

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 August 1992

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## TEUSNER, HON. B.H., DEATH

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Acting Premier): Mr Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform members that Berthold Herbert Teusner, member for Angas from 1944 to 1970, died at Tanunda on 7 August. I move:

That the House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. B.H. Teusner, former member and Speaker of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Speaking in support of that motion and commending it to all members, I have to begin by saying that Mr Teusner retired at the election which brought me into this place. I think I would be right in saying that there are now only two members who were members of this place at any time during Mr Teusner's period of stewardship on behalf of his electors and the people of South Australia, so I am not able to speak personally in respect of having shared experiences in this place with him. However, his record is written, for all who would read, in the public records of this State and no doubt is very fondly remembered by large numbers of people.

Mr Teusner was Government Whip from 1954 to 1955, he was a member of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation from 1950 to 1955 and from 1968 to 1970, Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker from 1955 to 1956, 1962 to 1965 and 1968 to 1970, and he was also Speaker for six years from 1956 to 1962.

Mr Teusner was born on 16 May 1907 at Rosedale. He was educated at Gawler High School, Immanuel College and Adelaide University and went into legal practice in Tanunda from 1932. He served on the Tanunda District Council between 1936 and 1956 and was the Chairman of that council from 1939 to 1956. He was Chairman of the Adelaide University and Royal Adelaide Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital advisory committees from 1962 to 1965; he was a member of the board of governors of the Botanic Gardens from 1956 to 1970; he was an honorary associate life member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and he was a member of the National Fitness Council of South Australia from 1956 to 1970.

I know that he entered very fully into the life of his community—very much the Barossa Valley community with its German heritage, its music, its festivals and many other things. I note also that he was very prominently associated with the Philatelic Society in his home town. Whether he personally was a philatelist, I do not know. If so, I suggest that is some sort of achievement. How many of us have been able to keep up that practice beyond our childhood? I join all honourable members in expressing our condolences to his surviving family. His wife predeceased him, but he leaves two children, eight grandchildren and three great grandchildren. The best wishes to the family go from all honourable members

here. We commend to the people of South Australia this expression of condolence on his passing.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I second the motion and also pass on my condolences to Bert Teusner's immediate family, to his children and to his grandchildren. I did not know Bert very well, but I do recall, still vividly today, three or four years ago being at a luncheon where we sat together and he reminisced about the Playford years and what it was like to serve under Playford. I say 'serve under Playford' because he was the dominant figure during that entire era. He highlighted, with a smile on his face, a number of stories that related to how Playford operated and kept control of the members.

Bert had a good sense of humour. For instance, it was interesting to see a question in the House that was directed to Robin Millhouse. Most members of the House would know of Robin Millhouse's interest in fitness. Bert asked him a question about a fitness campaign that was being run at that time. He then immediately asked for his own advice as Minister on how to keep fit (I suppose as comment in those days) and for advice for less fit members of the House.

It is interesting to see the sorts of tributes that have been paid to Bert through the years. In particular, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a simple tribute from Roger Goldsworthy, a former colleague in this place who succeeded Bert Teusner in representing the Barossa Valley. He said:

Bert Teusner is a thorough gentleman. I have never heard anyone refer to him in any other way.

I know from my own association with constituents of the Barossa Valley that they truly respected Bert Teusner; they thought highly of him and regarded him as a true gentleman of the valley. Anyone who is held in that light by Barossa Valley residents is truly a gentleman to be respected. I also stress the point that Bert Teusner represented the Barossa Valley very effectively and with great personal dedication. The way he conducted himself was always a tribute to both the Barossa Valley and this Parliament. It is with regret that we pass on our condolences to the Teusner family. However, we mark our respect for his contribution to this Parliament, to the Barossa Valley and to South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to add my condolences to the family of a former member of my electorate. As has been indicated, the Hon. Bert Teusner was particularly well-known. He was a keen and continuing member of the Tanunda Liedertafel, which has a history that goes back well over a century. He sang in that organisation up until the past six to eight months. He was frequently at the Carl Linger memorial service in the West Terrace Cemetery as part of the recognition of Linger's activities directly associated with the Song of Australia. Bert was also a very keen Rotarian and a community person who never did anyone any harm. I say that because many people would not know about all the things that Bert did for those in need, particularly during the depression years when he was in legal practice—a practice that still exists under one of his sons. Bert was of upright stature, with that familiar tuft of greying hair. He not infrequently occupied the seats on the Govern-

ment side of the gallery on a Wednesday afternoon after he had been to Adelaide to undertake conveyancing and the like in respect of his firm. Indeed, he was in the gallery earlier this year, but his trips have been less frequent over the past two or three years because of failing health and also because of a very strong commitment he gave to his invalid wife for the period of her illness. To all members of the Teusner family, I add my thoughts to those that have been expressed by the Acting Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I would like to make a few remarks, although I had only a brief acquaintance with Mr Teusner. As has been pointed out, between 1956 and 1962 he served two terms as a competent and dedicated Speaker of this Chamber. He called on me during my term as occupant of that office to offer me his advice and assistance in June 1989 in relation to the centenary of Parliament House, on which occasion he was an honoured guest in this Chamber. He made a few remarks to me at the time regarding his vacating the chair in favour of an Independent member, Tom Stott, in order that Tom Playford's Government could remain in office. As I said, Mr Teusner was a dedicated occupant of the Chair and one of nature's gentlemen. Along with other members of Parliament, I extend my sympathies to his family.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Like other members who have spoken, I pass on my condolences to the Teusner family. My colleague the member for Chaffey and I are the only members remaining in this Chamber who served with Mr Teusner. He was a very fair man. He was fair to both sides of Parliament when he was in the Chair, whether as Speaker or, later, as Acting Speaker or when he chaired the Committee stage of Bills. I know that Steele Hall, who was Premier at the time and who is in the Chamber at the moment, would like me to pass on his appreciation of the service given by Mr Teusner in counselling younger members of Parliament like me, the member for Chaffey and others who entered Parliament after the 2 March 1968 election. Mr Teusner was a tower of strength to us as individuals, not only because of his knowledge of the House but because of his knowledge of fairness.

It has been said that Mr Teusner was a gentleman. He was not only a gentleman, he was a gentle man. He was a man who considered others at all times and I do not believe members on the other side of politics could fault his attitude to serving in this Chamber for the benefit of the State and in the wider community for the benefit of the whole community. The Teusner family can be proud of the man who served them so well and abided very strongly by the old traditions of family life. He also served this Parliament and by that method the State. I trust that they will always remember the great work he did in serving all of us.

**The SPEAKER:** I will ensure that the thoughts of every member who has expressed condolences and the condolences of the House are conveyed to the family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.14 to 2.25 p.m.]*

## PETITIONS

### WOODS AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

A petition signed by 886 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow the Woods and Forests Department to enter the softwood chip export market was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

### GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to provide senior public servants with private plated motor vehicles was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore.

Petition received.

### GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 1 144 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to repeal the gaming machines legislation was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

### ROAD SEALING

A petition signed by 101 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to assist the relevant councils to seal an access road between Stockport and the Main North Road and to complete sealing of the Stockport to Hamley Bridge road was presented by Mr Venning.

Petition received.

### JULIA FARR CENTRE

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement about allegations raised in this place yesterday concerning sexual assault at the Julia Farr Centre.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I was informed late yesterday by centre administration that police are in fact investigating two complaints of sexual assault. These are the details of the incidents. In the week beginning 13 July, staff on duty in a ward area independently reported observing a staff member on two occasions allegedly involved in improper sexual behaviour with two female residents of the centre. As a consequence, action was taken on two fronts. First, the staff member concerned was suspended and subsequently resigned following investigation of the allegations. Secondly, after consultation with the residents and at their personal request, police were called in. Police are currently continuing their investigations with the support and assistance of staff at the Julia Farr Centre, who are also providing appropriate counselling support for the two residents involved.

I am concerned that the member for Adelaide raised these disturbing incidents without first checking the facts of the matters with the centre administration. While the honourable member was able to find the time yesterday to call the Director of Nursing at Julia Farr, he did not take that opportunity to raise any of these allegations to check their veracity. Instead, he has feebly tried to link these upsetting incidents to a supposed lack of staffing at the centre.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** That was the punch line at the end of his question. I have been assured that, at the times both incidents are alleged to have occurred, during which bathing was involved, the proper bath mix, that is, one male and one female staff member, were present. Action has already been taken to ensure that the policy of having an appropriate staff mix is adhered to and any other matter arising out of these incidents will be attended to in the proper way. The allegations also imply that staff at the Julie Farr Centre are unable to look after the residents adequately, and I reject this slur against the professionalism of the nursing staff there. It was in fact two nursing staff who independently observed the alleged incidents and took immediate action.

May I also say I find it questionable that the honourable member has raised these allegations in public. While I would be the first to admit that these allegations are disturbing, it has taken considerable courage for the two residents involved to talk to police and support an investigation without having to be the subject of rumour and political opportunism.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** You saw the letter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is out of order.

#### SEPARATION PACKAGES

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** In this House yesterday, the member for Bragg alleged that former Government employees who had accepted voluntary separation packages have been re-employed. I gave both the member for Bragg and this House an unequivocal undertaking that I would terminate the contracts of such employees if he provided me with their names. To date, he has failed to furnish me with those names, arguing that to do so would reveal the identity of his informant. I say again, I have asked for the names of the alleged 'rotters' and not that of his informant. If the member for Bragg was to cooperate, he would spare the Government departments a great deal of expense in the time-consuming exercise of scrutinising all their records. If he continues to withhold the names of the so-called 'rotters', I can only conclude that he is wasting public money and effort on a cheap political game.

To date, I have received advice from the Department of Agriculture, which was named by the member for Bragg, which indicates that the honourable member's allegations were wrong. In 1991-92, 26 officers from the department took voluntary separation packages. No employee's package exceeded \$100 000. Only two employees received gross payments exceeding \$100 000, and these included their accumulated entitlements for holidays and long service leave. Neither of these officers have been rehired, through Drake Personnel, as was alleged privately to the Minister of Agriculture, or any other way. The department has no current contracts, consultancies or employee on hire from Drake.

Of course, it is possible for former employees of the Public Service to be employed by private companies that tender for Government contracts. However, the Government has no power to dictate to the private sector whom it shall employ. In the near future, I shall present this House with information concerning the Department of Education and SACON, which the member for Bragg also cited. But the bottom line is this: if the honourable member is dissatisfied with the departmental inquiries, and if he believes that some individuals may slip through the net of those inquiries, let him give me the names of the individuals concerned. I repeat for the record; their employment will be terminated.

#### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair assumes that, in the absence of the Premier, the same situation that applied yesterday will apply today, with questions to the Premier being directed to the Deputy Premier, and questions to the Treasurer being directed to the Minister of Finance.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I direct my question to the Minister of Health. What reduction in Adelaide's public hospital beds will result from the 1.4 per cent reduction in real terms in the health budget that he announced last week, and will these closures add to the queue of 8 990 people waiting for elective surgery?

I have been given a copy of an internal memo from the Chairperson of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (Ms Mary Beasley) to departmental heads notifying them of the following closures of a further 50 hospital beds, extended shutdowns over the Christmas-New Year period and next Easter, a 25 per cent reduction in outpatient services, and a further reduction in staff numbers as a result of budgetary directions from the Health Commission. I understand that earlier this year the Minister requested hospital administrators to notify him of bed closures in the event of hospital budgets being reduced by 1 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is not possible to give an estimate at this stage. We would certainly expect some bed closures. In fact, we have been working for bed closures ever since Dr Sax reported to Government early in the early 1980s about what was appropriate for bed provision for a society such as ours. The plain fact of the

matter is that in the early 1980s Dr Sax indicated that about four beds per thousand was the appropriate level of bed provision and, despite some closures that have occurred in the past two years, we are still about five beds per thousand.

I remind the honourable member, as I have told the House on a number of occasions prior to his return to our midst, that those bed closures have occurred notwithstanding greater throughput in our hospitals. In the past couple of years our hospitals have been able to handle more cases than was previously the case because they have moved into day surgery, because they have scheduled the use of theatres in a much better way than was the case and because there are a number of other things that we are challenging them to do and they have started to do.

The honourable member mentioned booking lists and I am only too happy to get into that. Why is it that there are very short booking lists at some hospitals and much longer booking lists at others? The answer is that in some circumstances doctors refuse to give up patients. On a number of occasions there have been challenges to hospitals to share their booking list loads. But that is the sort of thing with which some members of the profession have a great deal of difficulty. They say, 'Why should I transfer my patients to you?' I do not see that ownership of patients—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**—really ought to be an issue that in any way holds up the capacity of people to be able to get the sort of services that our hospitals guarantee them. However, it is one of the problems with which we continue to grapple. Another problem that has been highlighted for some time has been the capacity of the public system to make arrangements with private hospitals, some of which have capacity, although they are certainly not losing business, to take some of our patients. The AMA continues to oppose that initiative. I understand that some of the honourable member's colleagues support that initiative; it is supported by the Federal Government and it has been canvassed by some other State Governments.

So, a number of imaginative initiatives are still open to us which I believe will mean that even in the light of a 1.4 per cent real terms budget cut, which the health system has, will nonetheless enable us to continue to provide a very good service. Immediate treatment will continue to be available at no cost to all emergency patients and there will continue to be a median waiting time of about four to six weeks for elective surgery. That will be the situation in 12 months time when the honourable member will no doubt be asking me a very similar question.

#### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether or not the clean-up and development of Gillman as the core site for the multifunction polis will lead to the development of new environmental technology that could be exported to other countries?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** It amazes me that the Opposition has so little understanding of the potential that the MFP site—and we are talking about the core site of Gillman—has for future development of industries and new technologies in South Australia. None other than the new Leader of the Opposition, who still has no understanding of the potential for development for this State and clearly indicated that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** It is very laughable. It is very sad as well. I would like to share with the House what the Leader of the Opposition said on 29 June in the *Advertiser*. Under the headline 'Brown urges new location for MFP', it states:

The Opposition Leader, Mr Brown, yesterday urged the State Government to relocate, rename and reshape the \$2 billion multifunction polis to avoid losing potential business to other States.

The sadness—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** This is interesting because I hope the community of South Australia will know and understand that the Opposition, to a man and woman, obviously—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the Minister resume her seat. Question Time is always interesting in this House. The Standing Orders, no matter how they are interpreted, will always be open to dispute. However, I would draw the Minister's attention to Standing Order 98, which provides that replies to the substance of a question may not debate the matter to which the question refers. I would ask the Minister to refer to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** With respect to the question, the answer is that I most certainly do believe that we have new environmental technology that can be developed at the Gillman site. I say that because I want to make it clear to the House that new technology will be developed. It will be developed as a result of the decisions and commitment taken by 178 countries at the UNCEO conference held recently in Rio. At that conference it was agreed that we would move ahead as a globe to implement sustainable development. The implications for South Australia of that decision are quite exciting and provide us with great potential, particularly with respect to what we are doing at the Gillman site with the MFP.

Our regional neighbours will need to import the kind of technology that we already have in place in South Australia, not to mention the new technologies that will be developed with respect to the cleaning up of contaminated land. I believe that all South Australians, perhaps with the exception of the Opposition, understand that South Australia has indeed already developed first-class technologies for export in the provision of services, energy planning, water treatment and the clean-up of our contaminated sites. These will be expanded by the development of the Gillman site. It is important to recognise that, in cleaning up a contaminated land site like Gillman, we will provide a prototype that can be exported to every

city in the world, and indeed around Australia, which has contaminated land sites.

The MFP is concerned with securing participation and investment in these new environmental growth industries. World agreement on sustainable development is indeed the new direction. I am amazed that the Opposition has so little understanding of where the rest of the world is that it is still back in the 1970s—yesterday's men—saying things like, 'We don't really want it there', because Opposition members have not bothered to find out what is happening in the rest of the world and with the decisions from UNCEO.

**Mr INGERSON:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer to Standing Order 98 with respect to debate and ask you, Mr Speaker, to pull the Minister into order.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister to be very pertinent in her response, if she has not already finished her remarks.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I have finished, Sir.

### CONSULTANCIES

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is directed to the Acting Premier. What steps did the Government take to coordinate the appointment of consultants by Ministers to ensure that there was no unnecessary duplication, to ensure the consultancies were justified and to monitor the consultants' activities to guard against exorbitant escalation of fees and waste of taxpayers' money? I understand that information given to the Economic and Finance Committee of this Parliament revealed that \$100 million has been spent by this Government on consultancy fees in the past five years.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There are guidelines that have to be adhered to—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** —by all Ministers and departments in this matter. If the honourable member has not been given a text of that, I can certainly get that for him. One thing I must point out in relation to this matter from—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The members for Goyder and Victoria are both out of order. If we are to get through Question Time comfortably, interjections will not be allowed. The Acting Premier.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** My understanding is that it is part of Liberal Party policy and part of that which it urges upon this Government that a number of matters which are dealt with by day labour or by staff of the Public Service ought to be contracted out to the private sector. In other words, instead of employing directly people who clean things or dig holes in the road or whatever else they do, that work should be contracted out. What else is a consultancy but contracting out the brain work? Members opposite cannot have it both ways.

If certain information has to be collated, if certain matters have to be put together, if this is essential for the delivery of the public services in this State, you do one of three things: you employ people to do it for you directly; you contract it out, which is another way of saying

you let consultancies; or you do some of both. Of course, you are very careful about the way in which you choose the path that you go along.

This Government, which has been successful in being able to reduce the size of the public payroll considerably in the past couple of years—some thousands of positions have gone—has, nonetheless, taken the decision that from time to time it is important that certain investigations be undertaken outside, either because we do not employ that expertise within the Public Service and never have done so or, alternatively, we once did, but we do no longer at the behest of the general call that there should be some down-sizing of the Public Service. That is all it is. I cannot understand the objection of an Opposition who says that we should be contracting out cleaning but objects to the contracting out of the sorts of things that are subject to consultancy. It is essentially the same principle.

### TRANSIT LINK

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Can the Minister of Transport advise the House what feedback has come from commuters who have used the semi-express transit link bus service between the Aberfoyle Hub and the city?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** He is a very big boy, isn't he? I thank the member for Albert Park for his question, and I note there was some comment from members opposite, which was quite out of order, about the relevance of this question to the member for Albert Park. I will deal with that in a moment.

The success of the express transit link bus service has been outstanding and I am particularly pleased and proud to have been associated with initiating such a service. I know that the member for Fisher, as a gracious person, would want to share in this success because it is an outstanding achievement. I also want to pay due regard to and compliment the Happy Valley council. Of all the councils I deal with, there is no council better than the Happy Valley council. There are many councils as good but none better. The cooperation that I have had from the Happy Valley council in using its resources and vehicles to link in with the STA's transit link has been outstanding. It is an example of cooperation of which many other councils ought to take note.

The Aberfoyle Hub transit link began operating from the Hub on 17 February 1992. It is part of a plan that I announced for the STA to concentrate more and more on the main arterial roads and on the principal railway lines, particularly from the outer suburbs, to bring in people in large numbers with as few stops as possible and as frequently as possible. I believe that is the principal role of public transport. That is the role it does best and some of the other things that the STA is attempting to do and traditionally has done can be done better by others.

The patronage of the service is around 1 000 boardings a day. From our inquiries of those people, hundreds of them are new passengers to the STA. So, it is possible to attract people back to public transport, but they must be targeted. We have to ask people what they want and then supply that service. As I stated before, the service is fast, it is frequent and, overwhelmingly, it services the outer

suburbs. The success has been such that, after discussions, the STA has agreed to introduce two more transit link services. From 17 August there will be a semi-express service from West Lakes into the city. As Minister of Transport—this was probably so for several Ministers before me—I have been prevailed upon by the member for Albert Park to introduce such a service. It will be a pleasure on 17 August for the member for Albert Park to wave off the first vehicle.

On the same day a transit link service between Elizabeth and the city via the north-east busway will also commence. I know that the member for Elizabeth will be particularly pleased, as will the member for Napier. Again, it is very innovative of the STA to have devised that route, to start well north of the busway to give people in Elizabeth the experience of modern, fast bus travel. It will cut a considerable amount of time off the journey. If the Aberfoyle Hub service is any indication, those two new transit link services will be a great success, and I look forward to hearing from the member for Albert Park after a fair period to report back to the House as to how those services are going.

### CONSULTANCIES

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** I address my question to the Acting Premier. Why is the Premier still refusing to provide to this Parliament information about the cost of consultancies commissioned by the Grand Prix Board, the MFP and the Planning Review, and will he say when this information will be made available? I am advised that the \$100 million spent over the past five years, as advised to the Economic and Finance Committee, may increase significantly when the committee has information on all consultancies commissioned. Information from the Grand Prix Board, the MFP and the Planning Review is amongst that still being withheld from the committee. This information was first sought in Questions on Notice from the Opposition in November last year.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will obtain that information for the honourable member but, again, I make the point that, if we assume that the information the honourable member has given us is correct, and I am prepared to assume that for the sake of the argument, we are talking about \$20 million per year being spent on consultancies in a State budget of something close to \$5 billion. That does not seem to me to be an unreasonable situation, given the facts I have just set out.

Are members opposite saying that the Government needs no information in relation to some of these areas? Are they saying that some consultancies should not be let in some of these areas? Did the Liberal Party in Government from 1979 to 1982 never let a consultancy? I find an air of complete unreality in this matter. I leave it to the Opposition spokesperson on Treasury and finance matters to work out the percentage of \$20 million in relation to \$5 billion—it is not too difficult. It is not very much, and it must be seen in that context. However, I will obtain the specific information for the honourable member.

### DAIRY INDUSTRY

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Agriculture explain the ramifications of the white paper for dairy farmers and, in particular, dairy farmers in the Barossa and Mid-North regions, and also explain what the white paper's proposal means for the farm gate price? Following the Minister's release of the white paper in late July, a number of my constituents and groups from Port Pirie have approached me regarding this subject.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for her question, which is of relevance to her and her constituents, I note in response to an interjection that has just come from the other side. The white paper which has been released by the Government and which resulted in some immediate policy decisions and an indication of legislation to come before this House later in the year was published after extensive consultation with all sections of the dairy industry. In so far as it was going to be possible to make a set of recommendations that would satisfy everyone on all points, as good as possible an effort has been made.

In saying that, I want to thank very much all sections of the industry—the farmers, vendors and processors—and all those involved for the considerable amount of energy and work they put in to reaching this stage. I also want to thank officers of my own Department of Agriculture for the particular role they played in this area—Steve Rice and Tim Newbery, in particular. First, I believe that there should be a maintenance of a farm gate price, and the white paper indicates that. We believe that it is important for the health of the dairy industry in South Australia—if we are to see one maintained—that that be the case.

However, we have a situation where the proposal now for a Statewide farm gate price replaces the previous farm gate price that applied simply to two areas of the State, with dairy farmers in other areas being subject to individual price contracts with milk processors. To move from that limited farm gate price to a Statewide farm gate price required some rationalisation of the system so as not to disadvantage dairy farmers and not to disadvantage milk processing facilities in the State and, ultimately, to advantage the industry and consumers.

The effective farm gate price that applied prior to the white paper decisions, and which still applies now, is, in the Metropolitan Milk Board area, 44.5 cents a litre before the 2.4 cents a litre augmentation; the Mid North, 34.49 cents per litre; the South-East, about 35.6 cents per litre; and in the Riverland, about 36 cents per litre. The proposal in the white paper increases the wholesale price and, therefore, the recommended retail price by two 1 cent a litre increments on all white milk sold in South Australia. This will raise sufficient funds which, when apportioned to the Riverland, the Mid-North and the South-East, will allow for a single Statewide farm gate return of approximately the same as applies in the Metropolitan Milk Board area of about 44.6 cents per litre.

That means that no dairy farmers will be presently disadvantaged and others will help move towards the farm gate price mechanism. That is a key point that will be of significance to the members' constituents. Other matters have been the removal of the maximum and

minimum price regimes. That has been implemented forthwith. We now have a recommended retail price, and I have asked the Prices Commissioner to monitor the situation so that we can see what actually happens to milk prices throughout the State.

Of course, the minimum now drops to zero and I might say that, while it may sound a position that would not be supported by many, it ended up being a position that all sections of the industry seemed to support. I have announced other issues with respect to unpasteurised milk and other questions relating to equalisation regulations and I refer members to the press release I issued on 30 July in respect of those matters.

### ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

**Mr INGERSON (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In response to a commitment last week by the Liberal Party to legislate to facilitate enterprise bargaining, the Minister said in the *Advertiser* of 4 August, that this was already occurring in South Australia. However, the annual report of the President of the Industrial Commission, Judge Stanley, tabled yesterday contradicts the Minister in expressing disappointment that, so far, only four enterprise agreements have been presented for approval.

In a decision in December last year, the commission stated that enterprise bargaining in South Australia was almost impossible because of the State's legislative framework, and it made particular reference to provisions of the Industrial Relations Act which limit enterprise bargaining to members of registered employee and employer associations. Employers have indicated to me that to use enterprise bargaining under State law would effectively require a work place to become unionised, in other words, a closed shop, and for this reason they back away from using it.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I am pleased to receive this question from the member for Bragg. I can well recall the discussion we had in this place when the current provisions of the Bill were debated some time ago; it was made clear to the member for Bragg then that, if anyone wanted to enter into a common law arrangement, they could. I was listening to John Hewson this morning talking on radio about common law arrangements. I thought that the member for Bragg would have been lauding that—that people can have common law arrangements, which is precisely what his Federal counterpart wants to do. There is nothing to stop people from doing that.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I have forgotten. All I know is that it is a lot. I want to go on to that. Some years ago, using the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, as it then was, I negotiated a contract of employment for a considerable number of people working at Moomba. It did not conform to the norm of industrial arrangements at that time and it was quite successful. It is reasonable to say that as a former union official I negotiated many things outside the award. The member for Bragg is really talking about the arrangements—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The Leader has a chance to ask me a question and, if he can frame it properly, he will have his opportunity. Getting back to the member for Bragg, if people are not members of a union, are employed by an employer and want to have a contract, they can enter into a contract—just like a common law contract and just as John Hewson says they should. If they want to do that, they can. I do not know what the problem is.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** All I know is that members opposite—particularly the member for Mitcham, who makes a habit of pointing, yelling out of turn and not being polite because his mother did not teach him good manners—just do not understand this. What he wants to do is to bring about a situation where people are treated as they were treated in the 1830s and the 1850s.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** There he goes, calling out again. He is just like the braying donkeys that one finds around the place. That is exactly what they want to do. They say that of course they do not want to do that, but the reality is that that is what they want to do. The yelling member for Victoria is up to exactly that, because he is on about minimum wages. They do not tell us what the minimum wages are: they say that they will tell us before the election.

The racket in this relates to the free discussion between the individual and the employer. What free discussion is there when there is one employee and an employer and the employee is harangued for two hours, such as happens in New Zealand? Where is the free discussion? It is straight-out exploitation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Leader is out of order. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The member for Victoria is yelling and shouting again. I wish that he would speak more quietly because then I could hear what he is saying and respond to his interjections.

**An honourable member:** That is out of order.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** It might be, Mr Speaker, but the member for Victoria is out of order every time he opens his mouth and yells. He ought to have some manners.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to come back to the substance of the response.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Members opposite want to turn the clock back to those days when people were thoroughly exploited. I have read with some interest articles about recent industrial disputes in France. I followed those disputes with some interest. One of the disputes involved the Renault car plant. I suggest that the member for Victoria get hold of the magazines that I read and inform himself about these problems, because there was a prolonged stoppage of work. There was no organised union at that plant and no-one could discuss with those workers how to settle their grievances and the dispute. The only way they could get a return to work was to get the local bishop to intervene and lead the discussions—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think that the Minister is ranging too far. I ask him to bring his response to a close.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The point I was making is that, where there is no union and where there is a large number of people, all with different ideas, there is no organised way of channelling the consensus of opinion needed to settle a dispute. Another example was the truck drivers—

**The SPEAKER:** I think that the Minister has answered fully and I ask him to sit down. I call upon the member for Napier.

### SOCIAL JUSTICE

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** My intelligent question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Will the Minister provide the House with details of the Government's social justice initiatives targeted to the disadvantaged in the Elizabeth-Munno Para area? The House will be well aware that the Elizabeth-Munno Para area has one of the highest concentrations of low income and socially disadvantaged households in South Australia. It was as a result of this that the Government set up the Elizabeth-Munno Para project to gauge community responses in order to counter the many problems in this area. Constituents are now seeking progress on these matters.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question and I am sure that he does not need to qualify it as being intelligent; my experience is that he always asks intelligent questions of Ministers. It is important, too, from the point of view of the development of the Elizabeth-Munno Para scheme, because it is a very important social justice initiative, as the member for Napier knows. His part in this has been supportive and very welcome indeed.

Some key factors play a part in the overall exercise and the development of what we are seeing as a social exercise in lifting the spirit and the environment of Munno Para for the benefit of all those who live there and, of course, for the benefit of the community as a whole. Those key elements of the strategy are basically the economic and employment regeneration of the area and significant changes in the housing tenure, form and mix of the area. There is also improvement in the provision and delivery of human services to that area, as well as an improvement in the environmental factors surrounding the overall living environment enjoyed by Munno Para residents.

It is particularly important to focus on the housing objectives. In May this year we set off on a program which will improve the home ownership arrangements for the residents of Munno Para. We have taken a number of significant steps to assist people in the purchase of their own homes. This applies not only in terms of Housing Trust stock, but we are looking at offering people the opportunity through HomeStart to purchase private stock which again will assist the balance and mix of home ownership in Munno Para.

It is important to record the various schemes which are being offered. One scheme, which has existed for some time, involves Housing Trust purchase, so people are

being encouraged; but we have a specific scheme which is allowing low payments at the beginning and some sharing with the Housing Trust of the cost of servicing those loans so that tenants can buy those Housing Trust homes. Supplementary HomeStart loan product for low income households is also being put in place as well as the promotion of shared ownership. That will be a significant benefit to those residents as well. We have identified more than 200 houses within the area that will be part of renovation and upgrading as a provision for sale.

Overall we will see a total improvement in the whole environment. We believe that this sort of incentive will give a much better outlook and will improve the quality of lifestyle for the residents of Munno Para. I thank the member for Napier for his support and I look forward to seeing the outcome. As it will involve Better Cities money, we expect to have about \$3 million this year focused on the Munno Para exercise. I look forward to seeing the end result.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Adelaide. The honourable member for Henley Beach.

**Mr Ferguson:** No, Sir; I have asked my question.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair allows the House the courtesy of referring to question lists. It is not a necessity; it is a courtesy given to the House. If members are not going to respond to those lists, we might as well do away with them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members are like a jack-in-the-box. The honourable member for Bright.

### POLICE COMPUTERS

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Does the Minister of Emergency Services intend that all police computer systems be rewritten as recommended by a consultancy report prepared for the South Australian Police Department, what will this conversion cost, will it be effective and what was the consultancy fee?

I have a confidential report prepared by Aspect Computing Proprietary Limited for the South Australian Police Department and I also have memos from senior computing staff which are strongly critical of the Aspect report. The report contains recommendations for the complete rewriting of police systems on their own IBM machines as well as those on the Justice Information System which has already blown its budget by \$20 million. I am reliably informed that the Aspect report proposes enormous and unnecessary changes to the police computer system which, I am told, could blow the police computing budget by as much as \$10 million.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I think it is his first question as the Opposition spokesman. I think he makes the cricket team of Opposition spokesmen whom I have had in the various portfolios. I welcome the question and will get an answer for it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Coles is out of order. The member for Henley Beach.



## BUSINESS SKILLS MIGRATION PROGRAM

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs advise what progress has been made on the new Federal business skills migration program, and has the Minister approached the Federal Government with a view to a special South Australian subprogram being introduced?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Discussions are still taking place between State and Federal authorities following a meeting of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Ministers held in Adelaide earlier this year. The business skills migration program now being introduced by the Federal Government replaces the old business migration program, due to problems that were identified by the Federal Parliamentary Accounts Committee. The problems identified by it were by and large problems that were faced in other States in Australia, not in this State. Indeed, the concerns that that committee raised reflected the very concerns this State Government put to the Federal Government before the changes to the business migration program back in 1988-89.

I wrote to the then Minister, Senator Robert Ray, about that matter in October 1988, warning that we had concerns about some of the proposed changes. In a sense, what I am saying is that we told them so. The program has changed, but I freely acknowledge that the business migration program for South Australia has been of enormous benefit to this State over the years. It is worth noting that about \$200 million in overseas funds has been brought into the South Australian economy from some 60 or so business ventures that have been already established, with others on the way.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** About 7 per cent of business migrants arriving in Australia over the 1980s settled in South Australia. If you take—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If you take account of the fact that New South Wales had a disproportionately high share of them and then look at the balance of the remaining States, you will see that we have better than our population's share of the remaining States. One of the reasons—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A point of order is being taken by the member for Hayward. The Minister will resume his seat. The honourable member for Hayward.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Sir, you have previously ruled today that debate is not allowed in reply to questions, and on the question of relevance, I note that the Minister is debating across the Chamber on matters that are not relevant to the question, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to again rule on that with respect to the Minister's answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair did not recognise debate in the Minister's answer. The Minister responded to an interjection, which was out of order, and the response was out of order. However, I will reiterate that answers are to relate specifically to the questions asked.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I was referring to my letter to Senator Robert Ray of 26 October 1988, in which we warned of the problems that would come from the accredited agency arrangements. One of those prob-

lems is that we felt that too few consultants would be accredited in South Australia which would disadvantage South Australia's share—and indeed that certainly did happen.

With respect to the State subprogram, which we now want to see put in place, this month I have written to the present Federal Minister, the Hon. Gerry Hand, outlining our case for a State subprogram, and I believe that that should be adopted by them. Among other features, it seeks to have a reduction of the asset requirement in the principal applicant's business or businesses, re-definition of the interpretation of what constitutes an employee, the reduction in the turnover requirement of the company employing a prospective applicant through the senior executive subcategory of up to \$A10 million and the requirement that applicants have at least survival standard English language ability. I have indicated to the Federal Minister that the introduction of a subcategory incorporating these changes would be welcomed as a move towards a more attractive program that we believe would benefit South Australia and the business skills program for Australia at large.

## GOVERNMENT HOUSING

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Why were unauthorised deductions made from the pay packets of Government blue-collar workers who live in Government employee housing in the country? How many employees were affected? Will they be refunded and, if so, how and when? In April this year, Government Housing tenants were notified of rental increases to take effect from the first full pay period after 1 July. These employees were told, in a letter from the Office of Government Employee Housing, that any increase would be taken from their pay from 24 July and that, to avoid large rental increases, weekly rental adjustments would be limited to \$15. I have received several complaints from blue-collar workers that deductions have been made from their pay and that they have been slugged rent increases of \$60 or more from 10 July.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am aware of the position. I will get a report on it for the honourable member because some complicating factors are involved. Some other tenants have also been affected, so I will get a full report, giving a comprehensive and complete brief for the honourable member. In that way members who are affected will have a clear understanding of their position in relation to the moneys that they allege they have overpaid. I understand the concern of members given the information that the honourable member has put before the House.

## O'MALLEY SCHOLARSHIP

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Will the Minister of Education advise the House of the current status of the King and Amy O'Malley Trust scholarship for home economics in view of the current revival of interest in this controversial member of this Parliament and of the first Federal Parliament? On his death in 1953, Mr King O'Malley, who represented Encounter Bay in this House

in the 1890s before representing Tasmania in the Federal Parliament and eventually becoming Home Minister, left his estate for home economics scholarships through a trust to take effect 25 years after his death. This was further delayed by legal disputation in Victoria regarding probate on the estate. Indeed, exactly 10 years ago today (12 August 1982), the then member for Salisbury, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, asked a question of the then Minister of Education as to the likely outcome of this probate dispute.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I am pleased to say that, given the effluxion of time, the King and Amy O'Malley scholarships have come into effect in this State and right across the country. Members may be interested to know that this scholarship came about because of the belief of King and Amy O'Malley that Australian family life ought to be strengthened and supported for the sake of the nation. Having no living relatives, they decided to establish a trust fund, leaving their estate to accrue interest for some 21 years after which the interest would be used for home economics scholarships.

This is perhaps an underestimated aspect of the curriculum in our schools and for male and female students this area of study is most valuable. Because of the generosity of this former member of the South Australian Parliament and Tasmanian member and Minister in the Federal Parliament, I think, from what the member for Walsh said, this bequest is now bearing fruit. Some 30 scholarships are offered around Australia. They amount to \$6 000 per year for undergraduate students and \$8 000 per annum for postgraduate students. There are four such scholarships available for South Australian students in this area and I understand that, sadly, they have not all been taken up. I would certainly commend this financial support to students who wish to pursue studies at the undergraduate or postgraduate level in the field of home economics. I do not have information about the state of the trust fund, which is administered from Victoria, but it is obviously very healthy.

#### ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** How does the Minister of Water Resources justify the Engineering and Water Supply Department monopoly on the sale of certain essential water and sewer pipe components to the plumbing trade, such as \$534 for a 100 mm stop valve when the price for a commercial supplier is \$275, which is a difference of \$259? Is it Government policy to charge such high prices, which are passed on to home owners, to prop up the E&WS foundry, or is it merely to take more money out of the pockets of South Australians on top of the \$8.8 million that the Government took from the E&WS for its own revenue last financial year?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In answering the honourable member's question, I have to say that I find amazing his attitude in terms of his continual attack upon the E&WS. It is quite incredible that the shadow Minister for the E&WS seeks consistently to denigrate and attack that department. Never once

has he acknowledged any of the benefits or the positive achievements of the department, or the changes in direction the department has taken. It is interesting that he continues to be so negative and to knock the department.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Heysen is out of order, and the member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I will be very pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member on this matter and provide it to him.

#### TOURISM MARKET

**Mr McKEE (Gilles):** Will the Acting Minister of Tourism inform the House of any positive news concerning Tourism South Australia's endeavours to snare a share of the North Asian tourist market?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am sure that all members of the House will be very interested in hearing some good news; that is, that South Australia is to reap the benefits of two international airlines announcing further direct flights into Adelaide. Cathay Pacific has announced weekly direct flights into Adelaide beginning 4 October, and Malaysian Airlines is pleased to announce that it is putting on a second weekly direct flight into Adelaide from Kuala Lumpur.

Tourism is one of our best and fastest opportunities to create jobs, and Asia is one of Australia's fastest growing tourism markets. All members would be interested to hear that the North Asian market (that is, Asia other than Japan) has now eclipsed Japan in terms of rapid growth, around the 30 per cent mark this year, in terms of tourists coming to Australia. We believe that it will be a major source of overseas visitors by the year 2000. South Australia wants to market an effective campaign, possibly involving other States, that targets immediate sources of tourists in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Research by Tourism South Australia shows that a concentrated effort in this region will pay dividends in terms of stimulating tourism and creating new jobs.

*Dr Armitage interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The member for Adelaide, who is calling out, obviously wants some more good news, so I am pleased to be able to tell him that the Okayama Prefectural Government and the Japan Tourist Bureau are now proposing a series of charter flights between Okayama and Adelaide. He will know, as he is an intelligent man although he has been dumped back down the benches, that Okayama is very much the transport hub of western Japan. Last week I met with a high level delegation from that prefecture including the Speaker, senators and business leaders, to discuss this issue. They are confident of this proposal's becoming a reality. Now that the Asian flights have been secured, and with further Japanese flights on the horizon, South Australia must not sit back and be complacent: we must be vigorous in our campaign to secure more tourists from this area.

Recently we have held talks with the Australian Tourism Commission in Sydney regarding a coordinated assault on the North Asian market, and next year the Australian Tourism Commission begins a \$10 million

five-year campaign promoting some of Australia's other attractions, its sporting opportunities, environment, arts and cultural festivals and food and wine. These, of course, are areas in which South Australia is already internationally famous. We want to dovetail our campaign in with the ATC's effort.

We must continually press home the message to the Federal Government and to Qantas that Australia does not begin and end in the eastern States: it does not start at Sydney Harbor Bridge and end at the Carlton football ground. We must get that message through to Qantas, in particular, which is rapidly becoming an eastern States airline, and we must keep pressing home to it the fact that, while these North Asian carriers are keen to come here, Qantas must do its bit before it can really claim to be Australia's national airline, as there is more to Australia than the Rock, the Reef and the Opera House.

### ELECTRICITY TRUST

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy, and if he is to answer it correctly he will have had to read a report.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is definitely out of order. He will not bring comment into a question and the Chair will be listening closely to the question.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Did the Government milk more money out of the Electricity Trust in 1991-92 to help pay for the Government's financial mismanagement? Over the previous two financial years the Government took \$67 million from the Electricity Trust over and above the normal rate of return on capital. All power consumers in South Australia are demanding to know whether there was a similar desperate grab for ETSA's cash in the 1991-92 financial year.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** It is an interesting question by the former Leader of the Opposition. While he was Leader of the Opposition several of his own front bench members indicated that ETSA ought to be paying a rate of return greater than the money we collected from ETSA.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** Why can't you answer the question?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is again out of order. The member for Stuart.

### DRIVERS LICENCES

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Transport tell the House how the changes to driver licence testing will impact on people wanting to gain licences, especially people in country areas? I have had a number of inquiries through both of my electorate offices about the changes and their effects, particularly on country people.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you—

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Stuart for her question. Most members in the Chamber, and I would particularly hope most members on the other side, would appreciate the importance of the question because it is an issue that has caused some concern in non metropolitan areas, and I would hope that some members opposite at least would have some concern about people who live outside the metropolitan area. Significant changes are taking place to the testing of drivers throughout the State. Some changes have already been announced and some will be announced at a later date, but the most significant one is the change in country areas where the police who do the licence testing at the moment will be replaced by qualified examiners from the Department of Road Transport.

The reason is twofold. The first is to get a better standard of testing because, with great respect to the Police Force, police are not trained to conduct these tests to anywhere near the same standard as are Department of Road Transport personnel. The second reason is that the Police Department and most of the police in country areas, particularly at single police officer stations, do not have the time to deal with testing any longer. At the request of the police we have tried to accommodate such areas by sending a Department of Road Transport officer into the area on a regular basis to conduct tests—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Goyder made some inane remark about money. It has nothing to do with money: it is to get a better standard of testing and to relieve the police of the testing burden. The police asked for that and we were happy to comply with the request. However, I have asked the Department of Road Transport to try in difficult locations to see whether sensible arrangements can be made. I am not averse to private individuals within those communities being trained to conduct driver licence testing themselves. For example, it could be the local schoolteacher or whoever. It is important that we are as flexible as possible whilst maintaining the safety standards.

There is another current issue in relation to driving tests which I believe requires greater explanation. I refer to the question of driving schools and qualified driving instructors being able to issue licences through a series of periodic testing and the maintenance of a log book so that the people, if they choose—it is purely choice—can obtain a driving licence in that manner. Of course, the other method of testing will still be available, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the inane interjection from the member for Goyder that shortly only the rich will be able to afford to obtain a driving licence.

If any constituent of the member for Goyder or of any other member in this House wishes to use the existing system, it is there for them. The log book system is merely an option and one that I think is worth trying. So, I would like the member for Stuart to advise her constituent that we will ensure that the minimum amount of disruption takes place during the changeover from the police to the Department of Road Transport officers. I hope that other members who understand the situation—and that excludes the member for Goyder, who clearly does not understand—will explain it to their

constituents and contact me if there is any particular problem in their electorate. I thank the House for its attention.

#### SEPARATION PACKAGES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer to the ministerial statement made by my colleague the Minister of Labour earlier today and a question asked by the member for Bragg yesterday. I wish to make an explanation concerning the alleged private conversation between me and the member for Bragg. At the outset may I say that, as the conversation was a private one with me, I express regret and apologise to the member for Bragg on behalf of my office and others for the fact that that conversation was publicly canvassed.

In saying that, I point out that the events that took place were that, following the question yesterday, I asked the member for Bragg whether he would provide me with details relating to one of the departments he mentioned, namely, the Department of Agriculture. As a result of my request, the honourable member came and spoke with me. During that conversation—and it has now become a fact in the public domain that such a conversation took place—the honourable member did not at any stage reveal to me the name of any individual related to this matter, and I want that on the record.

However, the honourable member did indicate his willingness, subject to protecting his informants, to assist. As a result of that, I pursued the matter with my office, which pursued the matter with the Department of Agriculture, which then came back to my office—my office then contacted my colleague's ministerial office with the information that we received. It is quite clear that along the way the interpretation of the word 'private' in terms of 'private conversation' obviously was significantly changed and lost. I very much regret that. One of the possible reasons why it was lost is that it transpires that the information available to my colleague's office indicated that a wide-ranging check of departments showed that the name of the particular company concerned had already come up on a number of occasions. Therefore, the member for Bragg was not, in terms of the information available to them, the first person to mention it. That may be one reason why the information was lost.

It also needs to be noted that, because the conversation was with me, it was not accurately—in the sense of completely and comprehensively—informed to all the others. It was not possible for my colleague, for example, and his office to know fully what transpired in that conversation. The information that my colleague was given about the response of the Department of Agriculture is correct in terms of the comments made about previous VSP recipients and whether any are being employed by the department. My previous practice in such matters with respect to in-corridor conversations should be noted. There was a genuine mistake on behalf of all involved, again, for which I express my regret.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Today during Question Time I asked the Minister of Transport about the transit link. One honourable member opposite interjected and perhaps somewhat unkindly I retorted. I refer to the member for Hayward, with whom I think I get on pretty well. Nevertheless, it was a very serious matter and I suspect he thought it was a dorothy dixer. As most members on this side of the House are aware, rarely do I ask a dorothy dixer. This issue of the transit link goes back many years. In fact, it goes back to about 1981 when the Hon. Michael Wilson was Minister of Transport.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed he was, as I concede readily. He was a person with whom I got on very well. I believe he was probably one of the best Ministers that the Liberal Government had.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague said, we even put him on the Taxi Board because of his ability. I shall not respond to any further interjections. The transit link has been proposed and pursued by me since 1981. I believe that persistence pays off. Eleven years down the track, this transit link will come into operation. The existing services in that area, particularly between 1979 and 1982, were appalling. Since that time they have not been much better until now. This is particularly important for people in the western part of my electorate: Tennyson, Semaphore Park, Royal Park, and the western part of Seaton, not to mention the suburb of Albert Park itself. This service will provide almost an express service into the city. It will go down the boulevard from West Lakes Mall, a major shopping centre, stopping at the Albert Park Railway Station, turning right at the Port Road-West Lakes Boulevard intersection, stopping just before the Woodville-Port Road intersection and running express right into the Adelaide Railway Station. That service has been long overdue. I thank the Minister and, indeed, the STA for at long last honouring my constituents' requests.

It has not been an easy issue to pursue. I suspect that the STA and the different Ministers of Transport finally said, 'For God's sake, give it to him and shut him up.' If that be the case, I am very proud that they have done so, and again I thank them very much for that. However, it is well deserved. Nothing is too good for my constituents, particularly those elderly people within my electorate, and my district has one of the highest ratios of elderly people in South Australia. I believe that that service will increase dramatically. It is not easy standing on one's feet as one gets a little older. I can attest to that myself. However, there are many older than I in my electorate. People around Delfin Island and on the pathway through to the Albert Park Railway Station will be well served. Should they want to get onto the train at the Albert Park Railway Station they can do so. Other than that, they can use the service that runs almost express into the city.

I am absolutely delighted. I believe that the extension to the West Lakes Boulevard—I was involved with that road—from Tapleys Hill Road through to Clark Terrace, together with this transport link, has proved that the

Labor Government does care for my constituents, particularly the elderly. Indeed, those many students who attend schools in my area, in particular the Hendon Primary School, will be well served by that service. I am absolutely ecstatic that I shall be given the opportunity to flag off this service very shortly. Anyone who wants to come along will be welcome. I suspect that there will be a few bottles of champagne opened to celebrate what I believe is a worthwhile event.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I want to discuss what I consider to be a most serious matter—an attempt by the Minister of Health immediately prior to Question Time to fudge the most important issue that I believe I have raised in this House as shadow Minister of Health. It was a clear example of the Minister's attempting subterfuge to get out of a particularly embarrassing situation for him. It was an attempt by him to gloss over a most serious matter. What more serious problem could the Minister of Health have than alleged sexual assaults on female patients in institutions and hospitals over which he has direct control? Perhaps a more serious problem that the Minister of Health might have rather than the actual occurrence is his not being told about it.

I draw to the attention of the House the fact that 23 hours ago neither the Minister nor the Chairman of the Health Commission had any idea that two patients were allegedly sexually assaulted although the alleged assaults occurred three weeks ago. Perhaps that is why the Minister says that my raising the matter in public is questionable. Perhaps the Minister is surprised that a shadow Minister with no resources whatsoever knows more about serious problems in his institutions than he does, with all the resources of the Health Commission and his multitudinous personal staff. It must call into question the lines of responsibility within the Health Commission. Given the events of the past 24 hours, I ask the Minister whether any direction has been given to directors and chief executive officers of institutions under his direct control to report any similar cases immediately? Alternatively, is he happy for alleged sexual assaults to occur in institutions under his direct control and for him not to hear about it? The facts are that two cases of alleged sexual assault did occur, no matter what staffing ratios the Minister chooses to tell us existed. I shall deal with that later.

I rang the Director of Nursing yesterday and asked about staffing numbers. When I was told what the numbers were, I realised that this occurrence was not because of immediate staff reductions, so I made no allegations to that effect, despite the Minister's statement. However, I reported a comment to my informant from one of the nurses at the coal face. The question whether or not resources are adequate comes from the nurses. The Minister, in his explanation, said:

Action has already been taken to ensure that the policy of having an appropriate staff mix is adhered to and any other matter arising out of these incidents will be attended to in the proper way.

That is ministerial fudge and subterfuge, because the Minister has misquoted the letter from the Julia Farr Centre. I am delighted to cite the full text of the letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Julia Farr Centre. It states:

Action has been taken to ensure that the policy of having an appropriate staff mix is adhered to prospectively.

The omission of the word 'prospectively' completely changes the intent and understanding of what the Minister has told us. It is an attempt to fudge the issue, because the Minister knows that he has failed the health system in South Australia. Two patients were allegedly sexually assaulted in institutions under his direct care. Does he take responsibility? He shrugs his shoulders and does not give Parliament the full information. It is absolutely appalling. When one puts that with the reported comments of the CEO in this morning's *Advertiser*—sometimes the practice was not adhered to because of change in work force situations—it makes one wonder whether the Minister really cares.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I rise to support a campaign that is currently being run by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. In indicating my support for this campaign, called Different Colours, One People, I would like to urge all members of this House to consider its impact. The Different Colours, One People campaign is aimed at helping young people to reject racism from their life. I do not think that the adults have done a very good job in the area of preventing racism, and it now becomes important that we ensure that the young people can take up this issue and do better at it than we have.

The message is a positive one, and it is about the future and the vitality of the world's cultures. The message is that young people do have the power to make positive changes in the world around them. As I said, this campaign is part of the community relations strategy of the Commonwealth Government. It is the result of a number of research projects and consultations which confirmed that racism really was an issue for young people and one on which the teachers and youth workers felt they needed some help.

Race Discrimination Commissioner, Irene Moss, launched the Different Colours, One People campaign at the Hard Rock Cafe at 11 o'clock on Sunday, 12 July. The whole of this week is part of that campaign, and I was very fortunate to be part of its launch in Port Augusta on Monday. At this stage, I must congratulate the local media, GTS4, whose newsreader, James Sutherland, was the person who launched the campaign and who was very positively behind it. A number of Aboriginal students, an Italian worker from the Skillshare program, the police, and I as local member were all speakers at that campaign and all very supportive of this project, which has been generated at the Federal Government level.

I would like to indicate what this campaign means to a number of people who have given it support. It has been given a lot of support by members of the entertainment industry, and one of the statements made in support of the campaign was made by Annette Shun Wah, as follows:

Often we feel powerless to change things happening around us, but racism has its start with the individual. By treating one another with fairness, according to what they're really like, rather than according to the colour of their skin, or the sound of their accents, we can fight the ignorance, injustice, and destructiveness of racist attitudes. Surely, in the 1990s we can embrace the differences between people, celebrate individuality, rather than wanting everyone to be the same.

I support that, because it is well known that Australia is one of the most multi-cultural countries in the world, and I think that gives us a head start in being able to fight racism in our nation and in our State. I am afraid to say that racism really is alive and well, and I have had first-hand experience of that. That is why I so strongly support this campaign and why I ask members of this House to offer their support. They can do that in a number of ways, one of which could be by trying to promote organisations in their electorate to do something about the program.

Media releases can be prepared for campaign launches, and quotes similar to the one I have just mentioned can be obtained. Members can support the schools in their electorates and ensure that the electorates are doing something about this matter. An information newsletter which comes from the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission is available for people if they want any further information on the campaign. I feel strongly about this matter, because I have been aware of it for a number of years, particularly because I have an electorate in which there is a big divergence of opinion and a lot of different nationalities. So, it is vitally important that we as members support this campaign.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I rise in response to a question asked of the Minister for Environment and Planning in this House yesterday by the member for Albert Park and an almost identical question asked by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles of the Minister, Anne Levy, in another place. The question, which related to beach charges, states in part:

Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of proposals that people should be charged to use Adelaide metropolitan beaches, and will she indicate the origin of this proposal?

It was quite obvious, by the mere fact that this question was asked in both Houses at the same time, that it was designed to discredit the Mayor of Glenelg, Mr Brian Nadilo. The question was asked as a follow-up to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 6 August 1992, which quoted Mr Nadilo as expressing concern at what he perceived the State Government proposals to charge people to use suburban beaches. Despite the Government's continual denial that it intends to implement such procedures, I contend that it does.

By way of evidence, I refer to correspondence that was exchanged between the Premier and me. On 6 May this year, I wrote to the Premier expressing concern about an ongoing debacle surrounding the construction of a car park at the Seacliff beach. As members would appreciate, many of the public who use beaches come from all over our State and, to arrive at the beaches, they do so via their private vehicle. It is necessary for them to park their vehicle near the beach so that they can enjoy that recreational pursuit. Since 1986, the State Government has continually promised but then deferred funding to upgrade and improve the car park and access to the Seacliff beach. The letter states:

On 3 October 1986, the then Minister for Environment and Planning, the Hon. Dr Hoggood, wrote to the then member for Bright, [my predecessor] Mr Derek Robertson, stating that 'funding for the Seacliff car park had been included in the preliminary program for this year, but all coastal facility funding had to be cut from the program to meet budgetary constraints'.

However, the then Minister assured my predecessor that it was hoped funding would be available in the following financial year. Of course, it was not. In frustration, the City of Brighton erected a sign outside the car park which read as follows:

City of Brighton

The poor condition of this car park is due to the State Government's continued refusal to assist financially in its reconstruction.

By order of the Council

Yet again, that funding was refused to council. As I have stated, people from all over our State use metropolitan beaches, and in this case the City of Brighton was forced to resort to borrowing the money at the expense of rate-payers to construct the car park for beach users. In fact, it borrowed \$95 000 for a term of 10 years, at an interest rate of 10.15 per cent, with an annual repayment of \$15 560. The Premier's reply to my letter, dated 10 July 1992, was most interesting. In part, he said:

I have been advised by the Minister for Environment and Planning, who is responsible for the Coast Protection Board, that the board did provide funding for facility type projects along the coast. However, due to higher priorities for coastal protection and rehabilitation type projects, no facility projects have been funded since 1986.

I repeat those words: 'No facility projects have been funded by this Government since 1986.' But then comes the Premier's wonderful solution to this funding shortfall:

The council has been encouraged to investigate other means of funding the work to offset this imbalance, such as the installation of parking meters to raise revenue.

The installation of parking meters for car parks used by beach users is nothing other than a tax or a charge on people who use and enjoy those beaches. This Government has continued to refuse funding to beachside metropolitan councils to enable them to properly maintain their beaches and it expects them to bear the brunt of that funding. Now it suggests that councils put in car parking meters and slug beach users for doing that. It is an absolutely ludicrous statement to be made by the person who purports to be Premier of this State. Is it any wonder that, with statements like that, the Premier is facing such difficulty.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I appreciate this opportunity to raise a matter in relation to the destruction of trees in the Belair Recreation Park and the property adjoining it, that is, the STA railway land. The Minister for Environment and Planning, who should be looking after our parks, is nicknamed throughout the Hills and the State as 'Logger Lenehan'. The best way to explain it is to read a letter into *Hansard*. The letter was addressed to the Minister of Transport and a copy was sent to the Minister for Environment and Planning. It reads:

Dear Mr Blevins, We feel compelled to write to you to express our personal disappointment and anger at the destruction of hundreds of pine trees in the Belair Recreation Park. We understand that this decision did not rest in your jurisdiction.

Eucalypts were also cut down and, although certain people denied that there were eight of them, later on they had to admit that there were. The letter continues:

As residents at the above address for over 20 years, living opposite the park and having enjoyed the heritage, character and freshness of these wonderful trees, we now pass this area daily only to view with much bitterness an environmental splendour

of a bygone era. We can only view the authorisation of such destruction as a criminal offence, and as these events record themselves in history, so too will the whims of the National Park executioners be remembered.

How shameful that they undertook such activity without realising how much personal grief they caused to others who saw such beauty and felt such strong heritage and ownership in their being. These beautiful trees gave such a welcome freshness and coolness in the summer heat as one approached the Park to journey home. The freshness of these pines will not be replicated by indigenous gums and, after all, the Belair Recreation Park is the lungs of Adelaide. What a price to pay for being labelled an 'introduced' species. Let us hope that this does not translate to the human species or we will have very few people living in this great country!

Our specific reason for writing to you has accelerated as a result of activity which occurred late last week by the STA. We are given to believe that the remaining pines near the Belair Railway Station and along the strip of land between the railway line and the national park boundary on the northern edge of the park, are also to be sentenced. We were extremely disappointed that in the process of culling introduced species a cluster of proudly standing lucerne trees in this strip directly opposite our property also met their end as a result of work by the STA. These trees had provided a source of food to the many hundreds of lorikeets which visited the trees over the years. We have observed how these lorikeets prefer the lucerne trees and literally hundreds of the lorikeets flock at the one time. Fortunately, we were able to photograph the lorikeets who were still attracted to the foliage of the trees which had been cut down. Upon contact with the environment officer, it was acknowledged that a mistake had been made in removing the lucerne trees and an offer to replant trees was made.

The fact remains that the damage has been done and trees take time to grow. We would definitely like to see a replanting program which includes lucerne trees, pine trees and other species which will benefit the wildlife. Given the number of koalas which we are aware of that clamber over the national park fence between the park and houses across the road, we would also suggest that some manna gums be planted. The other benefit of a concentrated planting program will also provide shelter and act as a sound barrier from the activity of trains, particularly where the signals are which directs freight trains to wait. Their waiting is with engines running at times for several hours.

Our concern however, lies with the intended destruction of all pines in and around the park and along the STA strip, and we request your intervention to prevent further destruction.

As conservationists, we fail to understand why introduced species cannot be left to co-exist in a balanced environment. Right across this country they can be seen as a happy mix. Our concern is also directed to the fact that the pine trees are a food source for the flocks of sulphur-crested and black cockatoos which have been part of this environment for many years. How lucky we are to enjoy these sights, but as park management dictates what is culled, we can't help but feel the flight paths of these wonderful birds will also change and perhaps we will even witness their disappearance.

Surely, now at this stage, when we as a nation are faced with environmental issues larger than we know what to do with or can control, sensible and balanced direction should be given in the management of land control. We ask that no authorisation be granted to the willy-nilly whimsical destruction of mature trees on the grounds of being an introduced species. Trees, like a human life, take years to mature and cannot be replaced overnight. Once they are destroyed they are gone forever and so too is any heritage that may have been attached to them.

There is more to the letter and I hope that members take note.

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

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Last Thursday the member for Eyre raised a matter concerning the way in which the vote for poker machines was reported in the *Advertiser*. By way of explanation, I intend to read into

*Hansard* a letter that was written jointly by me and the Opposition Whip to the *Advertiser* as follows:

The report in Saturday's (9 May) *Advertiser*, 'How your MP voted on the Bill' seriously misrepresented or distorted the position of a substantial number of individual members in relation to votes taken in the House of Assembly concerning poker machines by listing participants in the wrong vote and compounding that mistake by having that list full of errors.

Firstly, the political journalist concerned should have made it clear that the votes listed for the House of Assembly were not a record of 'how your MP voted on the Bill'. They were votes on a quite different matter than those listed on the same page for members of the Legislative Council.

Your journalist correctly reported that the Legislative Council voted 10:9 for the passage of the poker machine Bill in the early hours of Friday morning, 7 May, with the 'No' vote of the absent Mr Burdett being 'paired' with the 'yes' vote of Mr Sumner.

However, the vote taken shortly afterwards a bit before 8 a.m. last Friday in the House of Assembly was not a vote on the poker machines Bill. That particular vote had been taken back on 31 March when the Bill was passed by the House of Assembly (21:17) and had then been forwarded to the Legislative Council for their consideration.

The Legislative Council made several alterations to the Bill before passing it, and the House of Assembly votes that were so carelessly and inaccurately recorded in the *Advertiser* were in fact Committee votes (with Mr Martyn Evans in the chair) on whether or not a particular technical amendment should be accepted regarding the State Supply Department. Not all members who supported the Bill in the House of Assembly several weeks ago supported that amendment last Friday and vice versa. For example, Don Hopgood opposed the Bill, but, after it had been passed, he did not oppose the operational amendment that had been made by the Legislative Council, whereas some others did the opposite.

Particularly misleading was your listing of 18 MPs as 'Absent, Abstained, Overseas or Resigned'. On the same page, the 'pairing' of the votes of C. Sumner and J. Burdett in the Legislative Council was explained, but your political staff did not approach the Government and Opposition Whips or the House of Assembly Clerks to inquire about 'pairing' arrangements in the House of Assembly.

An exceptionally large number of 'pairs' was required on this occasion because the sittings of the Parliament had been extended for several weeks. As a result several MPs had made commitments for the month of May quite some time ago when it was expected that the sittings of the Parliament would finish at Easter.

For example, Greg Crafter as Minister of Education and John Meier as local member had a longstanding arrangement to be at Minlaton High School last Friday. As Crafter intended to accept this particular amendment and Meier intended to oppose it, their absence created an automatic 'pair'. Similarly, Colin McKee (yes) and Lynn Arnold (no) were paired on a trade mission to Indo-China.

Kym Mayes and Heini Becker were overseas with the Commonwealth Games bid. Kym Mayes (yes) was paired with Ivan Venning (no), who was attending an important matter in his electorate. Heini Becker (yes) was paired with Michael Atkinson (no) who was representing the Trade Minister in Eastern Europe. Susan Lenchan (yes) was ill, and was paired with Graham Gunn (no), who was also attending to an important local matter.

Mike Rann (yes) was attending a ministerial conference. Murray DeLaine (no) was present, but agreed as Deputy Government Whip to provide a 'pair' for the Minister for that vote. Similarly, Stan Evans (no) as Opposition Whip paired himself with Peter Arnold (yes) (who was in his electorate) to maintain parity. Mark Brindal has strongly opposed the Bill at all stages but was unpaired for this amendment because of a misunderstanding regarding pair arrangements.

Martyn Evans as the occupant of the chair at that stage could not vote, and it was inappropriate for him to have been listed as abstaining with the implication that he had chosen that course of action. Finally, Ted Chapman and Roger Goldsworthy had resigned weeks previously and should not have been on a list of 'How your MP voted'. The electorates of Kavel and Alexandra

were unrepresented from the dates of their resignations until the 9 May by-elections.

The last paragraph, which was not published by the *Advertiser*, reads as follows:

The *Advertiser* is a significant South Australian institution which purports to be a newspaper of record, and as such we believe you have an obligation to correctly present the facts about this Bill in fairness to the above elected representatives.

The letter was signed by me and the Opposition Whip. Unfortunately, although the *Advertiser* published the letter, it did not publish a correction of its gross misrepresentation of the procedures of 7 May in a way that would balance the prominence that was given to that misrepresentation.

I draw your attention, Sir, to *Hansard* of 7 May, which contains an error. G. Crafter and P. Arnold, who both intended to vote 'Yes', were not listed as paired with J. Meier and S. Evans, who both intended to vote 'No', although they were on the pairs list submitted to the Clerk by me and the Opposition Whip. I ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to arrange for the record to be corrected.

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair will take that into consideration and, if it transpires that an amendment needs to be made, I am sure that the record can be so corrected.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 11 August. Page 69).

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** It is traditional for there to be an Address in Reply, and I sincerely record my vote in favour of that tradition. However, I find myself in precisely the same position as I have been in on other occasions, more specifically last year, of being particularly critical of the content of the document that was handed to Her Excellency the Governor for the purpose of outlining a program and giving an overview of the South Australian situation not only to the Parliament but also to the people of South Australia. I will come to that matter in a minute.

I acknowledge my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and, through her, to her representative in this State, the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, a person who has continued to give a great deal of leadership to the State and one who is seemingly tireless in giving representation across all areas of the community. I believe that this House should justly record its appreciation of Her Excellency's efforts and of the work she undertakes for the community in her traditional role.

Since the last occasion on which Her Excellency opened the Parliament, the Lieutenant-Governor has retired. Sir Condor Laucke is a constituent of mine, a former member for Barossa and subsequently a Senator, rising to the supreme position of President of the Senate in Canberra. His health has been indifferent for some considerable time, and it was with some relief that he forwent the position he had held for almost 10 years.

In fulfilling his Vice-Regal responsibility in this State, Sir Condor was respected by all and is to be congratulated on the work he undertook in that role. I am certain that all members would join with me in wishing

Sir Condor an improvement in health and, with Lady Rose Laucke, a happy retirement and many more years of community activity, albeit in a less formal manner.

I briefly mention here two former members of Parliament, both members of this House, whose death is recorded in Her Excellency's speech, bearing in mind that a previous opportunity occurred to mention the late Joyce Steele, OBE, and the late Bert Shard. I had the pleasure of working with both of them, not both in this House but in this Parliament, and I always found that not only were they assiduous in undertaking their duties on behalf of their constituents but that they were very keen to make sure that as members of the Government—Joyce Steele as a former Minister of Education and of Community Welfare and the Bert Shard in his various roles, including Chief Secretary and Minister of Health—the people of South Australia received a service that could be commended.

Earlier this afternoon we paid homage to yet another former member of this House, a constituent of mine and (until his demise a few days ago) the only other Liberal member of Parliament to have served this House as Speaker. It puts me in something of a unique position at present, in that I remain—hopefully, for a long time—the only living former Speaker of Liberal persuasion. The name of Bert Teusner, to whose family I expressed condolence earlier this afternoon, was before this House within the past three years when it became necessary to remove from the record a private member's Bill he had fostered through the House in order for a parcel of land at Rowland Flat to be recognised as a memorial area for recreational purposes.

My colleague the member for Goyder would know this area well, as it is where he grew up. With the passage of time and the opportunity for the community of Rowland Flat to have access to a former home, we were able to extend the area of the memorial to include that home, which now plays a very significant role, and some of the funds originally involved in the recreational reserve are made full use of in providing a community home and meeting place for the residents of Rowland Flat.

Mr Meier: I had the privilege of opening it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** That is right: my colleague, as a favoured son of the community, did have the privilege of opening it. I now want to come back to the main purpose for speaking to this Address in Reply, that is, by saying how disappointed I was with the opening speech. I drew attention on 13 August 1991 to the fact that the content of the opening speech made on that occasion was quite farcical (pages 102-4 of *Hansard*). It was a sham to have it read by Her Excellency, because it did not face reality. For example, paragraph 3 of that speech stated:

However, there are encouraging signs in key areas of activity including private dwelling construction, consumer confidence and retail sales.

This was the prediction of the Government 12 months ago. I drew attention at that time to the fact that it was a very fanciful—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am glad the member for Spence made that comment, 'It will come for those who wait.' Unfortunately, there are many people in our community for whom, if it were to come tomorrow, it would be too late. I referred on the previous occasion to the



degree of hurt that we all observed in the community, and not one member of this House could say that the workload through his or her office has ceased in relation to genuine difficulties, whether it be in the matrimonial field, making ends meet in relation to electricity or water bills, or the funding required to give a child a reasonable opportunity through the education system: all of those matters are constantly before us, and a number of them have driven people to go over the brink, even to commit suicide. Regrettably, many people, once they have gone over the brink into bankruptcy or various other stages of social disaster, do not make a comeback. There is no way for them to come back.

We collectively as the Parliament of this State have been responsible for many of those difficulties. The members who sit opposite as the Government and who support the Government are more responsible than the total Parliament because of the manner in which they have propped up an extremely questionable management team. I will not proceed to detail or discuss the matter that is currently before the royal commission, because that report will come down in due course and the community at large will be able to understand, question and make decisions about the veracity of the statement I made about poor management.

I point out that 12 months ago the Government claimed that the corner was about to be turned and that things were going to improve and were improving, but the record shows that that is not the case. What do we find in the current document? Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 make some of the same spurious statements. In fact, paragraph 3 states:

My Government has been working to set in place a number of major reforms and to present policies which will have a major bearing on the future development and economic security of this State.

This is a reference to the future development and economic security of this State. If I had stood in this place last week, I would have said that we were in difficulties meeting the costs associated with the \$2.2 billion bail out. Today I can say we are in difficulty meeting a blow out of \$2.3 billion, but what will it be next week or the week after when the final figures of the State Bank come out? What does it mean in relation to the opportunity for this Government or any Government in South Australia for many years to achieve the results that are so much a desire and a reasonable expectation of the people of this State?

As I said 12 months ago, I do not want to preach doom and gloom. My comments are not put forward in that regard: they are put forward as a realistic statement of the circumstances in which we find ourselves and as a positive criticism of a shameless Government that makes utterances that cannot be fulfilled. The final statement in the third paragraph is:

They will address key issues including employment growth—  
Employment growth! What has the Government done in the past 12 months? Where do we stand in the Commonwealth? The paragraph continues:

... removing perceived obstacles and problems associated with planning and development laws ...

Only yesterday one of my colleagues drew attention to the fact that developers do not want to come to South Australia because of the obstacles placed in front of them. I certainly hope that 2020 Vision and the other

reports and legislation that will flow will overcome some of those difficulties, but there is no guarantee that that will happen or that it will be available to those developers for quite some time to come. Again, I draw attention to a statement made by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide almost three years ago when addressing a group of planners at a planning review at the Walkerville council chambers. Experts from a number of areas attended, including people from local government, from Government services and observers from interstate.

The Lord Mayor said, 'I have just returned from a Lord Mayor's conference in Queensland and, whilst there, I had the opportunity to talk to a couple of people who had been developers in South Australia in the past. In particular, I said to one of them "Will you come back to South Australia, because we need some further development?"' The Lord Mayor said the answer was clear, precise and telling. The developer said, 'I do not mind going anywhere to jump an odd fence, but I am blessed if I will go anywhere where I have to become a pole vaulter.' That was the situation unfolding in this State three years ago and it still persists. The Government recognises it in part. Certainly, I laud the fact that as a result of the initiative shown by the Liberal Party in the 1989 election relative to planning matters, where we indicated the importance of bringing down a policy that people could work to and direct their attention and efforts for an element of certainty, it has been brought forward now by this Government through the Premier's workforce under the direction of Michael Lennen in the form of the 2020 Vision report.

How it will be implemented and to what degree the recommendations are implemented is something that we have yet to debate, but I laud that approach. I make the point that it ought to have been in place a long time ago. Certainly, it was asked for by members on this side throughout the 1980s, because it followed on the serious and commendable work undertaken by the member for Heysen as the then Minister of Planning when new ground was broken and when, in bringing that matter before the House, it was clearly stated that, when you break new ground and you bring into operation new directions, it is important to have a regular overview of its implementation and to take early action to fine tune it where it is necessary.

The Government sat on its hands for nearly five years before it did anything of a tangible nature to undertake that fine tuning, and as a result we got into the position that the Lord Mayor of Adelaide referred to in the information he brought back from Queensland. To the extent that we are going to look at those pieces of legislation, we will have access not only to the reports that have been made available but also to others that are complimentary and there is a chance that we will be able to break through. However, we are breaking through from a base where inestimable damage has been done, where many people have suffered and where, unfortunately, people we represent will continue to suffer until it is all in place. Paragraph 10 states:

My Government will continue to reduce red tape through reviews of small business licensing by the Government's Deregulation Adviser, simplifying the process of doing business in South Australia.

How long ago is it that the Government said it was going to have a one stop shop?

**Mr Atkinson:** How long ago was it?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Certainly it was mentioned in the lead up to the 1982 election and reinforced in the 1985 election, and it has waffled about it ever since. We had a document brought forward after the work of a former Labor Party member of Parliament who started the work at the insistence of the last Liberal Government and who did a good job and who more recently has been associated with various aspects of environment and planning legislation. That officer gave a couple of my colleagues and me a briefing earlier this week about what is intended in respect of the EPA. The consistency of that officer's work—as I said, a former member of Parliament—in this area is to be commended, and I refer to the former member for Newland. The work that was undertaken for the Tonkin Government in relation to deregulation is to be commended. However, hardly any action has been taken on it in all these years.

It is only as a result of the work of the Independent members of this House—the member for Elizabeth, the member for Semaphore and more recently the member for Hartley, soon to be the member for Napier—that at long last a number of these regulations have been trimmed down. We have a cap on that. There is a sunset clause, so to speak, in relation to many of those measures. It has caused a kerfuffle in many of the departments that suddenly find that they have to actually think about and do something about the regulations that were put in place before the turn of the century, in some cases, and which have had to be reconsidered.

There has been a quite commendable change in some areas, but it is a process which needs a lot more work and which I believe will also give a clear indication of the work of these other people—the Independents—who have been able to play a part in relation to the revamping of the committee system of this Parliament. To the degree that everything that is currently in place is totally desirable, the referee—the voters or the electors—are still out. We do not know. Certainly, commendable changes have occurred and there are certainly very major differences as a result of which I believe the whole South Australian community has benefited.

It is with that background knowledge of the improvement we have seen in South Australia—and which I am hopeful we will see more of in the next 12 months if the Government is really committed to some of the statements made in this document—that I take a quite keen interest in an article that is available to all members. The article was published in the current edition of the *IPA Review* (volume 45, No. 2 of 1992). It is the current edition, which is available just outside the Chamber, and members can take the lot. The paper was presented by Tony Rutherford as a submission to the royal commission in Western Australia on behalf of the IPA. The article is entitled 'Improving Parliament; the essential reforms'. I will read one or two paragraphs of the article, as follows:

Many commentators, particularly in Queensland and Western Australia, have seen the issues of corruption and misgovernment as arising out of problems in our systems of government, and a small but convincing consensus is emerging that one obvious and necessary path for reform is to assert the power of the Parliament over the Executive.

That is not an assertion that was made last week or the week before; I previously advised the House that it was made first in 1572, or thereabouts. It is a recognition that

the Executive gets the bit between its teeth and forgets that it is answerable to its own backbench members and to other members of Parliament. Certainly, it is not necessarily answerable to members of the public. The article goes on:

This is perhaps most clearly approached in terms of accountability: it now seems clear that what is needed is an Executive which holds itself accountable to the Parliament . . .

We desperately need that, as the evidence shows at the moment. The article goes on to state that we need a Parliament that can hold the Executive accountable so that there is some power to the muscle of the Parliament.

**Mr Atkinson:** There always has been.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The honourable member has been asleep. For a long time he has been supporting, and continues to support, a Government that has not accepted that truism. Mr Rutherford suggests we need a Parliament that can hold the Executive accountable and a parliamentary process that can be made genuinely accountable to the electorate. He goes on to address the issue under a number of headings. The opportunity exists for me to draw attention to only those headings, the first of which states that Parliaments should stay in session for as long as they need to complete their business properly.

We have had a demonstration of that. What a debacle we had in May of this year; and it was a debacle in several ways. So much legislation was introduced that a great amount of business was just not addressed at all. It was also a debacle which saw the closing date of the session changed three times in the last four weeks and the time of the last day of sitting extended until 7.30 or 7.45 the following morning. As a result of that debacle, the transfer of a message went amiss and it has yet to be addressed in this Parliament. That is very pertinent to the South Australian scene.

Another heading in the article refers to the fact that Parliaments should control their own budget. That proposition has been given a great deal of consideration and it is important that, if Parliament is to fulfil its proper role, it should not be beholden to the Treasurer or the Minister of Finance or to some little group or particular Party. I am not talking about largesse; I am talking about the proper responsibility of having a purse that can be used for the greater good of the people and for the parliamentary system.

The next heading refers to officers of accountability being responsible to the Parliament. Over a long period we have required a number of people to report to the Parliament, but there has been fudging by Ministers or the alteration of reports coming to the Parliament that have not always got to the truth of matters. We have had the story of confidentiality. We are told that information is commercially confidential and that that does not allow a Minister to tell the House all the details. What a debacle we are seeing with respect to the State Bank, and a great part of that is associated with the lack of accountability and the fudging that has been undertaken by successive Ministers and, in particular, a Minister who, having been told more than two years ago of the difficulties that were arising, took no heed and then blamed everyone but himself.

The next heading states that all points of view represented in the Parliament should have the opportunity to be heard. I suggest that members quietly talk to the member for Elizabeth, the member for Semaphore and

the member for Flinders about that matter. In fact, they should talk to any member of the Liberal Party who happened to be in Opposition between 1985 and 1989 and ask them how much say they had in the affairs of State. The answer is 'none'.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence will have his chance shortly.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The impediment was a Labor dominated Parliament that ran roughshod even over its own backbench members. I suggest that before it fades too far into the past, members should look at the record to see how true that comment is. The next heading states that an impartial Presiding Officer is essential to the functioning of every Chamber. I take my hat off to our current Presiding Officer; he is truly independent. He has shown that independence by drawing Ministers' attention to their responsibility to the House, likewise with respect to all members—including both Government and Opposition.

The next heading states that no aspect of Government activity should be immune from parliamentary scrutiny. That certainly does not exist in relation to one or two areas. However, by George, we are fast getting there as a result of the changes in the committee structure. That is very important. It was demonstrated here again this afternoon when it was stated that \$100 million has been spent on consultancies over the past five years.

I accept the statement that was made by the Deputy Premier that many of those inside contract out for real reasons, but we all know—if we do not, we should—that a great number of them have been undertaken without proper control. Many have been undertaken at a cost to the people of South Australia, so I laud that particular one.

Question Time should be meaningful and constructive. I defy anyone to tell me that Question Time in this place at the moment is meaningful and constructive. All Parliaments need an effective committee system, and we are fast moving into that area. It was started in 1980 by the Estimates Committees, which were damned in the first instance but which at least have provided some benefit for the parliamentary system.

The final statement that is made in this three-page, well researched and well presented document is that the imbalance of resources available to the Executive and Parliament must be redressed. I only say 'Hear, hear', and I hope that every other member will say 'Hear, hear' too. I support the motion.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I support the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech, and I urge its adoption by the House. However, I notice that the form of the Address in Reply is a little different from Addresses in Reply that I have seen since I have been in this place. Of course, I have not been here for very long. Perhaps the Address in Reply has been in this form previously. However, I draw attention to the final words under point 3 of the Address in Reply, 'and we pledge our undying loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen'. I have not seen that addendum previously. It is an interesting addendum, to which I am happy to assent in supporting the entire address.

I note that during his contribution on the Address in Reply the member for Henley Beach stated that his loyalty was conditional on Australians not carrying a referendum to abolish the monarchy. He said that he would support such a referendum if it were carried but, assuming it were not carried, he would continue in his loyalty to the present constitutional order. It may be that some Opposition members will quibble with that conditional loyalty of the member for Henley Beach, but I would suggest that he ought not to be criticised, because there are precedents in our constitutional order for that attitude. I am sorry that the member for Hayward is not present to debate this with me.

In 1688 our legitimate monarch was His Majesty James II and the entire Parliament had pledged loyalty to him as the King of Great Britain. That Parliament chose to break its oath of loyalty, and that breach of oath led to the constitutional order that we have today, so we have many precedents for conditional statements of loyalty. I admire Her Excellency's conduct of her duties. Indeed, her legal scholarship leads her to exercise her powers and duties most correctly.

I welcome the return to the House of the members for Alexandra and Kavel. So ancient are their political origins that they really form part of my childhood. Before I could vote, the members for Alexandra and Kavel were prominent figures on the South Australian political stage. Indeed, I can recall—

Mr Venning: The previous ones.

Mr ATKINSON: No, the current ones. As a teenager I can recall the member for Alexandra weeping as he announced on television his transfer of loyalty from the Liberal Movement to the Liberal and Country League.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Hayward is incorrect. Obviously he was not politically active at that time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Apart from being out of order.

Mr ATKINSON: Apart from being out of order. If he had been politically active at that time, he would realise that the now member for Alexandra had transferred his loyalties to a rebel organisation whose colours were purple rather than blue—namely, the Liberal Movement.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

Mr ATKINSON: In 1973, I think.

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is out of his seat.

Mr ATKINSON: In order to maintain his preselection, given that the conservative faction within the Liberal and Country League had the numbers to withdraw his preselection on account of his joining a rebel faction and supporting the previous Liberal Leader, Mr Hall, the member for Alexandra transferred his loyalty back to the Liberal and Country League and chose to announce that on television. It is all very well to rat, but it takes special genius to re-rat.

The member for Alexandra is well remembered in the electorate of Spence because, when he was a Minister in the Tonkin Liberal Government, he proposed to build a prison on land lying between Hindmarsh Town Hall and the Brompton Park Hotel: he proposed to build a prison in an inner suburban residential area. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Liberal vote in the Brompton booth

fell to below 20 per cent at the 1982 State election, when the Tonkin Liberal Government was soundly defeated. Members opposite may be interested to know that the Liberal vote in Spence recovered somewhat after that. However, at the State election in November 1989, when I had the honour to be elected as the representative for that district and there was a Statewide swing to the Liberal Party, there was a swing against the Liberal Party on primary vote in the Spence electorate. I must tell members opposite that the Liberal vote in the Brompton booth fell to 19 per cent—19 per cent in a major inner city booth. How can Liberal members refer to themselves as a major Party when they can poll only 19 per cent in a major inner metropolitan booth?

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: I am happy to say that, with the return of the member for Alexandra, incredibly, to a leadership position, I would expect the Liberal Party vote in the Brompton booth to fall even further at the next election. People in that area have long memories about this man who tried to build a prison next to their homes.

When I was a teenager in the 1970s, before I could vote, the members for Kavel and Alexandra were the bright young things of the Liberal Party. They were of the Andrew Jones school, the political future of the Liberal Party, and here they are recycled again. It brings back lovely memories.

Her Excellency's speech shows that we have a Premier with a strong will to govern, undaunted by adversity.

Mr Matthew: But devoid of ability.

Mr ATKINSON: For all the Opposition's rhetoric about seeking support from the three Independents in this House so that they can form a Government, the truth is that you are all terrified of government.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is it not the custom in this House that members should address their remarks through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order. I heard the member for Spence say 'you'. That is not an acceptable term of reference in this House. The honourable member will refer to members by their electorates and to the sides of the House by 'Opposition' or 'Government'. The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: I am chastened, Mr Speaker.

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

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

Mr ATKINSON: If any of the three Independents or, indeed, anyone on this side of the House were to take the lift to the second floor of this building and present themselves at the office of the Leader of the Opposition to offer him support to form a Government in this session of Parliament, I have no doubt that they would be waved away, because the Opposition has no stomach for government in adversity. That is a Liberal Party tradition. Looking at Australian history, one sees that, whenever Australia comes upon times of adversity, whether it be the First World War, the Great Depression or the Second World War, the Liberal Party is always packing its bags ready to get out of office.

To provide some evidence of the determination to govern on behalf of the current Government, I need only

refer members to Her Excellency's speech and, in particular, to the changes in the criminal law, which the Attorney proposes for this session of Parliament. In her speech, Her Excellency said:

Amendments to the Summary Procedures Act will be reintroduced to provide for the interstate enforcement of restraint orders.

That is a very important reform, which has been called for by battered wives in this State.

Mr Hamilton: Mr Brindal doesn't seem to be too enthused by this.

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, I am disappointed that the member for Hayward doesn't share my enthusiasm for this very important protection for women in this State. Also, the Criminal Law Sentencing Act will provide courts with the power to suspend vehicle registrations for those individuals and companies who fail to pay fines. At the moment, fines are avoided by many offenders who simply present themselves for incarceration late on a Friday afternoon in the knowledge that they will be turned away and that their fine will be expiated. The threat to withdraw their vehicle registration will have a very powerful effect in law enforcement in this State.

Police will be empowered, through amendments to the Summary Offences Act, to establish road blocks when trying to apprehend a person using a car illegally. That is a very important change. I hope that has the support of the member for Bright because, truly, joyriding is becoming the scourge of our suburbs.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward should abide by the Standing Orders and cease interjecting.

Mr ATKINSON: Further, in her speech Her Excellency said:

Furthermore, police interviews of suspects by electronic recording will be made mandatory.

More importantly, Her Excellency stated:

... legislation to establish an Independent Courts Administration will be introduced in order to effect the appropriate separation of powers between the Executive and the Judiciary.

They are very important civil liberties measures: they are very important measures in affirming our constitutional order, in which independence of the judiciary is a very important principle, despite repeated calls from members opposite for Government to interfere in sentencing and for Governments to interfere with the exercise of judicial power by our judges. We get this rednecked nonsense from members opposite from time to time, but I am pleased to say that the Government is passing these laws to reaffirm the independence of the judiciary.

Another point that Her Excellency made in her speech was the Government's acting to create a national market for goods and services based on mutual recognition of standards and qualifications. That is a splendid initiative. Also, the Government intends in this session to reduce the licensing requirements on small business. Reference is made to the historic agreement on technical and further education between the Commonwealth and the States, and that is a major advance in training for South Australians. There will also be a consolidation into two Acts of the law on development and environmental protection. That is a very important measure if we are to get fast tracking of development in South Australia.

But most important of all is the proposed sale of the State Government's four year old 57 per cent stake in the South Australian Gas Company. As a member of a Party with a socialist objective, obviously, I believe that the sale of a Government shareholding is regrettable and something that we would not normally do in good times. But these are not good times, as members opposite habitually point out, and it is necessary, in order to reduce the State debt, that our 57 per cent stake in the gas company be sold and the proceeds be used to reduce the State debt.

Over the past four years, during which the Government has had a stake in the South Australian Gas Company, the average interest rate on SAFA bonds has been 13.3 per cent, yet the dividend paid by the South Australian Gas Company to the Government on our shareholding has been about 10 per cent. It would be obvious—even to members opposite—that if, say, a family has a deposit of \$10 000 in a bank which is earning 10 per cent interest, it would be rather foolish for that family to seek a personal loan of \$10 000 at an interest rate of 13.3 per cent. That statistic alone is a justification for selling our stake in the gas company.

Moreover, although we hold a 57 per cent stake in the gas company, it is unlikely that the Government will be able to maintain majority shareholding because, like any other company, the South Australian Gas Company will want to grow; it will issue new shares by way of a rights issue and, given the Government's current financial condition, we will be in no position to buy new shares. Therefore, our 57 per cent stake will be diluted to the point where we are no longer a majority shareholder. The Government is most responsible to act now while it has a majority shareholding which, if it were sold in a single parcel, to a major corporate buyer, would attract a premium for the State of about \$40 million. It is appropriate to sell now at the top of the share market.

As a member of the Labor Party, I have heard some of my Party colleagues, who, I guess, are more wedded to socialist ideas, claim that, in selling our 57 per cent stake in the South Australian Gas Company, we are selling their birth right.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr ATKINSON: Well, most of those who say that are more than four years old and seem to be unaware that the South Australian Government acquired its assets in the gas company only in 1988. The Government will reap an enormous capital profit from the sale, and it is most responsible for the Government to sell. I want to raise two further matters in the time available to me, and they are the two issues that attracted the greatest number of queries to my electorate office during the winter recess. The first is the question of poker machines and the second is the unlawful closure of Barton Road in North Adelaide.

I was astonished to read that the member for Alexandra recently addressed an anti-poker machines rally on the steps of Parliament House, urging the Government not to proclaim the Gaming Machines Bill. That is quite an extraordinary outburst from a member of this House. If this House decides to pass legislation and if the other place agrees to that legislation and it becomes law, it is scandalous for a member of this House to urge the

Executive Government not to proclaim that validly passed law, and I would hope—

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

Mr ATKINSON: I am indebted to the member for Ramsay for pointing out that disgraceful constitutional behaviour by the then Premier. The present Leader of the Opposition urges the Government to do that again. I do not think the Leader can be well aware of the constitutional history of our Parliament, because what he is urging is the same kind of thing in which Charles I engaged and which lead to the English civil war. I would not mind Charles I refusing to proclaim legislation: after all, Charles I was a legitimate monarch of Great Britain. The Stuart royal family certainly maintains my allegiance.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood the member for Spence to say that the Stuart royal family maintains his allegiance. That is quite clearly an irreverent use of the sovereign's name, which is contrary to Standing Orders. The Stuarts were not rightful kings of England and were not constitutional monarchs. I ask that the honourable member be instructed accordingly.

The SPEAKER: My constitutional history is not that good, so I will take it that the honourable member is correct.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Hayward is not correct. The Vatican drew a line under the Stuart dynasty and it therefore merged with the current royal house.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not have enough constitutional or royal history to make a ruling on that. The member for Hayward and the member for Spence are obviously divided on this point. It would be appropriate for the member for Spence not to use such references and perhaps he and the member for Hayward can settle this matter of history privately afterwards.

Mr ATKINSON: I would be happy to settle this matter with the member for Hayward over a glass of beer. While I would be happy to tolerate a suspension of our laws by Charles Stuart, I would not be happy to support their suspension by the member for Alexandra. It is an outrageous principle that the Executive Government can frustrate the will of this House simply on the initiative of those who oppose the Gaming Machines Bill. If that law validly passes this House, it should be proclaimed forthwith, and I say that as a member who opposed the Bill at all stages.

The Gaming Machines Bill will be recommitted to this House. As one who voted 'No' to that Bill when it was before this House, I signal that I intend to vote 'No' again. I have no objection to those who supported the Bill last time supporting it again. What I do object to is any member who voted 'Yes' last time voting 'No' on the recommittal because it seems to me that a lot of people in South Australia have committed their time and money on the basis that the legislation would pass and be proclaimed.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Spence is referring to the Gaming Machines Bill and the way members should or should not exercise their vote. I understand that the Bill is currently before the House and that it is improper (a) to refer to it and (b) to suggest how members should vote.

The SPEAKER: The Gaming Machines Bill is before the House and there is a Standing Order that provides for

that. It is not permissible for members to refer to Bills before the House and I draw the attention of the member for Spence to that Standing Order.

Mr ATKINSON: It is regrettable that the point of order was not taken during the half a dozen or so speeches so far that have referred to the Gaming Machines Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence will resume his seat. The Chair has been gentle on the honourable member and hopes that is not a reflection upon the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: Certainly not, Sir. With your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I shall attempt to make my point. I want to draw the attention of the House to the misreporting in the *Advertiser* on 9 May 1992. I wrote to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, Mr Peter Blunden, to make clear that the *Advertiser* had incorrectly reported my vote on that Bill. With reference to the story of 9 May I said that it:

... purported to show 'How your MP voted' on the poker machines Bill. It purported to show that no Labor MP had voted against the pokies, that I had abstained from the vote (or not voted because I was overseas) and that the Deputy Premier had voted for pokies. These three propositions are wrong. Four Labor MPs voted against the pokies: the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, the member for Price and me.

I even voted against pokies in the Adelaide Casino, a purist stance adopted by fewer MPs. I attended all three readings of the Bill in the House of Assembly, spoke against the Bill and was among the 'Noes' when the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council. You can verify this by reference to *Hansard* and *The Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly*.

Your prominent story and its striking illustration have given my constituents the impression that I avoided the vote, was pressured into abstaining by Ministers and breached my promise to vote 'No' to the people who contacted me about the Bill. I have angry letters that establish that the *Advertiser* has created such a false impression. Your story has damaged my reputation among ordinary right-thinking people in Spence, even though that was not your intention.

How can I go about correcting these untruths other than by writing letters to each of my 21 000 constituents? Alas, a correction in the *Advertiser* is the only way the damage can be undone.

You may argue that publication of the letter by the Government and Opposition Whips absolves the *Advertiser* from its duty to correct its inaccurate report. It does not. Letters to the Editor are treated by readers, quite correctly, as statements of opinion not authoritative corrections. Tens of thousands more readers will have seen your false report than will have read the Whips' letter to the editor.

The *Advertiser's* voting list was wrong and can be conclusively proved wrong by reference to the record. If the *Advertiser* is to be a journal of record and is to live up to its obligations as a member of the Press Council, it should publish a correct list, with photos, or, at the very least, a correction with photos for those MPs whose vote was falsely reported.

I received a reply on 9 June from the Editor of the *Advertiser*. He said:

Dear Michael, I am responding to your letter of 5 June requesting a clarification on how South Australia's MPs voted on the Poker Machines Bill. Although your request is almost one month after the article appeared—and I believe the long letter by John Trainer and Stan Evans clarified the situation—I am pleased to inform you that we are currently preparing another piece on where MPs stand on poker machines.

Such a story has not been published. He went on to say, 'It is obvious that you have been discussing with the Government Whip how the *Advertiser* is covering politics post-Tilbrook.' I wrote back to the Editor to disabuse him of the notion that I had been conspiring with the

Government Whip to criticise the *Advertiser's* reporting standards. Alas, that story correcting the original story has not been published and I have had to take a step which, as a former employee of the *Advertiser*, I regret writing to the Australian Press Council to seek remedy on this matter. I regret doing that because I am a former cadet reporter and subeditor with the *Advertiser* and it is a shame that this has to be done.

I turn now to the Barton Road closure. When the Adelaide City Council moved recently to close permanently Barton Road, which is the only remaining link between the town of Hindmarsh and North Adelaide, more than 500 people in the western suburbs and North Adelaide wrote letters objecting to the closure. By contrast, only five people wrote to the Adelaide City Council supporting the closure. I should like to read what these few people had to say in their letters. Dr J.L. Crompton, of 149 Barton Terrace West, said:

Increasing flow of traffic through the residential part of North Adelaide would certainly detract from the heritage nature of its streetscapes.

There is a splendid justification for road closure if ever I heard one! Dr Crompton went on to say:

Presumably, ratepayers would be called upon to fund the reopening of the roadway.

He is absolutely right, because ratepayers funded the original unlawful closure of the road. Mrs Mary Muirhead, of 194 Barton Terrace West, wrote:

We no longer have exhaust fumes spoiling our atmosphere.

Lucky Mrs Muirhead! Another person who wrote to support the closure was a Mr J.W. Daly, who did so under the Department of Recreation and Sport letterhead in his capacity as a manager of the parks section of that department. He said that the road ought to remain closed in order to preserve parkland. Quick reference to the telephone directory informed me that Mr J.W. Daly lives on Barton Terrace West, North Adelaide. I am pleased to say that his objection on the departmental letterhead was withdrawn the next day.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion before the House. I am pleased to take again the opportunity to commend Her Excellency the Governor on the excellent work she is doing in South Australia, and to recognise the respect which, I am sure, all South Australians have for her. I wish her well in continuing with that responsibility. At the opening of this parliamentary session Her Excellency delivered a speech on behalf of her Government. Of course, we all realise that that speech is prepared by the Premier and all Ministers of the Crown. I want to refer briefly to that speech which, in paragraph 3, states:

My Government has been working to set in place a number of major reforms and to prepare policies which will have a major bearing on the future development and economic security of this State.

The Governor's speech continues:

They will address key issues including employment growth, removing perceived obstacles and problems associated with planning and development laws, while ensuring a balance is maintained with environmental and community concerns.

I am pleased to recognise the enormous amount of work done by those involved with the Planning Review, and I look forward to further debate on that review and on the process that has been adopted. In recent years I have very

much enjoyed having had the opportunity to serve in the capacity of shadow Minister for Environment and, prior to that, as shadow Minister of Planning. It is an extremely important area and one I support very strongly.

Whilst I will miss that portfolio and the people involved in working in it, I look forward to the challenge that is mine in representing the portfolios of family and community services, housing, the aged and water resources. It is the matter of welfare and aspects of unemployment that I want to address particularly this evening. Whilst we all realise the hurt existing in the community and the difficulties being faced by so many people in this State, it is only since I have become more involved in the welfare responsibility that I have come to realise how extremely serious the situation is for so many South Australians.

The hidden list of casualties from increases in South Australia's unemployment is frightening in its numbers and social consequences. Homelessness, petty crime, alcoholism, drug addiction, domestic violence, child abuse and family breakdown can largely be related directly to the growth in unemployment. The consequential demands on the State's welfare services, both Government and non-government, are now, I believe, incapable of being met. One large non-profit welfare organisation has reported to me that well above 50 per cent of its welfare services are now directly responding to demands placed on it by unemployment. Statistically, the measure of the casualty list is inadequate, because the statistics are out of date by the time they are collected and programmed. However, in pure statistical terms the position is frightening, to say the least. The demand for youth accommodation with the Service to Youth Council has increased by 50 per cent in the past two years.

Youth suicides have reportedly increased throughout Australia by some 100 per cent. The demand for employment training with one non-government organisation in South Australia has increased by 270 per cent in the past two years, and that same organisation reports that, for every person now being trained, there is another on the waiting list. It is well known that crime statistics have escalated in recent years. Petty crime, which is more directly linked to unemployment trends, has gone up by approximately 20 per cent in the past year, according to preliminary statistics.

According to welfare organisations to which I have talked, drug use and alcoholism have 'gone through the roof' in their terms, in the past 12 months. Whilst statistics are not available and could be misleading anyway, welfare experts relate a significant proportion of this increase to unemployment. According to court officials, a rise in unemployment creates an increased incidence of domestic violence and child abuse. Again, it is difficult to support those claims statistically, but this pattern is so consistent that the connection is obvious. So, the tragedy and cost of unemployment involve more than the 89 000-odd registered for benefits in South Australia at this stage. It is more accurately measured in the catastrophic long-term scarring caused to families, to individuals and to the community generally, which has to pay for the consequences.

Independent research carried out in recent times by the Liberal Party has shown that, as well as a serious crisis

of confidence in our future in the key areas of economic and financial management and the delivery of essential services in health, education, transport and community welfare, there is overwhelming dissatisfaction with the performance of the Labor Government. Many of my colleagues have referred to that fact in their contribution to this debate. It is essential that we look at new directions. I am delighted that in recent times the Leader of the Liberal Party has set down those directions for the people of this State to recognise, those being: to give first priority to economic development and the creation of real jobs; and establishing a competitive edge for South Australian industry, with the Government leading by example through lower taxes and charges, the reform of WorkCover, reducing other imposts on business and scrapping unnecessary red tape and regulations.

The Leader's directions indicate that they include: a competitive edge is vital to encourage industry to put a new focus on export opportunities; the delivery of essential Government services to the community to improve quality of life, the key services, as I said earlier, being education and training, health, community service and security in public transport. This, of course, will include facilitating services that broaden community culture. We can go on by referring to the need for increased productivity and incentives for better work practices through major industrial relations reforms.

Again, the Government must set the standard with improved productivity within the public sector, so that we have a Public Service of which all South Australians can be proud. There is a desperate need for smaller and more efficient Government, so that taxes and charges can be kept lower, and a need for increased Government accountability with greater community input to decisions and more individual freedom. It is essential that the present Government recognise the need for a change in direction, and I can give an assurance along with my colleagues that after the change in Government at the next election those new directions will be followed.

I want to refer to some of the discussions I have had with organisations in this State that are much involved with people requiring welfare assistance. The number of people seeking material assistance from the Adelaide Central Mission is increasing at an alarming rate. I am told by that organisation that the need for food and clothing has reached crisis point. During the first three months of 1992, 2 074 people walked through the doors of LifeLine seeking help. Budgets have been exceeded, and statistics to 31 March show that material assistance ran at an enormous 217 per cent above budget for food and 265 per cent for clothing.

As winter has approached, more people have come to LifeLine seeking assistance during this period. As the Director of the Mission has said, it is ironic that in the 1990s the Mission is having to provide food parcels for people in need. Asking people to donate cans of food is reminiscent of the war effort or, earlier, the depression of the 1930s. Unfortunately, that is exactly what it has come to and that is why the Mission has found it necessary to launch the recession appeal.

The perilous state of the economy spells hardship for many ordinary families. For many years the Mission and many other organisations have supported the homeless and the unemployed, and now they are seeing the new

poor: people who have lost a home or people who have a home but who cannot afford to eat. Some of the detail provided by that organisation is quite staggering. Magnificent work is being done by organisations like the Salvation Army and one can read the reports it has released in recent times about the hard times that families in crisis are experiencing.

The report 'Hard Times, Families in Crisis' has just been prepared on the basis of an Australia-wide survey of users of Salvation Army services and describes situations of family breakdown, poverty and despair which are becoming too familiar in Australia. While I do not have the time now to go through all the detail of that report, I urge members from both sides of the House to obtain a copy, and I would be happy to provide copies for them if they wish, so that they can appreciate the tragedies being experienced.

The report emphasises the need for a national policy on families to be developed at State, local government and community levels. Many of the problems affecting families in this State stem from a lack of personal support services which strengthen the capacity of parents to cope with stress of all kinds and the importance of child-care related not only to employment but to the need for strengthening family functioning. Too often it is low income families already under duress who are excluded from child-care as a result of either the unaffordable costs involved or the service being linked to employment.

The report states that provision of child-care is a basic component of family well-being and quality of care should be a priority for all service users, whether involving a high or low income. Again, I urge members to obtain a copy of that report and read it for themselves. The position has been made clear from the discussions I have had with agencies in my own electorate. One such agency is Mount Barker Christian Care and Share, which has reported an 88 per cent increase in the number of people requiring emergency food parcels compared to the same period last year.

That organisation has been inundated with requests for food parcels as well as counselling services from people who have succumbed to financial and other related problems. The Director of that organisation said that one of the tragic consequences of the recession and unemployment was the soaring rate of family violence. He is quoted as saying, 'The recession has put people on a short fuse.' That organisation handled four domestic violence situations in three weeks in July and, according to the Director, the recession and unemployment have brought hopelessness, worry, depression and a fear of the future to many people. That is a tragic situation indeed.

I want now to refer briefly to the problems being faced by unemployed young people. We all realise that young people need to work: in our society the right to work has never been challenged, but many of the organisations dealing with people who require welfare services of one kind or another deal daily with young people who face the reality that there is no likelihood of employment for them. For example, I refer to the Central Mission and the magnificent work being done by Streetlink. Every day the Streetlink service for homeless youth sees the frustration and hopelessness felt by unemployed young people.

South Australia has about 40 per cent youth unemployment, but for the young people who come to

Streetlink it is 100 per cent. That organisation sees young people who have sorted themselves out, who are ready to take the next step but who just cannot find a job. Many of the young people who come to Streetlink lack confidence and self-esteem because they never had the opportunity to achieve. From talking to some of the young people who have sought assistance through that organisation, it is clear that some have sad stories indeed to tell that all of us should heed.

Reference has been made to the inappropriateness of discussing poker machine legislation at this time, but it has been made clear to me by organisations, which have been at the forefront in voicing opposition to the introduction of video gaming machines in South Australia, that the introduction of poker machines and the further widening of gambling facilities in this State will only bring further tragedy to families. As has been pointed out, we are at a point where one of the Mission's financial counsellors is devoting all his working hours to counselling the many victims of gambling. He said recently, 'While the Government is looking at increasing its revenue, the Mission is left to look after the casualties.'

In an *Advertiser* article last month it was pointed out that thousands of South Australians are being hit by the twin effects of the recession and unemployment because they cannot pay their gas, telephone and water bills, and a staggering one-third of households cannot pay their electricity bills. At the same time voluntary welfare agencies, utility providers and the Department for Family and Community Services have been flooded with requests for help from families fearing that their power, gas and telephones will be cut off.

A Government that really believed in social justice would not target those people in the community who can least afford to pay extra taxes and charges but that, regrettably, is what the Bannon Government has done and is all about. Under this State Government, electricity charges are the second highest in the nation, yet over the past two years Premier Bannon has taken \$67 million out of ETSA revenues to try to hide his Government's financial mismanagement.

As a result of the Arthur D. Little report, referred to on a number of occasions in this debate, electricity tariffs for business should be reduced to try to stimulate industry and employment, but under Labor there is no relief for those families and individuals living in hardship. The Liberal Party has the reduction of electricity tariffs high on its agenda when it achieves Government. In the meantime the Bannon Labor Government continues to ignore the plight of so many in the community who have difficulty paying their bills. I wish to refer also to the difficult circumstances faced by the elderly in this State as a result of the—

**Mr Becker:** It is cruel, what they are doing to the aged.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I agree with the member for Hanson, because aged pensioners are really feeling the pinch. Large increases in property valuations and increases in the cost of living have greatly decreased the value of the E&WS, ETSA and council rate concessions. It is becoming a lot harder for aged pensioners to retain reasonable living standards in this State. It is essential that the real value of pension concessions be restored and



maintained before wage increases and inflation further threaten aged pensioners with the loss of family homes and the unacceptable erosion of their living standards. It is important that all members of this House acknowledge the demand for the real value of aged pension concessions to be restored. Surely that is not unreasonable. It is an expectation in the community on the part of the elderly and one that we should recognise. The restoration of the 60 per cent value of those concessions in real terms is essential for those on pensions and those who have retired.

I could go on to bring to the attention of the House a number of concerns in the community, particularly on the part of those who for one reason or another have found it necessary, because of unemployment or for other reasons, to seek assistance from welfare agencies in this State. I take this opportunity to commend both Government and non-Government agencies that are working to help these people. They are putting in many hours and enormous effort with very few resources in a number of cases to assist people who are hurting in the community as a result of the depression and unemployment and the lack of support that has been given to those people by the Labor Government.

I urge all members in this place to make contact with those agencies in their own electorate to provide the assistance that they are calling for and to assure them of the support of this Parliament. It is more important than just being political; it is an issue that both sides of the House should recognise and work towards resolving. We should work in the new directions which are so necessary in this State and which were referred to earlier. I support the resolution before the House and I again call on all members to recognise the tragedy in the community for those who are in need and to do everything we can to provide the resources that are necessary to assist them.

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** I rise to support the motion before the House and, in particular, I commend Her Excellency Dame Roma for the manner and the dignity with which she has undertaken her duties as the Queen's representative in South Australia. However, regrettably, I cannot offer the same compliment to the State Government. The legislative program that has been outlined by the Government reflects nothing other than an administration in crisis. The Government's plan to amend the Industrial Relations Act will still mean that business and industries are bound to a centralised wage fixing system. The program also highlights the Government's legislative paralysis over the past decade. We have seen red tape and WorkCover reforms attempted before, but they have fallen victim to a lack of political fortitude on the part of the Government and also to union dominance.

The Government is also signalling its intention to bring back unpopular legislation. Once again we note that the Privacy Bill that lapsed in the last session is about to be reintroduced. There is no doubt that this legislation is nothing more than a diversion from more important issues that should be debated. It is only due to lengthy reports and continuous pressure from the Liberal Party and the community that the Government has produced any positives at all in its forthcoming legislative program. Thankfully, the Government has reacted to the Arthur D.

Little report, which highlights the stagnation that has beset the Bannon years of government.

The establishment of the Economic Development Board will require detailed consideration. The Opposition will certainly give it that worthwhile consideration and, indeed, put an emphasis on making us internationally competitive. Interestingly, the program also recognises the MFP's problems, which should have already been addressed by the Government. The Premier must appreciate the Opposition's view about the need to focus the project away from Gillman and promote and attract high tech research and development to existing sites. This viewpoint is being stressed continuously by almost all members of the Opposition in various speeches about the MFP in this Parliament, and we will continue to stress that Gillman must be second priority.

The Liberal Party and the community have also pushed the Government to act against repeat offenders and tighten up on court procedures and discipline offenders accordingly. We are pleased to see that at last our requests have been listened to and the Government has some positive legislation included in its legislative program for this session. However, the Government's legislative program provides absolutely no new direction or vision to repair the years of damage done by the Labor Government, particularly during the past decade.

The State Bank bail-out and other Government debts have seen debt increase during 1991-92 to a massive \$7.4 billion, which is about \$5 000 for every South Australian, and an alarming 25 per cent of our gross State product. That is the debt currently facing all South Australians and it is an issue that should be addressed by any responsible Government. It is always easy for those in Opposition to stand in this Parliament and point the accusing finger at the Government, chastising it for economic mismanagement. Indeed, it must be depressing for Government members to have that done in this Parliament day after day. However, the Government has had the opportunity to introduce a legislative program to start addressing the problems and the Government's failures. Unfortunately, it has failed to do so yet again.

What we are seeing now is a massive budget blow-out with the \$2.6 billion debt that faced the Bannon Government when it came to office going to \$6.6 billion last year and now we are looking at \$7.4 billion. Mr Speaker, your electorate, like those of all other members of this Parliament, would be feeling the burden of that debt as cut backs occur right across the State. The \$2.2 billion debt of the State Bank alone will cost South Australian taxpayers a massive \$603 000 per day, and absolutely nowhere in the Government's legislative program is there an attempt to redress this problem and an attempt to put into place programs that will repay the \$2.2 billion State Bank debt, let alone the total accumulated debt of \$7.4 billion.

With this sort of record, is it any wonder that we have all sorts of organisations now criticising the Government. Indeed, the Opposition was interested to note that the Public Service Association—normally a body that is supportive of the Government—slammed the Government in its submission on the coming State budget.

The Public Service Association report claims that the prospect of further State Bank indemnity costs should not be overlooked, that the South Australian economy will be

at least \$400 million worse off a year in the foreseeable future and that all scenarios reveal a bleak budgetary picture for the 1992-93 financial year, which will worsen as the debt burden becomes even more crippling, and that the South Australian Government Financing Authority is also facing reduced profitability. We are now seeing unions starting to criticise the Government in a bid to try to call it to account.

However, I do not think that any document which has been placed before members is more telling than the now often referred to Arthur D. Little report. The opening page of that report makes a strong criticism of the Government. The opening paragraph is headed 'South Australia's economy is poorly structured and vulnerable'. Nothing could be more telling than that heading alone. It then goes on to say:

South Australia for many years has enjoyed a high standard of living, an enviable lifestyle and a relaxed pace of life. Today all those are under threat. Unemployment is running at levels which society cannot sustain without encountering severe social difficulties. The unemployment situation could get worse. It is time to ask whether this is simply the product of the current recession or whether there is a more fundamental cause for South Australia's difficulties.

The report further states:

The answer to this question is not difficult to find. The problem is not the current recession; it is much deeper and more fundamental. The receding economic tide of the recession is simply revealing the structural weaknesses just underneath the surface of the economy. This report is about redressing those weaknesses and restructuring the South Australian economy in order to restore economic prosperity and with it to enable South Australia to maintain its high standard of living and its enviable lifestyle.

That document in its opening paragraphs lays on the line the fundamental causes of the economic malaise that this State faces. Nowhere in the economic platform that has been put down by this Government and its legislative reforms for the current session is there any realistic attempt to redress this problem. Indeed, it is almost as if the Government has given up and is just waiting for the next election and a Liberal Government once again to take its place and set South Australia back on the economic path to prosperity. Well may the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology smile, because he knows that he is likely to be the new Leader. I have no doubt about the reasons why he is smiling.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr MATTHEW:** I do not know why the Minister is interjecting. He is smiling. He knows that he will be the next Leader. It may be that he will become only the Leader of the Opposition, but hopefully when the member for Ramsay becomes the Leader he will reform the team and provide some sort of worthwhile Opposition. The consequences of this economic mismanagement are being felt within all electorates. I turn briefly to my own electorate where these consequences are being felt most severely. In recent weeks we have seen Government papers that forewarn the closure of Mawson High School as it amalgamates with Brighton High; the closure of the Brighton-Glenelg Community Centre, just outside my electorate and in that of my colleague the member for Morphett, but used by members of my electorate; and the closure of Brighton Kindergarten and one of the Marino and Seacliff Kindergartens. In a nutshell, the Government is using pre-schoolers and school children as its scapegoats to help pay for its economic mismanagement. This

sort of thing will not be taken lightly by me, nor by my colleagues, as the Government moves on facilities to try to cover its burgeoning debt. The current method is unacceptable.

It goes far beyond that to issues that cover our entire State. Nearly 10 000 South Australians are on the waiting lists for surgery. Only today in this House my colleague the member for Adelaide, who is also shadow Minister of Health, raised yet another concern about hospital bed closures. That concern has also been raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the future Premier of this State, in a bid to highlight what is occurring in the hospital system. While hospital buildings decay and crumble there is a desperate need for new equipment. The Minister of Health tells the health units that 'they will have to find savings of about \$20 million.' Hospital administrators, doctors, nurses and other staff will be pushed to the limit by the 1992-93 budget in order to meet costs for maintenance, new equipment, wage increases and inflation. Morale in our hospitals is at an all time low. The Government's inability to restructure the budget for this year will put an added burden on our dedicated health workers.

We are also seeing the impact of budget cuts on our fine Police Force, which is terribly under resourced. Only in recent weeks I raised concern about specific areas of under resourcing and under funding in the South Australian Police Department. I have highlighted that the most affected areas include groups like the Confiscation of Assets Unit, the Drug Squad and many regional CIBs. The most common complaints that I have received in my role as shadow Minister of Emergency Services involve access to unmarked vehicles, office equipment, accommodation and overtime payments. By way of example, some CIBs, which may have as many as 45 detectives, have access to as few as six unmarked cars. That means that the detectives must defer their inquiries or put their investigations at risk by driving Government-plated vehicles. This is unacceptable.

Drug Squad detectives are hindered in their investigations by lack of access to unmarked vehicles. They are further concerned that their vehicles, when they have access to unmarked vehicles, are registered in the name of the South Australian Police Department, often making it a simple task for drug underworld members to trace ownership of those vehicles and put those fine officers at some risk. The Confiscation of Assets Unit has no vehicle or equipment. It is forced to borrow vehicles and equipment from wherever it can. In other words, officers must scrounge around the Police Department in order to undertake their duties in a responsible manner. That, too, is completely unacceptable.

Further, it is absolutely ludicrous that the Drug Squad, a plain clothes undercover unit, is located in premises directly opposite the courts where drug offenders are taken for trial, and those officers must access the building across the road. It is a crazy situation. Cramped office accommodation is another problem. One regional CIB attempted to redress its accommodation problem by lodging an official complaint under the occupational health and safety guidelines. Their complaint was recognised, but, rather than being given more space, desks were removed from the area so that the desks per square metre would comply with those guidelines. The end result

has been that many officers do not have desks to work from and must almost play musical chairs or musical desks to get a place to work from. Again, this is completely unacceptable. This situation is one of many that must be addressed by the present Government. I look forward to the current budget session to examine whether the Minister has the fortitude to redress some of these problems. He cannot claim ignorance because I have continually reminded him of them.

The most critical problem facing this State is unemployment. On a positive note, I was pleased to see that there was at least a marginal drop in unemployment in the latest figures. Be that as it may, the fact is that unemployment is still unacceptably high. We still have one of the highest levels of unemployment in the nation. We still have an enormously long queue of unemployed youth. Some 42 per cent of young people aged 15 to 19 are unable to find work. That figure is not acceptable to any member of Parliament. Only 12 months ago that figure was an alarming 23 per cent of 15 to 19-year-olds. That figure also was not acceptable and an increase to 42 per cent requires an urgent remedy.

The merger of the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service has recently received considerable media attention, and justifiably so. I believe that is a full consequence of the Government's need to cut expenditure and recoup money to cover its burgeoning debt. The Minister of Emergency Services continually claims and protests that he has no intention of merging the MFS and the CFS.

Members of the Opposition hear those words, but we cannot escape the fact that SACON recently released a report—in fact it was in May this year—which talks about the merger of those two operations, the amalgamation into one building. The SACON preferred remedy is to remove the Country Fire Service from its existing headquarters and accommodate it in the Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters. They even go so far as to say that it would be appropriate to rename that building a fire service headquarters, or something similar.

**An honourable member:** They call it collocation.

**Mr MATTHEW:** The Minister claims it is collocation, but it is quite easy to see that it is nothing other than an amalgamation or a merger of those services. It would involve the services of using the one radio room, the one building and the one car parking area, and it even talks about the amalgamation of administrative services at a later date after the initial collocation and changes have occurred.

The Opposition will not stand by and witness the amalgamation of the CFS and the MFS. Merging both operations will do nothing other than destroy a dedicated and skilled volunteer force of some 20 000 members. We have already seen what happened to St John's. Time and time again, the responsible Minister claimed in and outside this Parliament that there was no intent to force the volunteers out of St John's. History has shown what the result was: St John volunteers have almost been eliminated. The ambulance service costs have spiralled; it now costs double what it did before to get an ambulance, when the St John volunteers were able to carry out their duties. Response times have extended; unions now control St John's. I do not think anyone in this State

would claim that we now have a better and more efficient St John's operation.

I defy any Government member to stand in this Parliament and tell us on the record that we now have a more efficient ambulance service, because the facts speak otherwise. It is most unfortunate that I and other members of Parliament are, for the first time ever, now receiving complaints about service difficulties from our ambulance service. That is a far cry from the well-run, well-organised, comparatively inexpensive, ambulance service of years gone by. We will not sit by and see the same thing happen to the Country Fire Service. That organisation has already been assured that under a Liberal Government—and that Government is not too far away—no amalgamation of those two services will occur, and that is something that they believe we will stick to and we have every intention of doing so.

I am pleased at the support of my country colleagues, the members for Murray-Mallee and Custance because, as rural members, they are particularly aware of the important role the CFS plays in their electorates, and they have both expressed concerns to me about these moves, as has my colleague, the member for Goyder, because those three members of Parliament are very closely involved with the Country Fire Service in their electorates, and they have been pleased to be able to convey Liberal assurances to those constituents.

It is not just that we are facing cuts in our electorates, cuts in Government departments, mergers, amalgamations and a sell-off of public assets, in the Government's desperate cash grab to do something about its burgeoning \$7.4 billion debt. It goes further than that: other money grabs are being made as well. We have seen the cynical money grab through the introduction of poker machines legislation to this Parliament, through which the Government estimates it will raise \$55 million to \$65 million in order to cover some of its interest payments.

We have also seen absolutely outrageous taxes and charges announced by the Government in recent times. I should like to refer very briefly to some of those. We have seen the total State tax take from a family of four of at least \$79.60 a week up by more than \$50 from \$28.76 when the present Government was elected in 1982. We have seen a trebling of taxes, fees and fines over the past nine financial years to fund the excesses of the Government in looking after its mates in 'SA Inc'. We saw increases in more than 400 separate Government taxes and charges last month, many above the inflation rate of 2.6 per cent.

We have seen a doubling of bank debits tax on transactions, which means that, for example, on a cash withdrawal of \$99, you will pay 30c to the Government. We now see in South Australia the second highest electricity charges in the nation, yet the Government insisted that ETSA contribute \$100 million to its revenue last financial year. We have seen more expensive water with a smaller allowance before excess charges with a wealth tax component on houses valued above \$140 000 this year, with the Government only recently belatedly announcing its user-pays system.

As I have stated, we have seen alarmingly long waiting lists for our public hospitals, dearer alcohol—with 1c extra on a schooner of beer or a nip of spirits, which pushes up the price of a glass of beer to \$1.60 and

whisky to \$2.61. We have seen more go on to tobacco products, such as an extra 75c on a packet of 50 cigarettes, up to \$5.80. Those are just some of the present Government's imposts on South Australians to try to hide its financial mismanagement.

Nothing changes the fact that every year \$220 million (or \$603 000 a day) is to be paid out on the State Bank debt, plus the other major losses incurring additional expenditure, such as those made by SGIC, scribmer, the East End Market site, and so the list goes on. We accept that the Government needs to try to fund its economic shortage from somewhere, but at the same time we would expect Government extravagance to be drawn into line by constructive auditing processes being put into place.

In recent weeks I have revealed at least three areas in which the Government has failed to have proper auditing, accounting and checking procedures in place to reduce Government extravagance. By way of example, the first thing I revealed on 21 July was that, regrettably, a number of unscrupulous Government employees—and I stress that it is a minority—are having the taxpayer pay for things such as sweets, cigarettes and videos through the improper use of Government Mobil charge cards. After being made aware of these abuses, I called on State Services Minister Levy from the other place to implement urgent investigations into the use of Mobil charge cards by Government employees. I regret to advise that, despite the fact that I raised this issue publicly on 21 July, the same lack of Government control remains. Procedures have not yet been tightened, and I have had only initial discussions with some senior Government employees who have been instructed to contact me regarding this matter.

Thousands of charge cards are issued to Government employees for the purchase of petrol for Government vehicles. That is a valid use, and I do not deny that. What alarms me is that no procedures are in place for the control of the use of these cards overall by Government. Certainly, after talking with the Director of State Fleet, I am even more alarmed than I was initially when I raised the matter on 21 July. Clearly, procedures are not in place to control these problems. However, some individual departments have recognised the problem and, having failed to get a central remedy, have taken it upon themselves to institute their own procedures.

I draw attention particularly to the Metropolitan Fire Service, which has written its own computer programs to control the use of petrol cards by employees of its department. From the briefing I have received, it seems to be a most sensible system. Interestingly, I was recently approached by an organisation that had tried to convince the Minister that these abuses were occurring and had offered the Minister the opportunity to look at a possible solution. The Minister declined, saying that there were no abuses. That just goes to show how little attention that Minister was paying to her department.

A second rort that I revealed in the system was with respect to procedures applied to the use of Government credit cards. On 24 July 1992 I revealed that toys and telephones, amongst other things, have been purchased on Government credit cards from electronic outlets. These allegations followed Government employees contacting me to express their concern over the use of Government credit cards, which were introduced late in 1990. On that occasion, in September 1990, the Liberal Party drew the

Government's attention to the possibility of abuse of those cards. Regrettably, despite our calls for audit procedures to be put in place, those calls were ignored and abuse is now occurring.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

Mr MATTHEW: Before the dinner adjournment I started to outline three areas in which proper Government controls do not appear to be in place. The third of these matters was raised in this House today and involved consultancies. We heard in this House today that some \$100 million has been spent on consultancies by the present Government. During Question Time today I raised an associated issue, namely, the consultancy of Aspect Computing Pty Limited which undertook work for the South Australian Police Department. This consultancy is indicative of the manner in which Government is using many consultancies. I am reliably informed that Aspect Computing was engaged to undertake a consultancy not simply to look at the police computer system but also to come up with a particular recommendation. Aspect Computing's brief was that it should come up with a recommendation on the rewriting of all police computer systems on both the IBM mainframe computer and the Justice Information Service mainframe computer.

That is very worrying indeed because, if this practice is becoming widespread, it would seem that the Government is embarking upon a process where it gives a consultant a brief to come up with a solution, and if the solution, with the benefit of the wisdom of hindsight, turns out to be an unwise one, it is also very easy to blame the consultant. Of course, blaming the consultant is becoming a regular Government practice. How often do we hear the catchcry, 'Don't blame us: we did the right thing. We engaged a consultant, the consultant made a recommendation and it appears that the recommendation turned out to be not quite correct.' It is heartening to see that the Economic and Finance Committee is investigating the Government's hiring of consultants as, undoubtedly, it is an area that has been greatly abused over recent years.

I close by highlighting further Government legacies that are continuing because of a lack of funding for our Police Force. I will do that with Government statistics. During the nine years of the Bannon Government violent crime has increased in our State by 1 766 per cent from 23 violent a crimes per week in 1981-82 to 71 crimes a week in 1990-91. I still await the 1991-92 figures. Property crimes have soared by 66 per cent over the same period from 1 455 a week (or 208 a day) to 2 650 a week (or 378 a day). We now have one break-in in South Australia every 11 minutes compared with every 25 minutes when the Bannon Government came to office 10 years ago. Serious assaults are up by 144 per cent. These are factual statistics from the Government's own statistics section. They cannot be disputed, and it is regrettable that they are part of the legacy of this Government.

During my contribution I have outlined some of my concern in relation to short funding of the South Australian Police Department. I look forward to the responsible Minister addressing that issue in this budget session.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I support the motion moved by my colleague the member for Napier. In doing so, I would like to add my congratulations to those of others members of this House to Dame Roma Mitchell for the way in which she has carried out her duties since her appointment. I had no doubt, when Dame Roma was appointed, that she would be a very good candidate for that position, and she has certainly lived up to and exceeded any expectations I had of her.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

Mrs HUTCHISON: No, I did not vote for the member for Napier, as he says. I would also like to extend my sympathy to the families of Mrs Joyce Steele and Mr Bert Shard. Although I did not know either of those members, I believe they were excellent members of this House and had quite a long parliamentary career. I extend my sympathy to their families.

I would now like to address the substance of the speech made by Dame Roma at the opening of this session of Parliament. In the first place, I would like to congratulate the Government on the legislation that will come before the Parliament in this session. It will be a very heavy session, and I think much of the legislation will be of immense benefit to the State in the long term. No-one could deny that we are experiencing very difficult economic circumstances—to believe otherwise would be very foolish indeed—but one of the things we have to recognise is that not only this State but every State in the nation as well as practically every other country in the world is facing the problems that we currently face. It would also be foolish to deny that probably the single most important issue facing any of us at the moment is that of unemployment.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Employment and Further Education for his very positive attitude in trying to ensure that we have a trained work force in place when the upturn in the economy does come. And it will come, because it is a proven fact, according to all economic indicators, that the economy cannot stay in a trough all the time. Some of the latest reports already indicate an upswing in the economy. Because South Australia was one of the last States to go into the recession, it stands to reason that we will be one of the last to come out of it. Whilst I do not like that, it is probably one of the things that we have to acknowledge: it is an economic fact of life for us.

I have heard a lot of doom and gloom in this House in the Address in Reply debate, but I would like to be a bit more positive and refer specifically about what has been happening in my electorate. Whilst we have a lot of problems there—and I would not deny that—there have been a number of initiatives which have been very positive in nature and for which I convey my congratulations to the Bannon Government.

Under the heading of 'law and order', I would like, first, to refer to the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, which came into operation in Port Pirie and Port Augusta last year. The latest reports I have had from the Neighbourhood Watch coordinators in Port Augusta indicated that the scheme has been of immense benefit. The community has got behind the Neighbourhood Watch program and there have been some very positive benefits since the inception of that scheme. Obviously, it is still in

its very early stages, but it is one of those things which can be of great benefit as long as the community gets behind it, and the community of Port Augusta has got behind it and is making it work.

The other area of crime prevention that I would like to address is the Crime Prevention Committee, which has been doing some very positive work in Port Augusta: it has set up a program to be followed in the coming year, and a coordinator of the Crime Prevention Committee was recently appointed. She has just taken up her duties and is very anxious to get started on this very important task. To John Smith, the Chairman of the Crime Prevention Committee in Port Augusta, I record my sincere thanks for the work he has done. He has agreed to take on the position for another 12 months, and I think that will be to the benefit of the people of Port Augusta.

As members of this House would be aware, there has been a lot of comment about juvenile crime in Port Augusta. I would like to put the record straight by saying that Port Augusta was very badly done by in the media because of the perceived juvenile justice problem. Port Augusta actually recorded the fifth highest incidence of juvenile crime in country areas, so it is not the crime capital of South Australia or of the nation, as has been portrayed by the media.

The media has a lot to answer for in respect of the sort of portrayal it gave to juvenile crime in that area. In Port Augusta, for example, one of the positive moves that have emanated from Family and Community Services (and I have spoken about this before) is the Country Aboriginal Youth Team, which has made enormous inroads into crime prevention by dealing with young Aboriginal youth in Port Augusta through setting up positive programs which help these young people stay off the streets and which are educational as well. Out of that program have come some jobs in schools tutoring problem students, and that can be seen only as a great advantage to Port Augusta.

One of the big problems we have, and I am sure that you would be aware of this, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you have been on the Juvenile Justice Select Committee, is in the area of Aboriginal education. There is a high mobility rate among young Aboriginal people, who move freely all around the State with their parents. As they do this on a regular basis, their education falls far behind that of white students.

That is a real problem and it is one that we need to address if we are going to attack the low level of education qualifications of Aboriginal students. I certainly hope that this matter is addressed by the Education Select Committee, because it is a serious problem when one realises that a complete section of our young people are getting a substandard education mainly because of the cultural differences between themselves and their white counterparts whereby, through no fault of their own, their education is sadly lacking.

We were given figures that the education of Aboriginal students is five years behind that of their counterparts in the white community. Certainly, I am aware of positive work being undertaken by Port Augusta schools, and I name particularly Carlton Primary School and its Principal, Bronte Stewart, as well as Susanne Hyde, Port Augusta High School Principal, and Pam Seaman, Augusta Park High School Principal. I know that the

people concerned are trying to work out mechanisms whereby they can trace their Aboriginal students so that they can send ahead and let people know at those schools where they can be caught up with and ensure that they know their level of education, what their weak points are and what they need to be doing immediately, because that is one of the problems Aboriginal students face when travelling from point to point. They can be in Port Augusta one week, in Coober Pedy the next and possibly within a month back in Ceduna, and then the cycle starts again. This is a real problem in Aboriginal education and one that I hope will be addressed by the select committee now established.

Turning now to the GATT talks and the rural sector, one of the real problems that we have had—and this matter has been addressed by the Minister of Agriculture—has involved the European Economic Community, which has crippled many of our markets. One thing we must do—and I am pleased that there has been some relaxation resulting from the GATT talks—is to make inroads into those markets. We hope the indications are correct that there are to be bumper seasons and we need to find lucrative markets for our products and to continue to get money back into the South Australian economy and the farming communities. The member for Custance, who is present in the Chamber, I am sure agrees with me that that is one of the important matters we need to address.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister for Environment and Planning, although she is not in the House at present. There have been some very real achievements in the environmental legislation of this State, not the least of which involves the Environmental Protection Authority. I am aware that some very positive things came out of the meeting the Minister recently attended in Rio de Janeiro, although some of the reports sent back to Australia seemed to suggest that that was not the case. However, the fact that all the participants got together was an achievement in itself and hopefully that will continue to occur.

One of the things we must continually ensure is that we have sensible development along with inbuilt environmental protection. Too often there may be people too far on the side of environmental protection at the risk of sustainable development. So, we must push to ensure that we get a sensible balance that is to the benefit of this State and the community.

I mentioned employment and training programs a short time ago. Unfortunately, one of our real problems is that there have not been sufficient places in all of our educational institutions for the students who have completed year 12 and wish to continue their education at universities or TAFE colleges. I am very pleased to hear that we now have more funding and that with the TAFE changes that have been made we will be able to accommodate many more of those students who wish to train at TAFE colleges.

In my own area we have the Port Augusta college and the Goyder college, which do excellent work and offer a wide range of programs. The Goyder TAFE college—as the member for Custance would be aware—also has an outreach campus from the Flinders University. That is something to applaud and I give great credit for that to

Maureen Morton, the Principal of that college, who is very forward thinking in the area of TAFE education.

Recently the WorkSkills competitions were held at Port Pirie. These competitions were very well organised by Maureen Morton and her staff, and I give her due credit and recognition for that. The TAFE college at Port Augusta has a very large Aboriginal education. It may well be, however, that we need to look at the ongoing situation involving young Aboriginal people, who at the moment are well behind in the training and education.

I firmly believe that we need to be looking more at regional development in terms of trying to locate more activities outside the metropolitan area. For a long time I have been an advocate of decentralisation. Indeed, I am very concerned about the trend back towards centralisation. I must point out that I will support any moves at all to put development back into the regional areas. Speaking specifically of my own electorate, which encompasses two regional cities—Port Augusta and Port Pirie—such development is badly needed because the unemployment figures in that area—as in every other area across the nation—are not good enough. We need to look for jobs for people and we need to ensure that in order to get those jobs people are trained. It is a cycle we need to look at carefully.

Unemployment is probably the single most important issue that we need to address, because if we can get people into employment a lot of other things will be dealt with at the same time, for example, social issues, self-esteem and the family problems which come with unemployment. We can deal with a whole range of issues, and the need for welfare will not be so dominant as it is now, causing many problems. If we can deal with that one issue I feel we can deal with a whole lot of other issues at the same time. I was extremely gratified to find that the Federal Government was providing the funding for the first two years of the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific passenger train at the Port Augusta workshops.

It has been needed for some time, and I was privileged to look at the plans that AN had drawn up for that project. I think they are excellent plans, and I am sure that if they do the job at Port Augusta workshops as well as they did on the Ghan (and I am sure they will), we will have a first class, world class passenger train, which I sincerely hope will be promoted overseas as one of the great train trips of the world.

One of my concerns is that I think Australian National really does have to make sure that the public relations people it gets to promote this service are top class, because everything depends on the promotion that will accompany the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific. They need to start doing that now, they need to start researching their markets and they need to make sure that when the time comes they have a very good project to offer to the community. The third part of that funding has also been guaranteed, and I am very grateful for that. I know that we have spoken about this previously; it is one of the things which has been of great benefit—a shot in the arm—to my community in Port Augusta and which it has welcomed.

One of the real problems the workers had in the Australian National workshops there was that there was no security for their jobs, and many of those workers are

young men with young families and with houses that are mortgaged. Their concern was that their jobs were dead end at that stage, with no security at all. With the Indian Pacific refurbishment money they see that there is a chance for them to continue their work to accredit their workshop up to the national standards, and this will enable them to tender competitively for the National Rail Corporation work. Knowing the quality of the work that is done there and has been done in the past, I am sure that they will be one of the top contenders for that work through the National Rail Corporation. It will not be easy; a lot of work will have to be done and many sacrifices made by those workers to make sure that they get their productivity up higher, but I am sure there is a lot of will to do that, and the recent funding for the Indian Pacific will certainly help.

Tied into that is the \$3.5 million which was promised in the One Nation package and which has now come through for the upgrading of the Port Augusta workshop. There has also been money for the upgrading of the Islington workshop. I make no apologies for the fact that I am very biased in talking about my own electorate, so I was very pleased and gratified to see that that money has come through as well. I hope that we can continue to ensure that Australian National presence in Port Augusta is viable and that those jobs stay there and increase.

I believe some comment has been made in the House about the Morrison Knudsen project and the fact that it has gone to Whyalla, and I see that the Minister is at the table at the moment. There has been a lot of criticism about that. Australian National has commented that if the locomotives had not gone to Morrison Knudsen in Whyalla they would probably have gone out of the State and there would not have been a chance for Australian National workshops in Port Augusta to get some of that work that may emanate from the work they are doing there. I read from a notice for Australian National staff which I have received and in which Mr Roy Pool states:

The facts are that if Morrison Knudsen Whyalla had not purchased these locomotives for rebuild then some other firm would have and it is almost certain that this would have been at some other centre e.g. Sydney [Chulora workshops, I would imagine]—our chances of support work would have been then remote.

He goes on to say that the current management of AN has been very supportive of Port Augusta and, 'as a result, we have had significant investments made into our infrastructure and major projects'. He also says that negotiations are in place to obtain service work from Morrison Knudsen but they cannot guarantee the work at this time. However, there will be continuing negotiations to get that work from Morrison Knudsen. I hope that AN is successful in its quest to do that. I shall certainly assure it of my assistance if there is any need to do so to ensure that it gets that work because it is then a continuing guarantee to AN workers in Port Augusta that they will have jobs in the future. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** First, I reaffirm my allegiance to the Crown and acknowledge the Queen as Queen of Australia.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** What about your allegiance to the Leader?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Of course there is allegiance to the Leader. I hope that the honourable member has as much allegiance to the next member of his electorate as he has to his Leader, too, and no doubt he will have. I pay tribute to the Queen's representative in South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell, for the magnificent job that she is doing. Anyone who has had any dealings at all with the Governor will have been most impressed by her wit and charm and the way that she carries out her duties. I compliment the Premier and his Government on making that appointment, because it has been an outstanding success with all South Australians. I pay that tribute to Dame Roma Mitchell.

I want to talk about a matter which affects part of my electorate, namely, salinity in the mid South-East. I want to put a few matters on the public record in this respect. Then I want to talk about some of the independent budget submissions made to the Government by the PSA and the engineering industry in South Australia and to acknowledge and reiterate some of the things that they have been saying. They are exactly what the Opposition has been saying for the past three or four years and time after time the Government has refused to pay heed. Whilst Rome is on fire the Government is still fiddling.

In regard to the salinity problem in the South-East, quite a few politicians attended a public meeting that was held at Bordertown. That meeting was called by the South-Eastern Local Government Association on Monday 10 August to discuss salinity. I should like to put a few facts before the House. The rising water table is occurring not only in the South-East of South Australia, but in other areas of Australia. Unfortunately, as occurs in part of the irrigation land in Australia, the water table in the South-East happens to be very saline. The problem of a rising water table in many cases can be beneficial to agriculture if the water is of high quality, but in this case it is saline and has a very high salt content. It is therefore causing tremendous damage not only to the permanent pasture but also to the trees, many thousands of which are dying. If anyone wants to fly over it, they can do it in an hour out of Kingston. The Kingston District Council and people in that area are very happy to take anyone around. Frankly, the damage done by the rising salt table is of horrific magnitude.

It was interesting to learn that the potential land that will be made unproductive covers 200 000 hectares in an 18 to 20 inch rainfall area. That will mean a massive amount of dollars lost to South Australia. Studies are taking place. An EIS is being worked out. It has been put off and will not be ready until early next year. We have now put off doing something to remedy the problem for another six months. If we are not careful, we shall get into next winter before any drainage work can take place and we shall then have lost another year. The only thing that people in the South-East have to look forward to is that by then there will have been a change of Government and we shall get some action.

The problem in the South-East with this rising watertable is two-fold, but it could be cured quite successfully if rational people looked at the problem. The initial cost that was prepared by a Government department of \$4.25 a cubic metre to shift the soil for two deep drains that need to be cut across the South-East is quite ridiculous. Obviously, that figure could be pruned

quite dramatically if private enterprise were allowed to tender for that work. In fact, preliminary plans and specifications have already been looked at by the private sector, and the cost is coming in much cheaper.

It was very interesting that one of the speakers at that meeting came from the Goulburn Broken Region Salinity Program, which is centred at Tatura in Victoria, where a very large area of irrigated land has a similar problem that is caused by irrigation from the Murray and the failure to get that water off the irrigated areas quickly enough, causing the watertable to rise quite dramatically.

The down side, from South Australia's point of view, is that they are now draining the land that is affected much more efficiently. With much better management they are draining off the water but they are putting it back into the Murray, and the water that flows into South Australia, after it has washed over those pastures and with that high salt level, will be detrimental to our irrigation.

We must all be more vigilant with our irrigation management, and I am sure that what has happened at Tatura and in the Goulburn Valley will be of use to South Australia in relation to what we can do in the Upper South-East. The cost-sharing arrangement has been a bipartisan event in Victoria. The cost of \$840 million that will be spent over the next 30 years is split up as follows: about 25 per cent by the State Government; about 25 per cent by the Federal Government; about 8 per cent by local government; and 42 per cent by the landholders concerned. I think that that is a fair and reasonable split. There are some tremendous benefits in the longer term not only for those people who work and farm that land—and much of Tatura is a dairying region—but there are good spin-offs for local government, and these are paybacks for Federal and State Governments as that land is kept in production.

I hope that one's political persuasion is not a consideration in respect of this, because the only way we can solve this problem is to export or produce our way out of it, and to do that we must maintain this very valuable resource. There is a huge problem in the South-East. I acknowledge the work that has already been put in by the Minister. I have had several meetings with her about this; it is proceeding, albeit slowly, to a conclusion where the State realises its obligations, where the Federal Government realises its obligations, and we can save this potential 200 000 hectares of very productive land.

I have a tremendous concern about one area, that is, the bottom or southern end of the Coorong where, over the years, because of the barrages cutting off the water coming down the Murray and not allowing the normal floods to flush the Coorong, it is virtually dying. At present the water in that area is four times saltier than the water in the sea; fish are dying in the area and many of the commercial fishermen who have fished the Coorong tell me that it is now no longer profitable or economic to continue to do that. The placing of this drainage water out of the South-East into the Coorong will have a tremendous benefit in revitalising the Coorong. Putting water into the southern end of the Coorong will revitalise it to where it was many years ago before the barrages went in. However, I have heard some very disturbing things from the conservation movement.

The conservationists say that this water cannot be put into the Coorong because it may affect the balance. I can assure members that man has affected the balance of the Coorong by the construction of the barrages. I would hope that we can save the southern part of the Coorong and one of the most productive areas of South Australia. I hope that commonsense prevails—and not the nonsense from the conservation movement about not putting water into the southern end of the Coorong—and that the environmentalists realise that sustainable agriculture and the sustainable benefits that would accrue to the Coorong are in the best interests of South Australia.

The parochial, narrow interests of some environmentalists cannot be listened to when the future of South Australia is at stake. All those measures are progressing. The area comes within my electorate and that of the member for Murray-Mallee, and the bottom end is in that of the member for Mount Gambier. It is a State problem, and it is a national problem. A bit of commonsense and bipartisanship between the State and Federal Governments on both sides of politics might enable something quite sensible to come out of it. I await the EIS and further information from the Minister.

I refer now to the budget submissions for the forthcoming State budget. As someone who has torn apart the past few budgets of this State Government and shown them to be the cons they were, I was interested to read some of the budget submissions to see how they stack up with the arguments that we on this side of the House have been putting in relation to the problems that this Government has with respect to its inability to make decisions. Of course, in the royal commission today the Premier said that he did make some decisions, even if they were to keep interest rates down just before an election.

It is interesting to note that members of the Public Service Association are suddenly not talking about ripping the shirts off their backs, as they did before the 1989 State election with respect to privatisation. In fact, the PSA's submission and the figure work in that are of the highest standard, and I pay tribute to that. It even got past the Leader's economic team who are, without doubt, the best in South Australia, if not Australia. I pay tribute to that team as they have, over the past three years, dragged down this Government to show what it has really done. That team's economic performance and analysis has been first rate. Some people are now starting to look at that analysis and understand that all the matters we have been talking about were factual, that the questions we asked in this House were asked with our having the answer in the bottom drawer and that they were in the interests of all South Australians.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

Mr D.S. BAKER: That's right; as the member for Mount Gambier said, being as conservative as we are on this side of the House, we under-estimated the magnitude of the problem.

*The Hon. H. Allison:* We believed the Premier.

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, I don't think we did believe the Premier, and I am sure that the people of South Australia did not believe the Premier. The PSA's budget submission is rather interesting. It does acknowledge that we now have a State debt of some \$7.4 billion. Members of the PSA also acknowledge that that is \$5 000 for



every South Australian, and they acknowledge that that is 25 per cent of the State's gross product. In its figure work, the PSA shows that the State debt has blown out massively from \$2.6 billion when the Premier took over stewardship of South Australia. The PSA also blows out of the water another great myth, which is rather interesting. First, it says that all the gains that were made in the late 1980s from the gross State product have now been blown out of the water by the State Bank fiasco; and, secondly, it blows out of the water the scenario put by the Premier and the Minister of Finance by saying that it is highly misleading to compare debt levels as a percentage of gross State product in 1991 with similar proportions in the past.

The comparisons are erroneous, because in the past much of that expenditure, as a proportion of outlays, was targeted towards public infrastructure and industry development. It was put in to develop South Australia, to put in the infrastructure that South Australia needed to be competitive with the eastern States and to attract industry to South Australia.

When the Premier says that our percentage of gross State product today is the same as in early days, it is completely misleading, because all that extra expenditure nowadays is used on recurrent expenditure and not in making this State a more productive place and a better and more attractive place for industry. It notes that capital expenditure has fallen from 21 per cent of outlay in 1981-82 to 13.6 per cent in 1991-92. In fact, in the last budget capital expenditure was down some 30 per cent, but the Treasurer of South Australia stood up and said, 'We want the Feds to spend more money. Please spend more money in South Australia. Please help us.'

At the same time, he was cutting expenditure in South Australia by some 30 per cent. That must be one of the most inane financial comments and one of the most politically naive ones I have heard. He says, as soon as we get into trouble, 'First of all, it's not my fault that we got into trouble, and no-one on my ministerial benches is at fault, but as soon as we get into trouble we cut our expenditure and bleat to the Federal Government to help us out.'

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** It is something that most of us on this side of the House can say. The PSA also says that South Australia will be some \$400 million worse off per year in the foreseeable future because of the economic management of this State in the past few years. I praise it for having the guts to put forward a submission that contains the facts. On our analysis, those facts are a very true picture of what is going on in South Australia. Of course, to get out of the problem, the PSA says that we must spend more on the Public Service in South Australia. It probably goes a little astray there, but its analysis of the problems in this State is very well done.

I turn to the other submission that was made as a budget submission, that is, from the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia, made on behalf of some 400 members of that association, which employs some 28 000 people. It is a fairly major organisation, and it links its analysis and budget submission very much to the A.D. Little consultancy.

It analyses what is going on and puts it in context with the Little report. Of course, today in Parliament, a

question was asked about whether the \$100 million was wasted on consultants' reports, and the Deputy Premier absolutely ducked the issue. The A.D. Little report is a report revisited, as it is at least the second, if not the third, time that it has prepared a report on South Australia's economic situation and where South Australia is going.

I do not think that anyone can criticise a Government for obtaining a consultant's report, provided that it acts on it. This Little report says, 'Look: we've told you before. We've told you your State is going down the gurgler, but you have not done anything about it. Now the wheels are turning a little faster: if you don't do something about it now, you are a basket case.' Spending the money on obtaining a consultant's report is the easy part: you then must have the managerial experience or the guts to carry out what the consultant tells you is wrong with the system.

It did not happen with the first one which, I think, was in the Dunstan years. With the new one the Premier says, 'Yes, we'll do something about it,' and the Engineering Employers Association says, 'Yes, you have to do something about it'. What have we seen since the report came out but more platitudes: don't worry about what's happening: I'm going to fix it. I didn't hold down interest rates before the election. It's all fabrication. We'll all be all right.'

We even had the Minister for unemployment get up here the other day, trying to tell us that there was more unemployment in this State in 1982 than there is under his administration. The royal commission will be worrying about the performance of the Treasurer of this State and, no doubt, he will be nicely packaged and sent off to oblivion by his Party as the knives come out. But here we have the Treasurer's closest adviser—

**An honourable member:** The would be Premier

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Yes, the would be Leader, the man in charge of employment in South Australia, and under his stewardship we have the highest unemployment ever in South Australia's history—and he is trying to fob it off.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** That is right. As the honourable member interjected, he is just a fabricator. It will be to South Australia's detriment if the Minister for unemployment in the present Government ever has any say in the future running of this State. I want that squarely on the record. If anyone has been behind the Treasurer aiding and abetting the disaster that has befallen South Australia; if anyone has been selling the furrphies; if anyone has been ripping the back page off the reports and putting them out as factual; if anyone has been week after week regurgitating the same drivel, trying to make it look better and trying to stop the facts as they are in South Australia, it is the Minister for unemployment. We on this side of the House will continue to keep the pressure on him. Any other person in the Westminster system would resign if under their stewardship 86 000 South Australians were unemployed. It is a disgrace that he stands up day after day replying to Dorothy Dix questions and tries to justify his position.

Getting back to the employers' submission and their linking it to the A.D. Little Report, it really says that the manufacturing employers in South Australia employ

about 18 per cent of the work force. What happens in those industries is a litmus test of the economy in South Australia. They are most critical of the public sector in South Australia in saying that if we are to reduce unemployment down to an acceptable level—they say 5 per cent by the end of the decade—we will have to have a 3 to 4 per cent growth in gross State product per annum (which is a big ask) and we will have to increase our export growth by some 7.7 per cent per annum. They link that in with the Arthur D. Little report saying that State taxes and charges also tend to have a greater impact on export oriented industries as they are less flexible to recover the cost. They are saying that, if there is not an incentive in South Australia for us to export and to get business going, our economic situation will continue to deteriorate.

They go on to say that the largest single economic entity in South Australia happens to be the Public Service and, if we are to have a globally competitive economy in South Australia (and that is where our future and Australia's future lies), we will need to have a world competitive Public Service. If we are to do that we will have to look at the performance and not only will we have to get the consultants reports but also we will have to act on them. Of course, that comes down to ministerial responsibility, to the ability of the Government and the Premier to manage and the ability of his Ministers to manage their portfolios.

It is very interesting to look at one of the bar charts in the engineering industry's submission. When we look at the non-performing loans and at the performance of the public sector, we find the State Bank of Victoria with half a billion dollars of non-performing loans. We see the US Savings and Loans scandal, which was all over the papers in America and made world-wide news, and we find \$2 billion of non-performing loans. The little old State Bank of South Australia under the Treasurer, the Hon. John Bannon, tops the list with just over \$3 billion in non-performing loans. That shows the magnitude of the problem.

According to the Engineering Employers' Association, looked at in a global sense the problem is much greater than people in South Australia or the hapless Treasurer realises, because he says, 'Don't worry about it; it's all done; I'll fix it in the future.' Quite frankly, it will not be fixed in the future. The EEA goes on to say that the inability of this Government to rein in public expenditure is one of the reasons why this State has its current financial problems as is its inability to manage its State instrumentalities. In the last two budgets there has been a continuing increase in expenditure; in fact, the last budget escalated on the previous two budgets. At a time when we need some management, when the private sector is suffering with 86 000 people unemployed, when the Government has to manage its services better, this Government has thrown open the flood gates because of its inability to manage.

The EEA highlights that point in its submission with some very good bar charts which show very graphically what has actually happened. The EEA makes some equally critical comments as does the PSA about the cutting back of capital works. The submission provides a very critical analysis of taxes, fees and fines and the way in which they increased in the last budget. Taxes were

increased by 14 per cent at a time when most people were trying to cut their budget and cut their cloth to fit. The following critical comment is made:

EEA finds this chart difficult to reconcile with the Premier's budget news release of 29.8.91: 'Across the board tax increases would have been irresponsible and unsustainable during a time of recession and certainly would have stalled any hopes of recovery in this State'.

That was the press release that went out with the last budget when, on analysis, taxes and charges went up by 14 per cent. That is the sort of irresponsible rubbish that has been coming out of the Premier's office aided and abetted by the Minister for unemployment. The submission goes on to refer to payroll tax and its effect on employment in South Australia—something that we have been talking about for a long time. Of course, we know that will be alleviated under the Fightback package, which will give South Australia some hope, but we cannot even get an acknowledgment from the financial gurus of this Government that payroll tax is a tax on employment.

All we get is a mouthing out of 'We can't lower it'. Of course, you cannot lower it if you have lost \$60 million on Scrimber, \$2 200 million on the State Bank or if you are going to have to plough another \$200 million into SGIC because you did not watch what you were doing. It is no good blaming someone else for all these problems, because the buck stops very squarely on the Premier's desk, even if he does try to pass it down to the Minister of Finance who is very adept at flicking it on and not taking any responsibility at all. I suppose when you get close to retirement you do not want to take on anything too difficult.

I turn now to the Electricity Trust. If ever there is an organisation that has been milked by this Government it is the Electricity Trust. I acknowledge that some productivity gains have been made in the past few years by the Electricity Trust, and I pay tribute to Robin Marrett for doing that. I pay no tribute at all to the Minister, who probably has not even read the report in which Mr Marrett said that he could make these productivity gains. However, electricity charges in South Australia have increased more than the CPI. At a time when we are trying to become world competitive, it is no good saying that we will hold the charges at CPI level when most other industries in South Australia, including the motor industry, have to make real cuts in expenditure in order to become world competitive. Until this Government realises that it cannot say that it will hold charges to the CPI—because that will not make us world competitive or turn around the problem—it will do nothing to help those 86 000 hapless South Australians who have believed the dreams they have been promised by the Bannon Government during the past 10 years but who now realise that those dreams have turned into nightmares.

I conclude by saying that the \$67 million that the Government has sucked out of ETSA in the past two budgets over and above the return on capital, which is legitimate, has given us the second highest electricity charges in Australia and has made ETSA the milking cow for the Government of this State.

That is costing innumerable jobs in South Australia. It is costing bankruptcies at the highest level since the Great Depression and, unless this Government turns around and decides to take the tough decisions as in the

EEA report and in the PSA report, South Australia will continue on the downhill slide that it has been on over the past 10 years, and I feel for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the motion that the Address in Reply be adopted. I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the debate. At the outset, I would like to welcome the two new members of the House of Assembly, namely, the member for Alexandra, the new Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Dean Brown, because it is a great pleasure to have Dean Brown with us to be able to lead us into the next election and for him to become the next Premier of this State. Dean has had a vast amount of experience in the private sector since his last term in Parliament and members on both sides of the House and certainly the public generally well recognise the expertise he has and his knowledge of what is needed for this State to get going again. I would also like to welcome the member for Kavel, Mr John Olsen. It is great to see John back in this House and certainly he is a great and welcome asset to the Opposition. We know that John Olsen is going to be an important cog in the lead-up to the next election and in the next Liberal Government.

What a mess this State is in. At long last the media in this State recognises how bad things are. For years the Opposition has been endeavouring to highlight many of the problems and so often the Government, particularly through the Premier and other Ministers, has tried to belittle the Opposition and say that the Opposition has been on the wrong track. But, the Government has been proven wrong and is now being shown up for what it has created in this State—an enormous mess. We have a mess, whether it be in our unemployment, our State debt, our credit rating, our State liabilities, our rates of taxation, our WorkCover fiasco and our charges etc.

I must say that there seems to be some semblance of commonsense coming into a small part of the Labor Party, and I was pleased to note during the recess that one of the factions gave a clear warning to the Premier that he faced a situation where he would no longer be able to lead the Labor Party. In fact, it was the convenor of the powerful left faction in South Australia, Mr Terry Roberts, who said that the jury was out on whether Mr Bannon would lead the ALP to next year's election. It was noteworthy that he said there were some who are now openly saying that a change is required, and strangely enough it is coming from people the Premier would consider allies.

It is heartening to see that people within the Premier's own Party recognise that the Premier has to go. The trouble is that it is not only the Premier who has to go—it is the whole Labor Government, particularly every Minister serving in the Cabinet, because every Cabinet Minister is an integral part of the decision-making and the Premier has simply been the spokesman. Therefore, it does not matter who replaces the Premier, that person has to bear equal liability.

Mr Roberts said that amongst other things many in the Party did not realise that the Government faced problems. I find that difficult to believe. I am sure that all Labor Party people, whether they be supporters from years ago or not, realise that problems have been created by the Labor Government. He also said that the Labor

Government was not in the ring with the Opposition in terms of winning the next election. Again, it is heartening to see a Government member in the South Australian Parliament recognising these facts.

Not only the Labor Party and the Opposition have been warning the Premier and the Labor Government that things are in a bad state but also the media, as I indicated, have been doing their fair share. There has been an enormous number of articles during the parliamentary recess, one of which bears mentioning. An article by Rex Jory in the *Advertiser* stated:

The South Australian economy has become old and tired. In the past 20 years the State has lurched from election to election, promise to promise. Rhetoric has outstripped reality. The rhetoric has included promises of a petro-chemical plant, a Texas-style oil industry, space research, transport centre, massive tourist development, a multifunction polis, high-technology industries and the centre for defence research.

The reality has been the decline of industries established in another era, a stagnant population, falling living standards, the loss of major firms through collapse, takeover or interstate moves and a deteriorating economy.

That is one journalist's view, and I believe that he sums up the view of many hundreds of thousands of people in this State. In addition to those within the Labor Party who are criticising the Labor Government, the Opposition, the journalists and the populace at large—and it is quite clear that the populace at large now recognises that South Australia is going in the wrong direction, indeed, recent figures show that some 64 per cent of the people in this State believe that—an independent inquiry, commissioned by the Government, through the Arthur D. Little corporation substantiates what has been said by so many others.

It is interesting to note that the Arthur D. Little report states:

South Australia for many years has enjoyed a high standard of living, an enviable lifestyle and a relaxed pace of life. Today all of those are under threat. Unemployment is running at levels which society cannot sustain without encountering severe social difficulties. The unemployment situation could get worse. It is time to ask whether this is simply the product of the current recession or whether there is a more fundamental cause for South Australia's difficulties. The answer to this question is not difficult to find. The problem is not the current recession; it is much deeper and more fundamental.

The report also refers to the textile, clothing and footwear industry being subject to severe competition from developing countries. Likewise, the whitegoods industry is facing severe pressure and the steel industry needs rapid change. It identifies the following:

Economic modelling undertaken for this study by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies indicates that, in a worst case scenario, South Australia could lose as many as 130 000 jobs between now and the end of the century . . . On the most realistic scenario, without positive action to change the economic structure, the unemployment rate would probably remain around its present level and South Australia's way of life would be under serious threat.

Some people might say, 'Thank goodness that an independent organisation has identified so many areas where South Australia has been heading in the wrong direction.' But I came across a report on my bookshelf entitled 'An Economic Growth Strategy for South Australia' written by Dr Fred Robins of the Graduate School of Management at the University of Adelaide, through the Committee for Economic Development of Australia. The report was released in July 1990, two years earlier than the Little report.

In the introductory pages, under the heading 'The pessimistic view' (and remember, this is two years ago), that report states:

The current state of the South Australian economy does not give rise to universal optimism. There is a sombre side to the local scene. A growing catalogue of initiatives and planned developments have not taken place, either because they have been administratively blocked, or because local factors have scared potential investors away. The economic cost of such 'opportunities foregone' cannot be accurately estimated but projects have sometimes been blocked after reaching an advanced stage of planning and after incurring very substantial costs. Not surprisingly this causes concern.

Alarm bells have been ringing within South Australia at least since August 1988 when the Managing Director of the State Bank gave a lunchtime talk entitled: 'Develop or Die.' He voiced his concern publicly because he had 'found a major pool of Australian capital, typified by two of South Australia's own wealthy families, interested in financing big projects, but not in South Australia'.

Some 12 months later the list of major development proposals stalled or abandoned had lengthened. By September 1989 the *Adelaide Advertiser* saw fit to run a special series of full-page articles on the 'develop or die' theme characterising South Australia as 'State of Stagnation'. About the same time a survey by the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) showed that for property investors South Australia was the least attractive mainland State. One local architect went further and said Adelaide 'is in a dying mode and it worries a lot of people'. The Lord Mayor said one sector of local opinion 'would like to put Adelaide in a Fowler's Vacola jar and preserve it for the next 100 years'.

So we see that the words used in the Arthur D. Little June interim report are simply an echo of the words used two years earlier in the Robins report. For that reason, I thought it would be interesting to look at the areas identified as of particular concern in the Little report versus the areas identified in the Robins report.

I was able to summarise under 10 main headings factors at which South Australia needed to look if it wanted to progress, if it wanted to come out of stagnation, if it did not want to go backwards and if it wanted a new direction. Those 10 headings are agriculture, the defence industry and electronics, the engineering sector, mining and minerals, motor vehicles and automotive components, the wine industry, tourism, new industries or services, education, and transport. These 10 areas just happen to have been identified in the Little report and had been identified two years earlier in the Robins report.

The Premier has had the chance to comment on both reports, and it is interesting to see what he said about the Robins report. I will refer to only the last paragraph, where the Premier said:

In summary, Dr Robins' report is a very useful and thought-provoking document. Its main shortfall, however, is that it underestimates the Government's capacity and desire to manage change and therefore our economic destiny.

So, in his capacity of leading the Ministers, the Premier was saying that Dr Robins did not know how effective his Government could be.

He was saying that the Government had a capacity to manage change and to manage our economic destiny. What has happened in the two years since then? We have gone down economically in every way. The figures can be supported through a whole list of areas, some of which I mentioned earlier. Two years ago the Premier was not happy to be reminded of where he was going wrong.

I should like to consider in more detail the 10 areas that I have identified as being common to both reports. First, I refer to agriculture. People recognise that agriculture has been, and continues to be, the major economic mainstay in this State. Both reports recognise that it will continue to play a leading role. Of course, the Robins report was written before the rural depression hit. The Little report has been written during the rural depression, but hopefully we are slowly coming out of it. Amongst other things, the Robins report says that we must have continuing improvement in agricultural productivity—that is not unusual to hear—whereas the Little reports says that any sustained growth in output must come from growth in productivity. It reaches the same conclusion.

**Mr Groom:** What would you do?

**Mr MEIER:** I fully agree with the assessment that increased productivity must occur. Neither of the reports is in dispute with what agriculture needs to do; nor am I. It is recognised as being extremely efficient. It is recognised that overseas competition has increased to such an extent that it has made life very difficult for our farmers and agriculturists. However, it also recognises that we still have great growth potential.

I turn now to the defence and electronics industries. The Robins report recognises that there is an urgent need to identify commercial market opportunities. The Little report also says that we need to become market driven in this general area. Therefore, both realise that there are problems in the electronics and defence industries and that we are now in the world market. Interestingly, the Robins report said that in South Australia the defence industry and electronics are underpinned by the presence of the Defence, Science and Technology Organisation, and partly for this reason Australia's electronics leader, AWA Defence Industries Proprietary Limited, is also located in this State, as are British Aerospace Australia and some 27 defence equipment suppliers.

The third area that I identified was energy, in particular electricity and gas. Both reports identify that we have amongst the highest electricity charges in Australia. I think in both cases we are the second highest. Both reports find that this is a disincentive for industry to locate in South Australia. That is not surprising. However, on the plus side we have the natural gas industry, and in that respect we have some of the lowest gas costs in Australia. Again, both reports from two years ago and a few months ago identify the fact that we need to maintain cost advantages in gas and that we might be able to use that to attract more industry. Both reports identify that a competitive energy pricing policy is needed or, as the Little report says, there is a need for flexibility in utility pricing. The utilities here are electricity and gas, and it is a great disappointment that there is a very strongly regulated price mechanism for them. If we want industry to develop, we must lift those restrictions.

In the area of mining and minerals, the Robins report clearly identifies that the problems of rigid wages structure, unique systems of land tenure and politicians who equate conservation with preservation are some of the biggest problems we face. However, the Little report states that there is a reluctance to undertake exploration due to restrictions on access to Aboriginal lands—and we

had that debate in the previous session of Parliament. As for the rigid wages structure, the Opposition has been hammering that point for a long time, and the whole basis of our enterprise bargaining proposal is to seek to have this brought to a level where industry will again want to come to South Australia.

I thought that the Robins report expressed well the fact that politicians equate conservation with preservation. I do not know that it is always the politicians; often the lobby groups within the State have an undue influence and unfortunately it has led to some industries not locating here when they could have done so. As the member for Light said in his Address in Reply debate contribution, when the manager of an interstate company was asked whether he would bring his company back to South Australia he said, 'I don't mind jumping an occasional fence, but I am not going to pole vault.' That is the reality of the situation.

As it relates to the motor vehicle industry and automotive components, the Robins report of two years ago stated:

There is a need to greatly raise productivity, to find export markets and to increase production volumes.

We recognise that, as Australia is such a small market. We cannot get any scale of economy into our production because of that small market, and, unless we export, we will die. So, we must find those export markets. Yet, two years later we find in the Little report a statement to the following effect:

Further development of export markets and diversification is essential.

So, nothing has changed in two years. Time and time again we are finding that this Government was told, over two years ago, to get its act in order and that here were the key problems. Yet two years later, the consultant Arthur D. Little is hired to tell the Government what is wrong and is saying exactly the same thing that was said two years ago. That is what is bringing the people of South Australia into a state of despair. They are saying that this Government must be replaced. If it did the honourable thing it would step aside.

Let us look at the wine industry. Two years ago the Robins report stated:

South Australia accounts for approximately 60 per cent of the country's wine production.

Thank goodness something is performing reasonably well. However, the Little report—

*The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:*

Mr MEIER: And no credit to the Government, as the member for Chaffey says, and he happens to represent a very important wine growing area; and as the member for Custance says, and he represents two very important wine growing areas. The Little report states that the target order over the next five years would be for 65 to 70 per cent of wine to come from South Australia. I would certainly hope so, seeing that two years ago 60 per cent of wine production came from South Australia. That is the very least that we would want to see. Again, it shows that there has not been the necessary Government assistance and support, although perhaps the wine industry does not need it when compared to so many other industries.

Let us look at tourism. The Robins report of 1990 states:

South Australia's share remains behind its share of tourism.

However, the Little report states:

If tourism is to grow, improvements need to be made to the destination appeal of South Australia's attractions and tourism infrastructure.

In fact, that is complemented by the Robins report, which states:

The first requirement is to have something to market.

It is interesting to look at the Robins report in relation to this matter. It goes into considerable detail, identifying that we need something to market if we want to pull ourselves out of the poor state we are in with respect to attracting tourists, yet after two years nothing has been done.

I managed to get hold of a few figures from the ABS March quarter, 1992, for overseas arrivals and departures that give some indication of what is happening with tourism. It is interesting to note that the Premier, in 1989, said that he wanted to see an increase in tourism of some 7 per cent per annum. Therefore, I thought that I would do some checking up to see whether we have increased by 7 per cent for overseas tourists. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to get those figures. What I did find out is that South Australia's share of overseas visitors has declined from some 4 per cent of Australia's total in 1986 to about 2.8 per cent in 1991.

So, we have gone backwards, unfortunately, even though the Premier said that the aim was to increase it at a rather dramatic rate. I went a little further and analysed the figures for each state from 1986 to 1991 and, whereas South Australia has had an overall increase of 13 per cent in numbers, from 56 400 to 65 400, Western Australia has had a 40 per cent increase in the same period, from 119 000 to 198 000; Victoria, that other State that is on its knees, has had an increase of 39 per cent, from 205 000 to 338 000; and New South Wales has had an increase of 34 per cent (it had the lion's share, anyway).

We had a classic case today in Question Time of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology saying that the New South Wales aberration of getting too many tourists meant that South Australia was not so badly off. However, New South Wales, of course, markets itself. Queensland has had a 62 per cent increase in tourists during the same period of time. And we wonder why we become exasperated that this Government is not doing anything to get our economy going, even though two years ago it was told, 'Please look at all these areas.'

I also refer to general development as relates to new industries. Certainly the Robins report identified that new brain-based activities were needed and, likewise, physical and electronic communication facilities were needed, whereas the Little report says specifically that amongst other things we could be looking at back-office functions, including dataprocessing; services such as computer software; and, in particular, research and development activities. Again, both reports identify these two areas. All we have heard is a lot of talk from the Government and no action.

The ninth area identified is that of education. The Robins report said that raising education and skills levels in the population at large and at the highest levels was most important, whereas the Little report says that the provision of export education services has potential for high growth from its present very low base. In fact, the

Little report is looking in a much broader sense at bringing people from overseas to use our educational facilities. I guess the one worry there is that we do not want to deprive our own people of proper education and, when they do find proper education, have to pay an exorbitant price because the places are being taken up by overseas students.

The tenth area of similarity between the two reports is that of transport. Two years ago, the Robins report said that an export-oriented future carries implications for transport and shipping. That is most important, and certainly things have to be cleaned up, and they have not been. The Little report says that geographic isolation of the State is a factor that we must weigh up, and there is a need for efficient and high quality transport infrastructure. So, that is important for both cases. Whilst belatedly the Government is making some moves, they have been very late in coming.

The Government had its chance for 10 years. It has been warned many times, particularly two years ago. It has ignored those warnings time and again, and its time is up. It is time that the Government did the honourable thing and put itself out of office. I know that the Premier will not be in his position for any length of time, but a shuffling of chairs as the *Titanic* goes down will not make any difference to this State. There is need for a change and a new direction.

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

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I am pleased to support the adoption of the motion now before the House. I want to place on record my sadness at the death during the past year of three former members of Parliament. Mrs Joyce Steele OBE was a member of the House of Assembly between 1959 and 1973, and made history on two counts: she was the first woman to hold the position of Opposition Whip, and in 1968 she became the State's first woman Minister. These achievements by Mrs Steele must have given other women at that time great encouragement and heart not only to pursue a career in Parliament but also to seek to succeed in other areas throughout the community. The example set by Mrs Steele would have been of great benefit to women at that time, as it still is.

The second member to pass away was Bert Shard, who was a member of the House of Assembly between 1944 and 1947, and who then became a member of the Legislative Council between 1956 and 1975. He served in the Ministry of both the Walsh and Dunstan Governments and his contribution was quite remarkable. The third member to pass away (and only today the Acting Premier moved a motion of condolence) was Bert Teusner CMG, who was a member of the House of Assembly from 1944 to 1970 and a former Speaker of this House. I extend my condolences to the families of the three former members.

I also wish to record my best wishes to the Hon. Ted Chapman, the former member for Alexandra, and the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy, the former member for Kavel, who both recently retired from this place. I wish them both a long and satisfying retirement. I should also like to welcome the Hon. Dean Brown as new Leader of the Opposition and member for Alexandra, and Mr John Olsen, member for Kavel, back to the House of

Assembly after his short stint in the Federal Senate. I hope that they both have a long and happy time on the Opposition benches.

In her opening speech the Governor briefly outlined the Bannon Government's legislative program for the coming session. One of the items noted by the Governor was the Planning Review, which was commissioned by the Premier on 4 April 1990. This review has progressed over the past two years, and has issued several major reports on all aspects of future planning for urban Adelaide, covering the period from 1990 to the year 2020, a 30-year period in which, no doubt, we will see enormous change, which is very badly needed.

This Planning Review will set in place mechanisms for that change, and it is the first time in the history of this State that this kind of forward planning has been done in a systematic, coordinated way. The Planning Review is a very exciting mechanism which tackles in a real way the planning problems that have plagued older areas of metropolitan Adelaide for many decades. They include places in my own electorate, such as Port Adelaide, Queenstown, Alberton, Rosewater, and so on, where planning problems have existed for many years.

The first phase of the Planning Review was an exhaustive community consultation program, which has been completed and the findings released. One of the main areas on which I would like to touch this evening is of grave concern to the community, namely, the issue of isolation. It is interesting that people stated in evidence and in consultation that they wanted to get back to the village style of living of the early days of this colony. Even with the hustle and bustle of modern suburban living many people can be and are quite isolated. The isolation that I speak of is not geographic isolation but personal isolation. It is very sad that many people, especially the elderly, have become isolated in recent times because of the suburban sprawl. Family and friends move away and because they do not have motor vehicles, they become isolated within themselves. It is very sad and an indictment on our society, but that is another issue.

I will deal with geographic isolation as it is something that we have brought on ourselves. All three tiers of Government must share the blame. It has not been deliberately perpetrated but has evolved over time. The planning review will go a long way towards fixing the problem. Originally the colony of South Australia under the community infrastructure system was similar to the set-up in England and Europe from where the original colonial settlers came. It was set up to cover the needs of the people at that time where all the housing was clustered together in village style. Employment was close at hand and people could walk or ride a bicycle to work. Shops, sporting facilities, recreation areas, parks, schools, churches, local government and all other services for the community were in that local area.

One example of this is Portland, where I have spent much of my life. It is now part of Port Adelaide, but originally Portland was one such village with definite boundaries—the railway embankment from the Commercial Road station to the north, the Port River to the west and main roads to the south and east. It was a small but dynamic area and many people lived there. People were born there, lived their entire lives there and

died there. My father-in-law was born in one street and 84 years down the track he has moved only about 200 metres. He still lives in the same area. Portland was typical of many such areas in metropolitan Adelaide at the time in that it was fully self-contained. In Portland there was, believe it or not, over 40 shops. It is amazing that in such a small area those shops were viable. The last of those shops closed its doors only about 10 years ago. As I have said, in those days people were born, got married, lived, worked and died in the area.

As time went by, and particularly after the second World War, ordinary working people got on their feet and started buying their own home. That was not common before the war. Working class people previously rented homes but after the war they started buying their own places and motor vehicles and generally they became more affluent, although certainly not rich. They were able to afford small homes with small mortgages and perhaps a second-hand car.

People became more mobile, and that set off a chain of events which, particularly in Port Adelaide, saw the redevelopment of that area. Vast numbers of houses were demolished to make way for bigger and better shops and, in particular, more and more car parks. People were shifted out of the area to make room for cars. Suddenly, after a few years, they realised there was plenty of car parking space but no people—a problem which still haunts Port Adelaide and which is being addressed somewhat slowly.

People started to look at the United States of America. Everyone thought that was the way to go—'Big is beautiful' and all that sort of stuff. We were all guilty of that right around Australia. People started to move out and to centre the local communities and infrastructure around the motor vehicle—something that has continued until now. I suppose one of the good points about it was that, when regionalisation began, industry started to relocate. Many dirty and noisy industries that had been right in the middle of housing areas started to look further afield. With some Government assistance they were relocated to places such as Wingfield, Gillman and even further afield. This certainly put some of those high pollution industries out of sight and out of mind to a certain extent.

Unfortunately, with this moving out of people, schools and churches were closed and, to cater for the movement of people away from regional areas such as Portland, regional shopping centres began to spring up. That led to the demise of the local corner shop, and one by one over the years they closed—as I have said, the last one closed in Portland about 10 years ago—and we then became trapped in the local supermarket syndrome. That was fine for people who had motor vehicles and could access those sorts of shopping centres, but it further isolated disabled people, people who were perhaps not of good health and, in particular, elderly people. These people were further disadvantaged and made more isolated by this trend.

It is only through the planning review that these sorts of issues have come forward, and hopefully something will be done to redress them. Many shopping centres were not easily accessible by public transport, and even the Housing Trust was guilty of building new homes in areas inadequately serviced by public transport. That

situation still applies to a certain extent in some areas. The isolation continued as the children of these people moved out, got married and shifted to the outer suburbs where they chased cheap land. No-one can blame them for that. Later on, their grandchildren moved out further. That added to the isolation of elderly people and their inaccessibility to shops, transport and other services.

The friends of these people also moved out, and loneliness set in for many of them, making the situation very bad indeed. These sorts of problems have been created by society, not purposely of course but because of evolutionary changes to our way of life. We found too late that these problems had been created. This is where, as I have said, future planning is so important, and this planning review will, I am sure, pick up these sorts of issues.

Urban consolidation commenced some years ago, and that is doing something to redress the problems, but it is a long and ongoing process which will take a long time to achieve results. I must commend the Housing Trust, which has embarked on a major urban consolidation program. It is only the limitation of money that has held it up, but some areas in my electorate are being redeveloped, and that is being done very well. Some councils are actively resisting urban consolidation. It is not enough just to consolidate the homes but, hand in glove with that, provision must be made for the services necessary for the people who live in this high density housing.

We have to re-establish schools and other community services for these people in some of the older areas. Some of the exciting concepts that were looked into and approved in recent times by the now defunct Public Works Standing Committee include schools made up of houses. The classrooms are in houses that can be added to or taken away as demand requires. Another spin off is that in a home environment children learn many other skills that we never learnt when I was at school.

Turning briefly to the MFP, I believe it presents another opportunity for the development of village style living and self contained communities and, with modern technology and other development, it will be an exciting project that will take us through to the year 2020. The MFP will provide opportunities for people to live, work and play in the immediate areas where they are situated and also to take advantage of technology drastically to reduce the cost of living and to conserve energy.

There will be many spin offs in that situation, with the intention being to rely less and less on motor vehicles for the sake of the environment and with the aim of conserving the world's non-renewable fuel resources. Such a development will save individuals and families much time and money. Thus far, local councils have had the responsibility of carrying out community planning needs but, having served on a council for some years, I do not believe that councils have a good track record in this area.

Council members often have vested interests, and I have seen time and again where the needs and interests of ordinary people have been bulldozed by councils, which have approved all sorts of projects, factories, clubs and other facilities that have drastically impacted on people's living space. With many councils, the only difference between prohibited use and permitted use in

planning development is that prohibited use is a little harder to get. Notwithstanding what I have said, I believe that local councils are still the best bodies to administer, implement and oversee planning matters. Certainly, I hope the planning review and the legislation that will flow from it will provide strict guidelines for councils to operate under and give more predictability to developers and people who wish to develop or plan areas. It is an important aspect of development and investment in South Australia that such predictability exists.

Now is the time to plan for the more economic use of land and facilities. We certainly need to provide better systems of public transport to reduce and ease the isolation of elderly and disadvantaged people who need good public transport to get to shopping centres because, whether we like it or not, I do not think we will ever see a return to corner shops. Large shopping centres are here for good, and they are really better places to shop because people can shop in air conditioned comfort, which is much more convenient.

New transit links and interchanges have recently been set up; in fact, they come into force on 16 August. In my electorate they are situated at the West Lakes shopping centre and also at the old railway grounds at Glanville. A major interchange can be set up to service all the northern and north-western areas. I have suggested to the STA that this be set up in the railway yards between Port Adelaide and Gillman, where there is a lot of room to do this sort of thing. Such a facility could service the northern areas and pick up the passengers from the buses and trains to take them to West Lakes, Outer Harbor, or wherever. It would be ideally placed, of course, for the MFP when that eventually comes on stream.

For so long everything in our society was the same. I remember as a youngster the shops and all the infrastructure at Port Adelaide had been the same for probably 100 years. The old shops and the wooden road blocks on the main roads through Port Adelaide, the railway lines and the trains that went right through Port Adelaide around the Black Diamond Corner to service the wharves and other industries in the port had been the same for the best part of 100 years. The tramcars were also in existence. Whilst that suited us at the time, the world passed us by to a certain extent. It did not really matter at that time because of the global isolation that we experienced in Australia. However, since then—with the world becoming such a small place as a result of modern technology and, in particular, modern forms of travel and transportation of goods—that situation is no longer tenable, and we must change.

We cannot fix new problems with old-fashioned solutions. We need massive restructuring across the board. We hear about the need to restructure our industry, but we need to restructure our whole way of life, including the way we travel, and so on. That aspect is addressed in the planning review and will be implemented. Massive change is needed. This became obvious some years ago, but people have resisted change. I guess that even Governments resisted change; it was too hard. It is human nature that people generally do not like to change, so nothing much was done about it. A bit was done around the edges, but nothing substantial was done. It is now very urgent that we restructure across the board, in all fields of human activity, including manufacturing,

business, and so on. That is what this Government is about and the planning review addresses that.

The Governor also mentioned the national TAFE initiative. I commend the Minister of Employment and Further Education, who argued very successfully for the national TAFE scheme. He argued very against a Federal TAFE, whereby the Federal Government was seen to be hell bent on taking over TAFE. That would have been disastrous for States like South Australia, because we would have been dictated to by the two big States, New South Wales and Victoria. However, the Minister argued successfully and was able to get support from the smaller States and the Northern Territory. Subsequently the Prime Minister and the Federal Cabinet agreed to set up the national TAFE scheme. South Australia will play a major role in that initiative, and tens of thousands of dollars will flow into TAFE training, which will provide thousands of extra TAFE places, especially for young school leavers, and that is great. Prior to the national TAFE initiative, approval was given for the construction of the Port TAFE college. As the local member and as a member of the now defunct Public Works Standing Committee, I was very pleased that the Port TAFE college was its last referral from Cabinet. That was back earlier this year when the Port Adelaide College of TAFE was approved. Work had started on that site and is progressing quite satisfactorily. It is a very exciting \$15 million project. It will be a TAFE college for world class training, particularly specialising in all the marine and associated industrial curriculum subjects and the training packages that are needed for that area. That is part of the north-western quarter of the City of Port Adelaide, which has not been developed.

Other areas have been developed in different ways, and some of the other areas, the north-eastern corner, for instance, have been refurbished, as you would know, Mr Speaker. That is an historic area where about four large blocks of buildings and places are virtually intact. They have all been heritage listed, wiring has been undergrounded, streets have been cobbled and trees planted. They have really given that area a lift. So, this TAFE college will complement that north-western corner and then, very soon after the TAFE college, will follow the much awaited development of the harbor-side quay on the eastern bank of the Port River.

Unfortunately, now that CSR has decided to close down the sugar works there, which was an institution in the Port area for so many years—my father and grandfather worked there—that area has also become valuable and prime land for redevelopment. All that western side of the main basin there, including all the old Birkenhead dockyards, will be very much sought after and prime real estate, being on the waterfront, and it will be a very exciting development that will take place, hopefully in the not too distant future.

Added to that, given that the other side of the river is your electorate, Mr Speaker, you would know that commercial shipping has been moving out of the inner harbor and has virtually ceased, with the exception of the *Island Seaway*. There is certainly a need for another bridge or causeway to be built across the Port River, as you have suggested on many occasions, Sir, and certainly this will be important when the MFP gets off the ground, to link the MFP and the rest of the place with the



increasing size and capacity of the Port of Adelaide situated at Outer Harbor. That bridge is very badly needed and, once it is in place, no commercial shipping will come into the inner harbor and the whole of that inner harbor area will be redeveloped. There will be all sorts of exciting housing and other initiatives there, and I think that whole basin area of the river will become wholly and solely used for recreational purposes, which will make it a very exciting area.

In my last couple of minutes I will mention that the Aboriginal problems that have been experienced in the Port for the past few years have suddenly almost evaporated, I am pleased to say. There has been some success in closing down the Central Hotel, which was a source of a lot of drinking problems by the Aboriginal people, and the dry areas that have been instituted in the Port area have contributed a lot to overcoming the problem. Another initiative that has been taken is that the Port Adelaide Aboriginal College has discontinued some courses and these courses for Aboriginal people are now being conducted on or near the tribal lands for these people. This means that those people no longer travel down to Port Adelaide, bringing a lot of their family and relatives with them, as was the custom. The problem in the past was that, while the students studied at the college, the tribal people who came down with them were bored and resorted to drinking, causing problems in Port Adelaide.

Another major thing has happened to help the situation. I pay tribute to an Aboriginal community worker or community development officer, Brian Varcoc. He has done a terrific amount of work in the Port area and he continues to do so. He is employed partly by the Port Adelaide City Council and is partly funded by the State Government. He is doing a remarkable job. I liaise with him quite a lot. An action committee of Aboriginal people has been formed and it comprises seven persons, including me. I am the only white person on that committee. It is a very exciting—

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Together with all other members, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In so doing I note with regret the reference to the passing of Joyce Steele and Bert Shard. I had the privilege of being a member of this Parliament when both members were serving. It is with regret that we note their passing. However, on a brighter note it is with great pleasure that I acknowledge the return to this Parliament of the Hon. Dean Brown and John Olsen, two members who will greatly strengthen the front bench line-up of the Liberal Party. In fact, I would venture to say that the front bench line-up of the Liberal Party is the strongest front bench line-up on either side of the House that I have seen in my 23 years as a member of Parliament.

It will be a formidable team, more than capable of taking up the enormous challenge that will confront it when it takes office after the next State election. Probably at no time in the history of South Australia has any incoming Government been confronted with such a mess as we have in South Australia at this time which has been delivered to us by the Australian Labor Party. Be

that as it may, I have no doubt whatsoever that, with the line-up that we have in the Liberal Party, they will be more than capable of bringing this State back to its former position within the total Australian scene.

I have looked through and listened to Her Excellency's address when opening Parliament last week. There was little in it that I could see that indicated that the Government had any idea of how to come to grips with the dilemma with which it is faced—the massive debts that it has incurred—and how it will generate any enthusiasm from within the people of this State to try to get this State out of the mess. It is only the people, as a result of incentives presented to them by the Government of the day, who will enable us to break out of the economic mess that we are in.

One of the mainstays of the Government's program for this session to help revive South Australia is the introduction of legislation to move to Eastern Standard Time. What absolute garbage. What difference will that make? With the electronic equipment and so forth available to us today we can communicate at any time of the day or night with any place in the world. The United States of America has five time zones across the breadth of the country. They stick to their true time determined by the meridian where that State or city happens to be.

Across the United States major industrial and commercial cities with 10 million and 15 million people interact with each other, in many instances on totally different time zones. The United States and Europe seem quite capable of operating with their proper time zones. However, this Government believes that our going a further 30 minutes towards Eastern Standard Time will make a big difference and solve all our economic problems. As I said, what absolute garbage! We are already 30 minutes out of kilter with our true meridian time. When the Government introduces the Bill, I will consider seriously, if I believe I have the support, moving an amendment to return South Australia to its true meridian time of one hour behind the Eastern States. If we are so inept that we cannot cope when operating on our true time, there is little hope for us in this State.

The Government has lost sight of the fact that 50 per cent of the State's economy is still generated by the 27 per cent of the people who live outside the greater metropolitan area, to whom this Government gives very scant consideration at any time. The reality is that 50 per cent of the State's economy is still generated by those people. As the member for Custance said, imagine what the situation will be for the people living on the Far West Coast if South Australia is an hour out of kilter with our true time. Those people, who, might I add, generate a significant part of the State's economy, are getting no consideration whatsoever. That is an outrageous situation when we consider that action is being taken under the guise of a solution to our economic problems.

I do not believe, when we consider the situation in other parts of the world, that it will make any difference whatsoever. If the argument were valid, Western Australia and its capital of Perth would have been extinct long ago, because they are two hours behind the eastern seaboard. I think we will find that the economy of Western Australia, and Perth as the centre of that economy, is doing somewhat better than is the economy of South Australia, and we are currently only half an

hour behind Eastern Standard Time. The Government will have to put up a pretty good argument to convince me that there is any validity in that argument whatsoever. If that is the Government's approach to solving our problems, we will not get very far.

In her speech Her Excellency referred to the Department of Marine and Harbors and the navigation of our coastal waters, and stated:

Legislation will rationalise existing legislation to provide for the efficient administration, development and management of harbors and for safe navigation in South Australian waters.

I can say quite positively that the maintenance of the navigation aids around the coast of South Australia leaves a great deal to be desired. Mr Speaker, you and I have spent a considerable amount of time, at various stages during the past few years, in the coastal waters of South Australia, and we are both aware that many of the navigational lights around our coastline fail to operate much of the time.

That is a dangerous situation. It is dangerous enough for locals, for those of us who have some idea about where we are, but people who come into South Australian waters and who rely on charts to determine exactly where they are and on navigation lights to indicate the entrances to various ports and harbors find it extremely difficult if those lights do not operate and if they do not have local knowledge. In many instances, the lead lights to a number of our ports and harbors around the coastal line of South Australia just do not work. That is due to a sheer lack of maintenance, and it is deplorable that this has been allowed to occur.

The Minister might decide to introduce new legislation, but that will not fix anything, unless there is a will to physically make sure that the navigational lights around the coastline of this State actually work. If that is not done, the problem will continue. There will be a grave risk of serious accidents and loss not only of vessels but also of life. At night, when heavy conditions prevail and if the lead lights do not operate, a disastrous situation is created for people who do not know exactly where they are. I will scrutinise this legislation closely to see how it is worded and to ascertain the commitment of the Government and the department to restoring the services to those provided in years gone by.

Let us consider what the Government is not doing. I have listened with interest to a number of speeches from members opposite, but I have not heard one member opposite say how new, meaningful and permanent jobs will be created. Unless the private sector is provided with incentives to become more productive, unless it is allowed to become more productive, many of the jobs that, it has been suggested, will be created will be created artificially: no longstanding jobs will be created unless we are able to increase production significantly.

I am talking about the primary and secondary industries of this State. It is not difficult to find factories in metropolitan Adelaide which, only a few years ago, employed 400 and 500 people but which today, if they are not closed altogether, are down to a skeleton staff of 40 to 50 people just to maintain a spare parts division, or something like that, for the products they have put onto the market over the past 50 or 100 years. There are no incentives, and the fault lies in part with the State Government and in part with the Federal Government.

However, I remind members that Labor policies, whether State or Federal, just do not provide any incentives for primary producers or the manufacturing sector to become more productive. Regarding the average primary producing property in South Australia or Australia, the return on capital investment, in most instances, is absolutely zero. In fact, the owner of the property is lucky to get a sufficient return to achieve a liveable wage from that property. So, in the present climate, why would anyone consider investing in either primary production or secondary industry?

We have heard a great deal of abuse and criticism coming from the Labor Party regarding Federal Opposition's Fightback! package, and the media in this country have much to answer for in relation to the future of this nation. I am not suggesting that the media must go out and promote the Fightback! package, but they have a responsibility to portray accurately what that package is about so that the public of Australia can make a clear decision based on the facts. I have yet to hear a radio or television program in which the journalist or interviewer has ever said anything other than that the Fightback! package will add 15 per cent to our costs.

They are not silly: they know the real situation. They are blatantly and dishonestly refusing to present the true facts, and that is all I ask them to do: to present the true situation and let the people of Australia decide. The Federal Treasury has acknowledged that the 15 per cent goods and services tax will increase the cost of food and other things across the board by 3.5 per cent, not by 15 per cent, yet I have still to come across a journalist or interviewer who is honest enough to tell the people of Australia the true situation.

In many instances we have 10 per cent and 20 per cent sales tax, which will all be removed, I understand so that we will end up with a 3.5 per cent increase. However, other aspects of that package mean that all the tax on fuel and such things will be totally wiped out. The massive reduction in the cost of fuel and the incentives in the export field for producers, both primary and secondary, will be enormous.

Each and every one of us in this country ultimately lives off productivity of the primary and secondary industries and, above all else, off those products that we are able to export. Other than the primary and secondary industries which are actually productive and in which people work, everyone else lives off productivity in one way or another. The largest percentage of the population lives virtually by taking in one another's washing, which is absolutely non-productive, but we still come back to the 15 or 20 per cent of the population that is actually involved in exporting and earning wealth for this nation. That is really what the Fightback! package is all about.

All I expect the media in this country to do is to portray honestly what the package contains, in the same way as I would expect them honestly to portray whatever package the Labor Party in Australia is putting forward, and let members of the public make the decision for themselves. However, to date, I have yet to find a journalist or an interviewer who will honestly put forward the true situation. I think that is an absolute disgrace and, as I said, the media of this nation have a great deal to answer for because of the position this country is in.

Unless they mend their ways, it will be a long time before this country gets out of the mess it is currently in.

Proposals have been put up in the Federal arena in relation to training wages. I will not enter into that debate at the moment, but a subject to which I have referred in this place over the years is that of working for the dole. I maintain that any able-bodied person in this country should be prepared to work for the dole. I am not talking about working at a reduced rate but about putting in the appropriate number of hours per week at the hourly award rate commensurate with the value of the dole, whether that equates to a day and a half or whatever it might be. Every able-bodied person in this country receiving the dole should be prepared to do this. Certainly some people are not in a position to do it for one reason or another, but there are plenty of able-bodied people out there who could do it.

I have watched this concept develop over a number of years on various trips to the United States of America, and certainly in those States where this system is operating, the people involved state quite freely that, once they are accustomed to this system and are involved in useful constructive work in their State, they would not go back to the hand-out. They have the attitude that no-one hands them anything. Whatever money they receive they physically work for. They earn and have a different attitude towards themselves and towards the State.

An enormous amount of work needs to be done not only in this State but throughout Australia and one of the great areas in which people could be used in a worthwhile and meaningful way is in the reafforestation of this country, particularly in the Murray-Darling Basin. Having spoken to numerous local government authorities in that area, I have found that they would be more than happy to administer and supervise such schemes to help reafforest the Murray-Darling Basin. It is the sort of work that has to be done if we are to come to grips with the salinity problems caused by excessive clearing in years gone by. It is a problem that cannot be solved in any other way.

Western Australia is a good example of excessive clearing of the agricultural lands and certainly an enormous amount of work has been done in the University of Western Australia in developing highly salt tolerant native species. Some of those species are so salt tolerant that they will survive when irrigated with seawater. Such species are being developed by the University of Western Australia and are being propagated by various companies such as ALCOA on a commercial basis. Some of the material is being exported overseas. When we look at the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin and the extent of the tree planting program that will have to be carried out in connection with the high water tables and surface salinity, if even a percentage of the one million people who are unfortunately out of work at the moment—unemployed and collecting the dole—could be effectively used in reafforesting Australia that would be of benefit not only to them but to Australia as a whole.

We will never get the full potential of productivity of this country from a primary producing point of view back to what it might be unless we engage in a massive program. As I have said, no Government has the resources to just go out there and replant Australia. In the

case of unemployment benefits, those moneys are being provided by the taxpayers of the nation. So, if we get some return by those means, not only will the nation benefit but also the people who are engaged in this very worthwhile and meaningful work will gain a great deal.

In order to be able to efficiently export, we need efficient irrigation techniques. The Murray-Darling Basin is a significant producer of wealth for Australia; yet, when it comes to Governments putting any of the enormous wealth that the basin produces back into it, they are very tardy in doing so because it is outside the greater metropolitan areas of the major cities of Australia. The Murray-Darling Basin contributes between \$10 000 million and \$15 000 million annually to the benefit of this nation, and far less than 1 per cent of that productivity goes back into the basin to come to grips with the problems of salinisation and reafforestation. It is quite ludicrous to suggest that any business will thrive if less than 1 per cent is reinvested in it, but that is what we expect from the Murray-Darling Basin.

It is contributing between \$10 000 million and \$15 000 million to the economy at the moment, but it would have the potential to do even more than that if it were not for the fact that Governments, both State and Federal, rip every cent they can out of the basin principally for the benefit of the metropolitan areas of the major cities and centres in Australia and in South Australia. While 50 per cent of the State's economy is produced in the rural areas of South Australia, somewhere between 10 and 15 per cent is reinvested into country areas, while the other 85 per cent is spent in the metropolitan area.

That is why we are in the present mess. Money is not being invested where it can earn and produce; it is being spent in areas to satisfy the multitudes. If the people want an entertainment centre, we give them one. It will not earn any money for the State; in fact, the taxpayers will have to prop it up, but that is what the multitude wants. I am talking about reinvesting in the nation where the nation has the potential to earn and return this country to what it was. We will only get back into that situation when we can again effectively export and compete on world markets. We have the potential to do that in a number of industries, and probably one of the greatest at the moment in this country is the wine industry. I have always held the view that we should have a wine industry in Australia four times as big as it is today, with 25 per cent of our production being adequate to meet the needs of the Australian market and 75 per cent being exported. On that basis we would have a stable industry.

We have the potential in this country with our climate, water, machine pruning and harvesting, modern wineries and the right varieties to produce high quality wine at a more than competitive price with France, Germany and Italy, and that can be an enormous income earner for Australia, but the incentives have to be there. Governments—both State and Federal—have to support the primary producers to enable that to occur. Unless that sort of change in thinking occurs nothing will happen and we will probably have to wait until after the next State election when Dean Brown takes over and hopefully we will see some of the things that I have been talking about put into practice.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** It is really not difficult to know where to start with this Address in Reply debate. The speech given to the Governor to read to the assembled members from both Houses of Parliament was intended to set perceptions. The rhetoric it contains is no different from the kind of rhetoric that this Government has been using over the past 10 years that it has been in office. This Government is expert at setting perceptions and God awful at anything else. What the Minister at the bench has just done in moving his motion bears testimony to that fact. Much fanfare and publicity was given to the initiative taken by the Leader of the House, the Deputy Premier, and other members of the Government for saying that late sittings of Parliament were absolutely crazy, that it was ridiculous to expect that we could make sensible decisions into the late hour of the evening and the wee hours of the morning, even grinding on past the middle of the morning in a full session.

Yet the Minister has moved his motion because the Government is anxious to get into the legislative program, and more particularly the Bill referred to in Her Excellency's Speech, namely, the legislation enabling poker machines to be installed in this State so that the Government can get the money that will result from their introduction. That is why the Minister extended the time for the adjournment tonight.

He does not give a damn about what we have decided about Standing Orders, that we should not sit beyond 10 p.m., that we should adjourn after a grievance debate and go home. It is not only ourselves who suffer in consequence in terms of our ability to perform next day or days after that, and it does not affect me, I am sure, as much as it affects a good many other members. I am accustomed to that kind of life, as anyone who has had to work in rural industry will be.

No, I am concerned for the people who record the proceedings of this Chamber and who also record the proceedings of the other instrumentalities established by motion of this Chamber and the other place: the people in *Hansard* and those who work with them, and other people in the building who supply us with support services. They have to continue working, and just at the moment that is fairly onerous. It has been quite unreasonable and unconscionable of the Minister to do what he just did, to force the debate on beyond 10 o'clock. No account was taken by the Parliament, the Treasurer or the Government to allow sufficient funds to be provided for the provision of *Hansard* reporting services to the four new committees we have just set up, yet they meet for longer periods of time than any of their predecessors and they do more important work because they have greater statutory responsibility to this place, the other place and therefore the Parliament and the people of South Australia whose interests they were established to protect.

I know the member for Hartley—who will soon be the member for Napier—would agree with me on this point, and I know that other members opposite who are members of those committees have already seen an

enormous increase in the workload. Yet, the Government is so hell bent on getting access to the legislation referred to in the final part of Her Excellency's address—the poker machine money—that it is prepared to push the people who support us, as well as ourselves, beyond reasonable limits of endurance and to hell with the consequences.

Let it be shown on the record that we on this side of the Chamber do not support the action the Minister has just taken to extend the sitting of the House tonight. It is typical of his arrogance and that of other Ministers who have done so much damage to this place and to the State over the 10 years that they have been in office. The sooner they go, the better. It is time to fight back, not just here in South Australia but right across Australia, because Governments of the ilk of the Minister sitting at the bench opposite have promised so much but deceived us along the way and delivered so little.

We now have far worse unemployment than we had in 1982, without having suffered a drought. We now have a far worse economy, less relevant and less able to adapt itself to the real world in which we live. Indeed, we are closer to only one thing which has not been stated by the Premier, any of his Ministers or the former Treasurer of this country—now the Prime Minister—and that is the fact that we are becoming part of the third world and the poor white trash of South-East Asia in the south-west Pacific.

**Mr Holloway:** That is Dr Hewson's policy.

**Mr LEWIS:** No, it is a consequence, I say to you, Mr Speaker, and through you to the member for Mitchell, of the policies of his Party in Government. This entire recession and its consequences for us now are home grown; it is a direct consequence of the actions of a man who said that he knew where we were going and that he would lead us there with confidence. However, here we are, and we have worse to come, yet he has the gall to stand up and say that he will lead us out of the mess.

**An honourable member:** Trust me!

**Mr LEWIS:** Trust me! Psychiatrists have a term to describe people such as the Prime Minister. They are called narcissists. Their real problem is that they cannot believe that the world would want to do other than listen to anything they have to say about the way the world should be in their opinion. They are not just arrogant in a conscious way; it is pathological for them. They seem so prepossessed by their opinions and what they believe would be the benefits of those opinions for everyone around them that they insist that other people should listen to them and do as they say.

Well, we have listened and we have done and we have been done in no uncertain fashion. We now have far greater unemployment in this country and far less relevant education and training for the needs of the future than we have ever had before, yet the Government proclaims that it has done a great deal in that arena and that we have a better trained work force and a system in place to do it. Sure, the mechanics are there, but the system is not producing the results. Why else after 10 years do we still need to train our work force, and why is it that we still have not just high unemployment but even higher unemployment, and it is increasing? That observation is made acknowledging the fact that there is a huge percentage of hidden unemployment in the

statistics because of the way in which those statistics are prepared. People have dropped out after attempting to get work; they have given up.

It is simply too much trouble to look for work. They have found other ways of living and, in addition to that, the Government has provided the means by which they can stay at school more comfortably in social terms for the mean while, week by week, month by month, or go to TAFE courses for yet further periods in their life, but all to no avail. They would otherwise have been in the work force had there been a stronger demand for what they had to offer—theirself and their training. The tragedy is that the education system has failed them, and so has the training system that has been provided by this Government in this State and the Federal Government in Canberra. So, it is time to fight back and to do something about that.

We need to rethink entirely our roles as individual citizens of this country and the way in which we will live our lives, acknowledging that we as individuals have a responsibility to ourselves first and to our country to keep our skills relevant to the needs of the marketplace in which we can sell those skills. It is not the responsibility of the rest of the world to give us three meals a day, and it is not the responsibility of the world to give us the means by which we can sit around and take training courses when we should otherwise be at work.

If farmers were to have done that at any point in our history, particularly since the Second World War, and if they had taken time off from farming when the work needed to be done, we would not have had the harvests we have had and the prosperity they generated, and we would not have had the woolclips we have had and the income they have produced. No; farmers have taken the time to do that study privately and alone, from the information provided to them from the extension services in the Department of Agriculture, say, and other forms of literature that are available and the extension services through the ABC and, more particularly, by going to meetings and discussing the outcomes of the trials they have done on their properties.

That is the kind of approach we will have to adopt in this country in our factories and offices. It is not good enough to believe that 38, 37.5 or 36 hours a week (or whatever it is, according to whatever award we are working under) is enough to not only warrant the income we get in our pay packet but also to set aside time from that meagre 35 to 40 hours to retrain ourselves in an ongoing way. It cannot happen, because the rest of the world does not do it that way, and we live in the world.

We are part of the global village. We cannot insulate ourselves from that reality. Like it or lump it, we must accept responsibility as individuals and, on the basis of each individual doing so, for our own continued education, updating our skills, we may find that we can collectively stand shoulder to shoulder and meet the challenge of the future and succeed because we have been blessed by divine providence with more natural resources, a better climate and a more sensible land tenure system than any other society on earth.

All those things should mean that we are the most prosperous nation on earth, but, instead, we are down in the high teens or 20s, and heading towards third world status. The big problem we have, of course, is that there

are too many complexities in our taxation system, and that wastes time. In the process—and I would ask the Minister at least to be polite enough not to talk so loudly that I can hear what he is saying from this side of the Chamber, or to turn his back on you, Mr Speaker, and conduct such a rude conversation with that other goose, the member for Napier, who honks as he does.

*Members interjecting:*

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

Mr LEWIS: We need to remember and recognise that as individuals we have a life. In addition we have citizenship. That entitles us to no more or less than the responsibility to do our part. If we do not, no-one else will do it for us. It is not good enough for us to expect that, because time has passed, we ought to be paid more money to enable ourselves to buy more goods. All that has done for us has been to expand our capacity to buy imports without expanding our capacity to produce for ourselves. Our own products are considered by us to be inferior to what we can buy for the same price as imports, in the main, where they are manufactured; and our own goods are more expensive and therefore are not chosen as frequently. In instances where they are less expensive item by item, they are indeed more costly for each unit of benefit that we get from them because of poor workmanship. South Australia is in a worse position than any other State for that reason. Our real wage overhang is greater.

One of the ways in which we could solve unemployment in this country, instead of increasing the amount of money that we take from our wage packets each week in the form of taxation, to pay for the dole for people who are less fortunate and do not have jobs, is to reduce the cost of that job and the amount of tax that we must pay. The employer would then have the same amount of money available for the payroll and it would go further and create more jobs immediately.

The same amount of money would call up the same value of goods consumed. There might be a different mix, but it would call up the same value of goods to be consumed. We would not then have a 'them and us' class. We have a growing percentage of the Australian population without work and without the prospect of getting it because each job, by law, costs the employer more than it is worth. If we reduced the amount in each pay packet we would be able to reduce the amount of taxation collected. We would not need so much tax because the number of people on unemployment benefits would be reduced.

That is part of the thesis of what a real wage overhang is about, and this country suffers from it in a classic way. The trade union movement, with the large employer bodies in that most exclusive and ridiculous of clubs, the industrial relations club, has caused that problem in this country. They believe that, because they can settle their disputes as employer and employee representatives and get the court to sign a piece of paper saying that it is within the law, everything will be sweetness and light; but it will not and cannot be.

That brings me to some of the aspects about the prospects for the next year in this State and country. Let us look at the country first. Judging by what Federal Ministers have been saying recently, I believe that Mr

Keating, the Prime Minister, with Mr Dawkins aiding and abetting him and with Mr Howe at the back pushing from the left, will do what they have not done before. They will not run a deficit of \$4 billion, \$5 billion, \$6 billion or \$8 billion. They have already had the first bids, knocked them back, set them up and re-rounded the figures. They accused Mr Howard, the former Treasurer 10 years ago, of rubbery figures when they quoted in that election campaign leaked documents that contained first bids of a deficit from the department of \$9 billion.

I am telling the House that in my opinion, net of ephemerals, the Federal budget will be about \$16 billion in deficit. Ephemerals are income items derived from those capital assets which the Federal Government at present is saying it will sell off. I think that they will raise about \$3 billion or \$4 billion. Probably, if we take the ephemerals into account and deduct them from that net trading position in the budget, as it were—taxes in and expenditure out—we shall find that the bottom line, even including the \$3 billion to \$4 billion in asset sales, will be about \$13 billion. Never has a Government in this country brought down a budget deficit as wickedly irresponsible as that. I am now on the record as having made that prediction—see if I am not right.

I welcome my Leader, the member for Alexandra, and my colleague, the member for Kavel, back into our midst in this Chamber and amongst our ranks in the Liberal Party. I know that their presence strengthens our ability to represent the interests of the people of South Australia when we take office following the next election. I thank them for making the sacrifice and returning to public life in this Parliament, because it is a sacrifice and it is on more than one front that the sacrifice is made. I pay a tribute to the contributions that have been made over the years by their predecessors. I also wish to acknowledge the contributions that have been made by those members who have departed life on this earth since we last sat, with the most recent death of Mr Bert Teusner, a distinguished former Speaker in this place.

I turn now to the problems of the South Australian economy. Our unemployment rate is the highest in the nation. Even though it has reduced from 12.5 per cent in the past month by a percentage point or so, it is still within the same general trend. There are wide variations in the way in which that data is collected which explain that apparent arithmetic difference as being no indication whatsoever that unemployment is falling in this State. Frankly, I do not think it is falling. The small business people whom I represent do not give me any reason to believe that it is falling.

The national unemployment rate of around 11 per cent is still a problem. Bob Hawke and other Ministers, including the Prime Minister Mr Keating, have said that no Government which allows this country to have an unemployment rate of 10 per cent ought to be in office one day longer.

Mr Speaker, this Government stays in office here one day longer and the Government in Canberra stays in office. We cannot do much about the Federal Government, but we certainly can get rid of this corrupt Government. It is hanging just there, really. We ought to cut it down and bury it. The sooner that is done, the better.

Back in 1982, after a serious national drought, we did not have the same unemployment figures that we have now. If one wishes to look at the problem from another angle, one sees that our employment rate is 7.8 per cent of the Australian labour force (as defined), and that is a participation rate even lower than the national per capita participation rate. By June, 637 800 people were participating either full-time or part-time in the work force, and that is a pity, because it is less than 7.4 per cent of the Australian labour force. We must acknowledge that there has been a very rapid growth in the part-time labour force, where people have only part of a job, not a whole job, and they are not counted as being part of the unemployment figure but are included in the participation rate. Under-employment is hidden.

We now have a State debt that has blown out from \$2.6 billion when the Government took office 10 years ago to \$6.6 billion at present, and it will almost certainly exceed \$7 billion. In 1989, it had risen to \$4.4 billion, but it was not possible to determine it at that time because the Government had a tricky technique of fudging the figures by introducing—

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

Mr LEWIS: I am interested in the comments made by the member for Henley Beach, by way of interjection. Last evening, he was quite wide of the mark in the remarks he made about, for instance, those people in State Print whom, he said, we in the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee should retrain. They are not our employees. He knows that I tried six years ago to get involved in a process of conciliation, understanding the industrial sociology that was involved. I could see the problem coming, and I attempted to get involved. But I was insulted by the Hon. Anne Levy, and my offer was rejected by the Attorney-General.

The committee's attempt to participate in an essential process of retraining as new technology could, should and would ultimately be introduced was simply rejected out of hand. No attempt was made by them to do anything about that problem—and nor by the member for Henley Beach, the troglodyte that he is. He lives in a cave and wears an untanned animal skin in terms of his understanding of industrial relations. He is not even a part of this world: he comes from another era.

*Dr Armitage:* And he is moving to another place.

Mr LEWIS: And he is certainly moving to another place.

Mr FERGUSON: I take a point or order, Sir: I resemble those remarks.

Mr LEWIS: I can see he is quite amused by them, also. I trust that in retirement it will give him further amusement. During this 10 years, we have also lost our credit rating. At the time the current Premier took office, we had a triple A credit rating, and it has now been downgraded, not once but twice, and will probably be downgraded again. It will certainly cost us a lot of money. At present it is costing some \$1 million a week. If we look at the way in which capital has been spent from the Consolidated Account, we see that \$570 million was spent in 1988-89, but that was cut back to \$408 million in 1991-92. That is a cut in real terms of 30 per cent. Yet, the Ministers opposite, backed up by the people who sit behind them, and even yourself, Sir, and the other two Independent members, hold office and

claim that they are doing this State a service by cutting the amount of money available for construction works.

The Minister at the bench should be ashamed of himself as a Minister in no small measure responsible for that type of investment. The money that should be invested in capital works, in renewing our infrastructure or in building additional infrastructure is going into the transfer payments current account for expenditure in welfare. It is doing nothing to generate a more stable future and a better climate for investment in this State, to create the jobs about which members opposite prate so often. That is why we have increasing unemployment.

We know that, through industrial disputes in the 12 months to December 1989, 35 000 working days were lost but in the 12 months after the election 125 800 working days were lost. The unions were kept in check as part of the election window-dressing so that the Government could claim, as it did corruptly claim that it had kept industrial peace. It also claimed that it had kept interest rates on housing loans in check, by doing a deal—which in another State described as a bribe—with the State Bank, giving them back \$2 million to buy the election. And they sit on the other side as a minority Government.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

Mr LEWIS: Yes, they do—immorally, corruptly; continuing to do things for which they have no mandate at all. They have 48 per cent to 52 per cent, and they claim they have the right. I find their current attitude just as arrogant, just as disastrous and, indeed, appalling in prospect. That Government is snap-frozen dead. It is hanging in the air. It stinks. The sooner we cut it down the better off we will all be, not just in this place but across the length and breadth of this State. Members opposite are not doing what needs to be done. The way ahead is not the way they are taking us. There is no flair and light.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise in support of the Address in Reply, and I would like to congratulate Dame Roma on the way in which she is doing her duties so very capably. I, too, would like to pay tribute to the deceased members who were referred to today, particularly Bert Teusner, who was a colleague of my father, who has many fond memories of him. My father would wish me to add that. I also pay tribute to Joyce Steele and Bert Shard, both colleagues of my father. Much has been said about them today, and I pay tribute to their families.

Members may not be aware that within the past two weeks Mrs Tom Stott died. Tommy Stott meant a lot to the farming community in South Australia—much more than most people would realise. He gave us orderly marketing. He did things for South Australia from which we have benefited for over 30 years. Mrs Stott's death in the past couple of weeks marks the passing of an era. As you know, Sir, Tom Stott sat in the Chair in this place. He was a very capable and very diverse man, and I only wish that we had more Tom Stotts running around the place today, particularly when it comes to rural industry.

I respect the privilege that is mine to continue to represent the people of Custance. I have just been

preselected again, so I am happy that they have confidence in me. I am also pleased for the sake of South Australia, for the Liberal Party and for my own sake that Dean Brown and John Olsen are back in this place.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Sir: all members must be referred to by their electorates and not by their Christian and surnames.

The SPEAKER: In general terms that is correct, but in the context used by the honourable member the Chair might be a little lenient on this occasion. The reference to those two gentlemen will be taken as a reference to them in terms of friendship rather than as to their membership. I point out to the member for Custance that the general custom in this House is for all members to be referred to by their electorate in general reference.

Mr VENNING: Thank you for your ruling, Sir. I accept the point of order and will watch it next time. The member for Alexandra is back in this place fresh from the outside. He has taken that privilege from me because, until he came here, I was the man fresh from the outside. The honourable member is fresh from private enterprise and the world of business, and will be a great asset to this Parliament and to South Australia. He has very good credentials to be South Australia's next Premier. I have known the member for Kavel for many years, and it is great to have him back in this place. As you would know, Sir, he is the previous member for Custance, and he paved the way for me to come into this place. I have known the honourable member since he was about 11 years of age and, throughout, he has been an achiever, whether in the Kadina council, in Rural Youth or in the Young Liberals. The member for Kavel was always an achiever. To see him on the front bench gives me a warm inner glow. If ever there was any doubt about the comparison of the front benches, line them up now.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr VENNING: We have the monkey in the circus with us tonight. There is no doubt whatever. Given the seriousness of the problems of the State, I am glad that we have both the member for Kavel and the member for Alexandra back in this House because, when we get into government, the job will be extremely difficult. We do not know the full extent of the problem. It gives me much heart to see both gentlemen with us tonight.

In continuing to support Her Excellency's address, I declare my allegiance to the Queen and her representative, Dame Roma Mitchell. I refer to the specifics of the Government's legislative program for this session. The Economic Development Board is to remove perceived obstacles and problems associated with planning and development laws. I have heard this before. As the member for Goyder capably stated, the Robins report came out two years ago but the Government saw fit to commission the Arthur D. Little report. We find that that report is a mirror image: the same things were repeated. Notwithstanding what one reads in the Governor's speech, seeing is believing. Let us hope that, in a week or two when we see the budget, we will see some action.

I refer to the issue of Eastern Standard Time—of all the ridiculous things I have heard! As my colleague the member for Chaffey stated earlier this evening, the proposition is quite ridiculous. South Australia is already half an hour behind our true meridian time. It would

divide the State in half. The Government is wasting its time in trying to introduce legislation such as this. It ought to bring the whole of Australia onto a common time by drawing a line through the middle of the nation. That would be a commonsense approach.

We see different time zones in many other countries of the world, such as America, which has four time zones, so why must South Australia catch up with the Eastern States? It would not solve anything: it would divide the State. Members ought to come to Ceduna or Thevenard in the middle of the daylight saving period and see it how it really is. Those members opposite who have children, in particular the members for Mitchell and Spence, would realise the trauma for a family in these situations. If we add daylight saving time onto the extra half an hour, where will we end up? The Government is wasting its time in trying to introduce such measures.

I refer to the legislation to replace the Planning Act based on the 2020 Vision report—an initiative that I welcome. However, I will wait until I see it. I will be interested to see what is said about development in rural productive areas. In a recent overseas study, I found that we in Australia have to restrict where we live. We have to restrict the urban sprawl, because we are living on some of the most productive land. In other countries, restrictions are placed on such land. Let us hope that the Planning Act will recognise this.

I agree with the Environmental Protection Act with regard to the heritage Bill, but I wonder who will pay. I agree also with the prevention of pollution, but let us not have suffocating restrictions. I welcome the initiatives related to TAFE. As the member for Stuart said earlier, the Goyder college, which both she and I represent, should be praised. However, I am concerned about the restructuring of the campuses. I do not want to see any phasing out or loss of campuses in rural South Australia, because our region suffers the the highest unemployment, particularly amongst young people. We need to train them in various areas and they should not have to travel great distances to gain skills.

I welcome the senior secondary assessment; it provides a good opportunity to standardise education across Australia. I am amazed that it has taken so long to come up with this. The Government must be joking. We hear at every opportunity, 'We are going to cut red tape', but what do we get? We get laws, licensing, regulations and costs, and it goes on and on. This causes a tremendous loss of time and efficiency in all our production areas, and the Government gives us that throw away-line, 'We'll cut red tape.' When will that start? I will welcome the Government's action but, as before, I think that comment is included to fill a space and to sound good.

I appreciated the Governor's comments about agriculture, but I am afraid she did not say much. She mentioned the wool prices. We know that there is at least a 9 per cent increase—that is the ABARE prediction—which is good and which will help all of us. Wheat is of some concern, given the \$20 deduction per tonne. That is very distressing. It represents an 11 per cent fall in income—and we have had the best opening for the year for producers. When the Governor was delivering her speech, I was aghast because three quarters of this State was looking down the barrel of a drought but, thank goodness, she must have known.

I give Dame Roma all the credit, because that night we had one of the best rains I can remember and certainly the most timely. The trouble is she has forgotten to turn off the tap, and it is still coming. When she made that comment, I hurt a little and I thought, 'I don't know who is advising Her Excellency', but luckily it has turned out very well. We have had one of the best openings for producers, and this follow-up rain has helped most of them, but I believe it was a little late in some areas of the West Coast and the north.

Last Saturday, in the mud, we had the Crystal Brook show and we welcomed many politicians, in particular three members from the Government side. As usual, they were made very welcome. It was a most interesting day. This was the first time that I heard criticism levelled at politicians that hurt. I have been here long enough now to call myself a professional politician, and we are all being tarred with the same brush for failing the rural people. The show was opened by His Worship Bishop Peter de Campo from Port Pirie. What he had to say was wisdom indeed.

I noticed that the member for Albert Park, who was there, was interested in what he had to say, and what the bishop said I have said in this place before. It is a disgrace to see where this State, with all its resources and hard working people in the lucky country, is today. When we see the waste of potential that lies around our rural areas, we wonder what is going wrong. We have the resources and the people, but we do not have the guidance, the people in power to show us the way we should go.

There would not have been one person in the room who disagreed, but I come into this place and hear the rhetoric from the other side. I have a few friends on the other side. They stand in this place time and time again uttering this hollow rhetoric. The member for Stuart spoke very well tonight about decentralisation. I agree with her 100 per cent, but it is just talk. Why does she not get her colleagues to do something about it? Time and time again, we see industries in the regional areas close down and set up again either in Adelaide or the Eastern States.

We are losing time and time again, and I am getting a little tired of this rhetoric. They all agree with me, but because members opposite come from various sectors of the community, some from the unions, they feel they have this subservience to the union. They stand up and the same dogma comes over time and time again. It is not getting the Government or the workers of South Australia anywhere, because we will all go down this drain together. We need everyone. I think the member for Spence referred yesterday to the sharing of profits. I agree: we have to share management and profits, otherwise there will be nothing to share.

We have to give people the right to make a profit, otherwise there is no incentive. The Crystal Brook Show is a good opportunity, and I invite Government members to attend. The member for Napier makes various sorties to the country and the member for Unley, as the then Minister of Agriculture, also made visits. Government members have heard the urging and anxiety from country people and agree with them but, when they come back into this place, we hear a completely different story.



Returning to the Governor's speech, I welcome her forecast of changes to the Crown Lands Act in order to sell off little pieces of Crown land in order to cut administration costs. I have many small Crown titles in my district and the cost of administering them is much more than the rent received, and I believe that this initiative is a good idea. I also agree with the proposals for the Lands Titles Office. The Government has been listening at long last and is starting to tackle some of those problem areas which waste money and stifle incentive. At last the Government has seen the light. However, I will not believe it until I see it.

As to the Murray-Darling Basin legislation, I support it and I hope to be involved in the debate. Certainly, I ask the Minister to consider altering the law in respect of water connections in isolated areas, because the present system is a total joke. People can connect to water main and have huge pressure requirements and demands but be restricted to five litres a minute. I know one person who hooked onto the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline with a 30 kilometre private pipe that he had to put in, but he is restricted to five litres a minute. That is a joke. I have not been persuaded that that is commonsense, and I hope the Minister will in due course change the provisions but, if she does not, I will be introducing a private member's Bill to deal with the situation.

I certainly support a Dog Control Bill but, as law and order breaks down, people are keeping bigger and more dangerous dogs, and it is a vicious cycle. I hope we do not overreact to that one. The Governor says that the Government Management and Employment Act requires minor amendment in some areas. I say it needs major change. Government management is the biggest single problem in this State. As to the national market and reform for goods and those service providers currently working in regulated occupations, well and good, but we have to be competitive. It is all very well to market goods but, if we cannot be competitive, we are wasting our time. It is good to have the best marketing strategy possible but, if we are not priced right, we are wasting our time.

One of the last issues raised—and one of the most important—is WorkCover, concerning which there is to be continued reform. This issue was before the House last session and we had a glorious opportunity to overhaul the WorkCover system, but we did not do so. We wimped out, and now WorkCover is back again. Let us hope that we can institute reform this time, because WorkCover is another of those suffocating imposts that absolutely kill off enterprise. Why did we not reform it in the last session?

Reference is made to the Industrial Relations Act and certified agreements. Are these industry based agreements? If they are, I welcome them. We are already going down this track, but the Government has had to be dragged kicking and screaming into this arrangement when it should have gone down this track a long time ago. Reference is then made to efficient administration, development and management of harbors, and I fully support that. Where have we got with the Minister thus far? I hope he initiates some early areas of privatisation, particularly in respect of bulk handling belts. Already people want to buy infrastructure but they cannot do so. The Government will run the infrastructure down to such

a state that, when it is in poor repair, it will be sold off. That is deplorable, and I will be looking to see what we have in this legislation.

I also note that family trusts are to be disclosed in detail by members of Parliament and, although I wonder why, I have no hassle with that. As to the Privacy Bill, I believe we must have legislation in relation to this matter of privacy. I was in the United Kingdom during the Mellor problems and what they did in that case infringed the rights of the individual. It got to ridiculous lengths, and I would hope that we can do something without taking away the right to reveal corruption, etc.

This Government has been in power for 20 years, apart from the three years of the Tonkin Government. It has failed on any criterion. Any business that lost money every day for 20 years would not still be there. I often wonder how we can make this Parliament more accountable to the people. If it were accountable, the Government would not be in power and we would not have reached this position.

The member for Albert Park has just arrived, and I hope he has noted my earlier comments. This definition of Government does not fit this Government, so I will just say that it has been 'in' for 20 years. What has it achieved in 20 years? If we thought about it, we would see that when Playford was in this place South Australia was in a very different position. Members should think about where South Australia was then and where it is now. It is all very well to say that there have been problems all around the world, but members should look at what many other countries have achieved in this period. Many countries have risen from third world status and are now leading the world in many areas.

I am sick of excuses. We hear excuse after excuse, but what do we see? Decline and further decline. As I said, the Tonkin Liberal Government was in power for three years during the 20-year period of this Government, and what did it achieve? Members know about the Roxby Downs saga; it is in the history books for all to read. If it were not for the bravery of one man, who did not last long here, we would not have Roxby Downs. What about Port Bonython, the gas pipeline and the O-Bahn? That all happened in that three-year period. Many other significant projects were initiated.

What has the Government done? I think of the Grand Prix, and I will give the Government credit for that, although I do not know what the future holds for that event, because we will need to lift our game or we will not keep it here. However, I offer my full support to the Government in that initiative. There is not much else that the Government can hang its hat on. I will not spend my time here now saying how bad the Government is, because that is obvious. We have heard it said that for every year that Mr Bannon has been in power he has lost \$1 million. That is a pretty damaging record, but I do not hear anyone on the other side contradicting this statement.

**An honourable member:** Only \$1 million a year!

**Mr VENNING:** It has been \$1 million a day. That was just a slip of the tongue.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** There is the proof, and members opposite knew the facts. I had overlooked it, but they knew the facts and made the situation even more

damning on themselves. How could anyone lose \$1 million per day with the resources that we have in this country? What will they do to turn this situation around? The Government will soon bring down its budget, and I look forward to some pretty drastic changes. Will they be included? Has this Government the guts to turn around and say, 'We have made some mistakes and we will change'? We have seen some small amendments foreshadowed in the Governor's speech, but they will not achieve anything; they are not the macro changes that we will require to turn this situation around.

We will have to forget some of our prejudices, particularly while this Government remains in office. Members opposite will certainly have to forget some of their prejudices and acknowledge that they have made some mistakes and show us the way out of this situation. Whether they have six days, six weeks, six months or 18 months left in Government, they have to start now, otherwise the next Government will never be able to get the State out of this mess. We need, managers and workers, and we all need to prosper together. Many mistakes have been made in the past. As members know, Sir Thomas Playford did wonders for this State and left it in a very good condition.

He took this State of South Australia from an agriculture dependent State to a 50 per cent agriculture and 50 per cent manufacturing State. What has the Government done? It has taken it straight back so it is 90 per cent dependent on agriculture, and 27 per cent of the people are doing that for you. So, I will be very interested to see what you do in the budget. Will you help these people get out of this problem or will you make it harder? Will you increase fuel prices and jack up Government costs?

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Custance continues to refer to the Government as 'you'.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. It would be much easier if the honourable member would direct his remarks to the Chair. That would obviate the need for any reference to anything beyond the Government or the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** No, I am not using my notes copiously; I am addressing the crowd but, because they are listening, I am not reading my notes and I am losing that control I should have. I will refer to them as the Labor Party. The socialist Government has taken us to that position. It has taken this State back to an agriculture dependent State, and members opposite know it, and the only way they will get us out of this problem is to get out of the agriculturalists' way. In the short term, that is the only solution we have. I will not dwell on the bad things this Government has done to South Australia.

We are in total decay; I do not know how much lower we can go. We had growth industries all over this State once; we had full or very high employment; we were technologically advanced; and we had initiative and inventiveness. We had a very good standard of living and we only have to go to another country to see how standards in this country have slipped. We know they have slipped when we go to another country and observe where they are now. We also used to have excellent law and order, which we do not have now. What are we

doing about it? Not a lot at all, judging by the Governor's speech, but we will see about the next budget.

With all these massive problems, and all we seem to be worried about now are poker machines. The time taken up by this Parliament on that ridiculous Bill, on which I will vote 'No' until the end of my time here, is totally ridiculous. I am very much concerned about what the budget will bring, and no doubt the Government is working on it at the moment: I hope it will implement the Robins and the Little reports, but I am not confident about that. Will there be a mad grab for cash? I hope not. I think they have to take it very steadily and turn us around. I will resist any price rise on petroleum; as the member for Albert Park would know, as he was with real people on Saturday, that tax will hit them harder than any other sector of the community, and I will resist it at all costs and fight it to the end.

Without referring to what is being discussed, the royal commission teaches us the lesson that we all have to be accountable. I wonder what we can do to make this Parliament more accountable, because this Government has gone on for so long and has caused the problems we are in, so we are not accountable. We have to do something about it; it has been in office for so long. The lion's share of this blame has to come down to the media. They have a big responsibility to tell it how it is and clearly they have not done that. The media of this State have been playing games and the people in South Australia have not been getting the picture. I was in this place when the Government was first asked about the State Bank. It just bounced off and the truth was hidden from the people. I am glad to see the media waking up, but is it too late? South Australians are pretty uninterested in the political process of this State. As you would know, Sir, less than 7 per cent of them are at all interested in politics. That makes me 100 per cent in favour of voluntary voting in South Australia, or Australia for that matter.

We have to get people to cast votes who know what they are voting for. Such a system will make us all more accountable. We will not be able to take things for granted. We cannot expect to win Government on a couple of key swinging seats. We have reached a ridiculous situation. We can get ourselves out of this mess by biting the bullet. We need to make tough decisions. We have the resources. We can build a petrochemical plant, we can build a uranium enrichment plant and we can even build a nuclear power station.

**Mrs Hutchison:** In Custance?

**Mr VENNING:** No, in Port Augusta where the member for Stuart comes from. That is the spot. I should like to highlight a problem in my electorate concerning the Clare High School. I am gravely concerned about what has happened there. I hope that the Minister will work with me in solving that problem, and I hope that it will be solved next week. I look forward to the budget with great expectation. Will the Government do what it has to do or will it continue to decline? I support the Address in Reply.

**Mr OLSEN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 10.57 p.m.the House adjourned until Thursday 13  
August at 11 a.m.