in the conference of managers will make plain to the court that all it needs to do is to tidy up the statement, as it were, about the reasons why the sentence is passed and to confirm the sentence as it thinks appropriate.

With those kinds of remarks, I lay the lie quite honestly and honourably to the cacophany of interjections that I heard coming from members of the Government when they accused us, as members of the Opposition, as being friends of criminals.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr LEWIS: We would not in any circumstances ever contemplate whether or not we were friendly or otherwise with criminals. I am certainly not, anyway. All I want to do is make sure that, in the course of tidying up this unfortunate situation, we do not set precedents that can then be used in argument subsequently by the approach which the Government had formerly proposed in the original legislation. We have now settled that; let us have no more nonsense about it and no more point scoring about it outside this place. Let us accept the fact that the court will do its duty, that the mistake was made, that it has been so interpreted and now so covered.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Were you here?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Yeah, I heard it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You can control this animal?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Hon. G.F. Keneally): Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, you learn to control this animal.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Acting Chairman. I submit that the term directed at me—'animal'—is unparliamentary and I request that it be withdrawn.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is unparliamentary and I ask the Minister to withdraw.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very happy to withdraw it—because I have a lot more to say and I do not want to be prevented from saying it by not withdrawing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has withdrawn unreservedly?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Absolutely. I do have a lot more to say about the member for Murray-Mallee and I do not want to be prevented by being named and expelled from the Chamber. The member for Murray-Mallee is, of course, entitled to his point of view on how he wishes to interpret the conference. He is perfectly entitled to do that. It may have very little bearing on what actually went on but, nevertheless, he is entitled to his point of view, the same as I am. We all in this place make allowances for the member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: And we make them for you, too.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, you can make them until half past seven. I think we make far too many allowances—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Acting Chairman. I take exception to that remark.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader should control himself.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want to be yelling out to two of the most senior members in the Chamber—one on each side of the House. It certainly does nothing for the status of the Parliament. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee has taken a point of order. He objects to a statement made by the Minister. What is the statement that the honourable member objects to?

Mr LEWIS: That he and indeed all members of this place make allowances for me. That statement impugns my reputation and implies that I am in some way less than adequate in the performance of my duties, and I take exception to it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is, of course, a reflection on the honourable member, and I ask the Minister whether he wishes to withdraw that.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very happy to, Sir. As I say, I have a great deal more to say—whatever the form of the words might be, I am happy to comply.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 173, which reads:

> The House will interfere to prevent the prosecution of any quarrel between members, arising out of debates or proceedings of the House, or any committee thereof.

I strongly recommend that all parties take heed of the content of that Standing Order and that this debate conclude at the earliest possible moment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order of the honourable member for Light. I ask all members participating in the debate to adhere to the motion before the Chair—which is dealing with the recommendations of the conference. We do not want to create further tensions within the debate. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I was saying, Mr Acting Chairman, I had no quarrel with the member for Murray-Mallee when he stuck to the motion that was before us—none whatsoever. I disagreed with him—he was incorrect in a number of areas, but that is fine. There is no argument with that. What I do object to, and object to very strongly, is his statement that I had just conducted myself in the Chamber in the way that I conduct my private life, that is, do it first and fix it up later.

I would have thought that that remark has nothing whatsoever to do with the conference of managers; in fact, all it has to do with is the member for Murray-Mallee's belief that he can say anything he likes in this place and get away with it—anything at all. Again, he was allowed to, but I did not take a point of order and ask for it to be withdrawn. I want an explanation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I just point out to the Minister that, as he is well aware, when a statement is made about him in the course of a debate it is up to him or another member, but particularly the member who feels offended, to draw attention at the time the alleged offence is committed. The honourable member did not take offence at the time but did so two or three sentences later. In those circumstances, the Chair was not able to rule as the honourable member obviously believes the Chair should have. I would like the honourable member to direct his remarks to the recommendations of the conference rather than the behaviour of any member within this Chamber.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I intend to do that. In relation to the comment you have just made, Sir, I did not take exception to the remarks made by the member for Murray-Mallee precisely because they were made by the member for Murray-Mallee. However, I would have thought that any person who was prepared to make a statement like that, in a very public forum, would at least have the guts to stand up and justify it. If the member for Murray-Mallee does that, I will be happy.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Motion carried.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You coward—you're a miserable, dirty, low coward.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. G.F. Keneally): Order! I heard the honourable Minister's statement across the Chamber. It was quite loud enough for the Chair to hear. I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw unreservedly the comment he just made.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very happy to do so, Sir.

Mr Hamilton: Even though it is right.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Albert Park to withdraw his comment.

Mr HAMILTON: I so withdraw, Sir.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister for Correctional Services to obey Standing Orders. We are about to complete the week's sittings. We can do that if members allow the Chair to continue with the proceedings.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister and the Deputy Leader, or any other member, want to continue the discussion, they should do so outside the Chamber. I ask all members to adhere to Standing Orders and not provoke each other any more.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 5 September at 2 p.m.