

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 31 July 1986

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. J.P. Trainer) presiding.

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

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.10 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.35 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

### DEATH OF Mr C.A. HARRISON

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That this House expresses its profound regret at the death of Charles Albert Harrison, a former member of this Chamber, and offers its deepest sympathy to his daughters and son.

Charles Albert Harrison, who preferred to be called (and indeed we felt easier calling him) Charlie Harrison, entered Parliament on 30 May 1970 as member for Albert Park, and retired from Parliament in September 1979. On 4 June this year we learnt of his death at the age of 71 years. I think it is true to say that Charlie Harrison was very much a man of the people, representative and typical of those people whom he served in the years that he spent in this Parliament and before. He made sure that they had a consistent voice on matters of importance to their area, their work, their families, and their general welfare.

He knew his electorate very well indeed; in fact, he was born in Alberton in 1915 and experienced at first hand the hopes and fears of people living in the western suburbs of Adelaide, living through the fluctuating fortunes of the 1920s, the depression of the 1930s, the war years, and those years of boom and growth following them. He was born a working class boy, and continued to live closely with the people he knew best and to work in a number of different ways to improve the lives of people who knew what it was like to face hardship.

He spent his life representing their interests and aspirations—on the Woodville council as a member for 27 years, in a period from 1939 to 1945 when he served in the Royal Australian Navy, in the trade union movement, and in the ALP. He was an executive member of the United Trades and Labor Council, including a term as President. Before entering Parliament, he was State Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation, a union which played a pivotal role in representing the work force of the State's most important sector of manufacturing industry. The workers whom Charlie represented were often newly arrived migrants whose work was of crucial importance to the State's economy, and the VBEF had to deal with a multitude of industrial and other difficulties in representing their interests. He was a member of the ALP State Executive for many years and of course his involvement in the Labor movement culminated in his election to Parliament.

In his maiden speech to this House, he concentrated on four matters: workers compensation, employment in the manufacturing industry, housing, and transport. Every one of these was of vital importance to his constituents. He said in his maiden speech (and I think this indicates the humility of the man that made him relate so well to the people he represented):

I consider it an honour to have been elected a member of this Parliament. I thank the constituents of the Albert Park District

for the strong support that they gave me. I sincerely trust that my efforts here will benefit those people personally and the State generally.

Humility and sincerity were hallmarks of his lifetime of devotion to representing people whose lives were often punctuated with hardship and struggle.

When he retired from this House in 1979, I think he could have felt well pleased with his period in this Chamber. Charlie had no pretensions or aspirations to ministerial office. He wanted to serve his electorate and his constituents, and he did that well and honourably. Unfortunately, his retirement has been cut short by his illness. To his daughters Valerie and Rhonda and to his son Charlie and their families, I extend, on behalf of this House, sincere condolences on the death of our former friend and comrade.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I place on record the Liberal Party's recognition of Charlie Harrison's contribution to this Parliament. As has been said by the Premier, Charlie Harrison was a member of the House for a period of some nine years, representing the seat of Albert Park between 1970 and 1979. Prior to that he was State Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Federation. As a result of that he had very strong and very important links with the motor vehicle industry in South Australia—a vital industry in this State.

Charlie Harrison's long association with local government in this State was in his representing the Albert Park ward of the Woodville council, and that relationship lasted some 27 years. Those who have been involved in local government appreciate that an involvement of some 27 years is indeed a significant contribution. While he was a member of the House he served with distinction on a number of committees, including the Land Settlement Committee, the Industries Development Committee, the Public Accounts Committee and the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, being Chairman of the two last mentioned committees from 1975 to 1976 and from 1976 to 1979 respectively. Charlie Harrison also served his country during the Second World War between 1939 and 1946 in the Royal Australian Navy. His death earlier this year ended a battle with cancer which lasted for several years. I am sure all members of this House would extend great compassion and sympathy to any individual who has to persevere with the rigours of that disease. On behalf of the Opposition I extend our sympathy to his family in their time of bereavement.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I, too, join with all members of this Parliament in expressing my condolences to Charlie Harrison's daughters Valerie and Rhonda and also to his son Charles on the loss of their father. As has been stated, my predecessor Charles Harrison represented the Albert Park electorate for some nine years. Charlie was well known throughout the district, particularly because of his activities in the adjacent industry at General Motor's-Holden at Woodville. It has also been mentioned that Charlie Harrison served for many years on the Woodville council and was well known in the Albert Park ward. In particular, ex-servicemen called upon him because of his understanding of their needs after having served for some six years in the Royal Australian Navy. They had confidence in Charlie when seeking information about their entitlements after returning from that last conflict.

Charlie, in the last three years of his battle with cancer, never once complained about his problems on the number of occasions that I went to see him. 'She'll be right, mate' was typical, I think, of Charlie, who never complained about himself. Those people who know about Charlie's family and some of his problems and difficulties came to understand

that he was not one to complain. One of his greatest loves, of course, was in the bowling arena. He subsequently moved to the Rosewater area, where he was well known and well respected and where he played for many years. I, too, join with all members of this Parliament in expressing my condolences to his children.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I would like to be associated with this tribute to a man whose presence did nothing but enhance the prestige in which this place is held in the public esteem. It was with some shock that I learnt this morning of Charlie's death. I was overseas when this occurred and it was with great regret that I learnt that he had died. He was one of those of the class of '70 who came into this place. There is a diminishing number of us now—I think there is only one longer serving in this place. Our memories of Charlie are those of a pleasant gentleman and a moderate Labor man. He was a man of deep conviction but nonetheless one that was fairminded and completely lacking in spite. Those of us who came in with Charlie would agree with me in saying that we enjoyed our association with him and we express our regret and condolences to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 12.47 to 2.15 p.m.]

#### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

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

Ordered to be printed.

#### STANDING ORDERS

**The SPEAKER:** I have received the following memorandum from His Excellency the Governor:

The Governor returns herewith a copy of amendments to Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, adopted by the House of Assembly on 6 March 1986, and approved by him in Executive Council on 24 April 1986.

#### PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 195 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

A petition signed by 506 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce legislation to repeal the Daylight Saving Act was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: PATAWALONGA RECREATION AREA

A petition signed by 133 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the

area west of the Patawalonga boat haven bridge as a public recreation area and oppose any measures to allow waterfront housing in that area was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: HALLETT COVE PRESCHOOL FACILITIES

A petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide funding to ensure adequate preschool facilities are available to all children in the Hallett Cove area was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: LONSDALE RAILWAY STATION

A petition signed by 212 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to upgrade access facilities at the Lonsdale railway station and to take steps to reduce the incidence of vandalism in the carpark was presented by Mr Robertson.

Petition received.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Government Management and Employment Act, 1985—  
Regulations—General Regulations.

Remuneration Tribunal—Report, 1986.

Report relating to—

Travel and Expense Allowances.

Commissioner for Public Employment.

Solicitor-General.

Judiciary.

Ombudsman.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Regulation—Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971—Accommodation Allowance.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Planning Act, 1982—Regulation—

Crown Agency.

Crown Development Reports—

Erection of Classroom—Fremont High School.

Grange Primary School.

Water Tank—Coromandel Valley.

Transmission Line—Port Noarlunga to Aldinga.

Report on Administration of National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1985.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Sewerage Act, 1929—Regulation—Fees.

Water Resources Act, 1976—Regulation—Fees.

Waterworks Act, 1832—Regulations—

Fees.

Registration Fees for Plumbers and Certificates of Competency.

River Murray Commission—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Bills of Sale Act, 1886—Regulation—Fees.

Crown Lands Act, 1929—Regulation—Fees.

- Pastoral Act, 1936—Regulation—Fees.  
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1985—Regulations—General Regulations.  
Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—  
Certificates of Approval.  
Division Plan Fees.  
Filing of Plans Fees.  
Registration and Instrumentalities Fees.  
Registration of Deeds Act, 1935—Regulation—Fees.
- By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Forestry Act, 1950—Proclamations—  
Nangwarry, Hundred of.  
Joanna, Hundred of.  
Barossa, Hundred of.  
Gambier, Hundred of.
- By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Harbors Act, 1936—Regulations—  
North Arm Mooring Fees.  
Port MacDonnell Mooring Fees.  
Port Pirie Mooring Fees.  
Robe Mooring Fees.  
Harbors Act, 1936 and Marine Act, 1936—Regulation—  
Survey Fees.  
Marine Act, 1936—Regulation—Survey Fees.
- By the Minister for Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
South Australian Council on Technological Change—  
Report, 1985.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education  
(Hon. Lynn Arnold)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1985.  
Tertiary Education Authority of S.A.—Report, 1985.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Building Act, 1970—Regulations—  
Ceiling Heights.  
Certificates of Competency.  
Surface Skimmer Devices (Amendment).  
Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulation—Fees.  
Controlled Substances Act, 1984—Regulation—Prohibited  
Substances.  
Dog Control Act, 1979—Regulation—Registration and  
Pound Fees.  
Drugs Act, 1908—Regulation—Child Resistant Containers.  
Health Act, 1935—Regulations—  
Notifiable Diseases.  
Qualifications of Managers and Directors of Nursing  
Homes (Amendment).  
Local Government Act, 1934—Regulation—Expiation  
Fee for Litter.  
Local Government Finance Authority Act, 1983—Regulation—  
Prescribed Body.  
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Regulation—Fares.  
Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—Regulations—  
Late Registration Transfer Fee.  
Sundry Charges, Registration and Licence Fees.  
Towtruck Fees.  
Various.  
Nurses Act, 1984—Regulations—General Regulations.  
Nurses Registration Act, 1920—Regulation—Revocation  
of Regulations.  
Occupational Therapists Act, 1974—Regulation—Regis-  
tration Fees.  
Psychological Practices Act, 1973—Regulation—Fees.  
Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—  
Inspection Fees.  
Substitution of Road Traffic Board.  
Traffic Prohibition (Woodville).  
South Australian Health Commission Act, 1976—Regulation—  
Health Centres Audit.  
S.A. Waste Management Commission Act, 1979—Regulation—  
Licence, Fees and Wastes.  
Corporation By-laws:  
Adelaide—No. 14—Encroachments.  
No. 16—Central Market.  
Gawler—No. 42—Restricted Use of Roads.  
District Council By-laws:  
Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 41—Dogs.
- Willunga—No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.  
No. 23—Dogs.  
No. 24—Poultry.  
No. 25—Amendment By-laws.  
Yorketown—No. 27—Foreshores Reserves.  
Libraries Board of S.A.—Report, 1984-85.  
Local Government Superannuation Board—Report, 1984-  
85.  
Radiation Protection and Control Act—Report on, 1984-  
85.  
West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report on, 1984-  
85.  
Police, Commissioner of—Report on Breath Tests, 1984-  
85.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act, 1965—  
Regulation—Penalties and Definitions.  
Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, 1982—Reg-  
ulations—  
Establishment of Council.  
Local Government Arrangement.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Business Names Act, 1963—Regulation—Fees.  
Commercial Tribunal Act, 1982—Regulation—Register  
of Dealers and Delegated Powers.  
Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscella-  
neous Provisions) (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—  
Regulation—State Provisions.  
Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws)  
Act, 1981—Regulations—  
Commonwealth Application.  
Commonwealth Jurisdiction.  
Date of Operation.  
Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982—Regula-  
tions—  
Search Warrant.  
Commonwealth Application.  
Commonwealth Jurisdiction.  
Date of Operation.  
Fees.  
State Jurisdiction (Amendment).  
Criminal Investigation (Extraterritorial Offences) Act,  
1984—Regulations.  
Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935—Regulation—  
Prescribed Hospital.  
Education Act, 1972—Regulations—  
Education Allowance.  
Remuneration to Members of Ministerial Commit-  
tees.  
Second-hand Goods Act, 1985—Regulations—  
Exemption.  
General Regulation.  
Second-hand Motors Vehicles Act, 1983—Regulation—  
Exemption from Repairing Defects.  
Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—  
Regulations—  
Date of Operation.  
State Jurisdiction.  
State Reference.  
Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulation—Second-hand  
Furniture.  
Trustee Act, 1936—Regulations—  
Authorised Investor of Trust Funds.  
Authorised Investor of Trust Funds (Amendment).  
Rules of Court—District Court—  
Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926 and  
Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1977.  
Planning Appeal Tribunal—Planning Act, 1982.  
Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935.  
National Crime Authority—Report, 1984-85.  
Senior Secondary Assessment Board of S.A.—Report,  
1985.  
Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1984-85.
- By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—  
*Pursuant to Statute*—  
Children's Services Act, 1985—Regulation—Commit-  
tees.

By the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Housing Improvement Act, 1940—Regulations—  
Inquiry Fee.  
Control of Substandard Housing Rental.

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1968—Regulation—  
Fees.  
Dangerous Substances Act, 1979—Regulation—Fees.  
Explosives Act, 1936—Regulation—Fees.  
Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972—Reg-  
ulations—  
Asbestos Removal and Certificate Fees.  
Industrial Premises Fees.  
Registration of Premises Fees.  
Lifts and Cranes Act, 1960—Regulation—Fees.  
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975—Reg-  
ulation—Fund Contribution Rate.  
Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—  
Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

*By Command—*  
Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of 123rd  
Meeting, 10 February 1986.  
Australian Soil Conservation Council—Resolutions of  
First Meeting, 11 February 1986.  
*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Brands Act, 1933—Regulation—Fees.  
Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946—Regulation—Pen-  
alties.  
S.A. Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1983-84.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—  
Fees for Nets.  
Lakes and Coorong Fishing (Licence Fees).  
Mesh Nets and Lobster Pots.  
Non-indigenous Fish Species.  
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery (Reduction of  
Licences and Pots).  
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery (Reduction of  
Licences and Pots).  
Walloo Reef Netting.  
Marine Scale Fishery (Licence Fees).  
Restricted Marine Scale Fishery (Licence Fees).

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
Racing Act, 1976—Rules of Trotting—  
Fees.  
Gelding and Ownership.  
Speed Racing.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GERARD RESERVE YABBIE FARM

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Develop-  
ment):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I wish to inform the House that, on 20 June this year, my office was advised of difficulties associated with the as yet uncompleted CEP project to construct a commercial yabbie farm at Gerard Reserve. I was apprised of the matter that same day; this was the first contact on the matter my office had received since I took over responsibility for CEP. I immediately called for a report from the Office of Employment and Training, which jointly administers CEP projects in South Australia. That report was delivered on 26 June. Its contents caused me some serious concerns.

The history of the Gerard project can be summarised as follows. In September 1983, a grant of \$430 015 was made available to the Gerard Reserve Council to develop a com-

mercial yabbie farm at their property at Winkie under the Fraser Government's wage pause program. The project also included funds from the Aboriginal Development Commission of \$102 716. The project managers were Adelaide consultants Trojan and Owen.

Due to difficulties experienced with obtaining water diversion rights and supply of power to the site, it became obvious that the project could not be completed by 30 June 1984—the last date that expenditure could be incurred under the wage pause program. Consequently, the project was transferred to the Community Employment Program in May 1984. However, by January 1985, major delays had been incurred due to locational difficulties, construction problems and harsh climatic conditions. The project was stopped in February 1985.

After appraisal of the project, further CEP funds of \$188 683 and State funds of \$142 591 were approved in April 1985 to meet outstanding debts as estimated at the time and complete the project. However, the project did not recommence because of concerns by the Aboriginal Development Commission about the construction methods being used. As a consequence, the ADC commissioned an independent inquiry which reported in August 1985 that an estimated \$612 000 would be required to substantially reconstruct work already commenced and complete the project.

To date, a total of \$868 005 has been allocated to the project from the Federal Government, the State Government and the ADC. Of this, \$142 591 is State money. So far, \$684 726 has been spent, with the balance remaining in the bank, and committed CEP lines. Of the money spent, the report showed that some \$9 000 was not properly accounted for.

In May of this year, an officer of the Office of Employment and Training and an officer of the Commonwealth visited the project. Their visit revealed that some deterioration of the project had taken place since February 1985. They asked the council to propose ways by which they believed the project could be finished and by whom. The council indicated to those officers that they wanted no further dealings with Trojan and Owen.

On reading the report, I called for the complete files on this project. After considering those files, I contacted the Auditor-General through the Chief Secretary on 15 July 1986, and requested him to conduct a full and independent inquiry into the project. The Auditor-General replied on 18 July 1986, stating that he would be in a position to investigate the matter in mid-September after production of the audit report. I advised the Auditor-General on 21 July 1986 that this would be satisfactory.

Subsequently, further investigation by my department has revealed that the \$9 000 of unaccounted for expenditure was spent on items which are unlikely to be chargeable against the Federal or State advances. I have also subsequently been advised that federal officers are also conducting their own investigation of the matter. I will keep the House informed when the Auditor-General has investigated this matter and provided me with a report.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Cadell Training Centre—New Kitchen.

Golden Grove First Primary School.

State Primary Geodesic Survey—Completion.

Ordered that reports be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

### PROPERTY TAX

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier give an absolute and unequivocal guarantee that the Government will not attempt to introduce the Health Minister's proposed property tax before the next State election?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes.

### COMMONWEALTH GAMES

**Ms GAYLER:** In recognition of the superb performance of Australia's Commonwealth Games team and, in particular, the South Australian contingent in Edinburgh this week, will the Minister of Recreation and Sport consider an appropriate form of recognition for our heroines and heroes on their return to South Australia?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this matter. I was privileged last week to attend the opening of the Commonwealth Games and spent one day at the Games before returning home. I am delighted to say that the Australian team's morale, interest and enthusiasm was unparalleled, certainly during my visit. High morale has certainly been evidenced this week with the record of gold, silver and bronze medals that the Australians have taken. The performance of the team as a whole has been outstanding and reinforces the State and Federal Governments' policy in terms of funding to the Australian Institute of Sport and the South Australian Institute of Sport.

The honourable member referred to an appropriate form of recognition: I am delighted to say that the Premier and I will co-host a reception for the returning members of Australia's Commonwealth Games team, their managers and officials. I will briefly refer to some of the outstanding achievements made by South Australian athletes, and there are more to come. Dean Lukin has won a gold medal in the 110 kg weightlifting competition. Dean Woods has been outstanding, and I had the opportunity the other night of viewing on television his unparalleled performance. I believe he will go on to bigger and better things with the world titles coming up. Brenton Terrell has won silver in the men's double sculls rowing event; Amanda Cross has also achieved success in rowing, in the women's lightweight fours; Carole Ridell in rowing also; and Anton Wurfell for shooting, in the individual air rifle event. We expect tonight to collect another two gold medals for the South Australian contingent in the Commonwealth Games team. It will indeed be our pleasure to welcome back those members and to share with them their joy and enthusiasm for their successes.

### STATE TAXES

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In view of the current economic climate, will the Premier give a guarantee that there will be no increases in taxation in the State budget?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It would be quite irresponsible for me to give any such guarantee while we are in the middle of our budget deliberations. I can repeat, as I have done on a number of occasions, that we are making all efforts to ensure that we can avoid increases in Government taxation rates. That is obviously the central part of our budget planning strategy.

I remind the House of what I said before the most recent election. I was not so rash as to repeat my 1982 promise

which I lived to regret and which in the interests of the State was broken: I said that, while our strategy was to ensure that we remained a low tax State (as indeed we are), at the same time, if drastic changes occurred in our economic circumstances, in relation to economic recovery, the rate of inflation, Federal Government support, or the expectations of people, especially members of the Opposition, in terms of Government services and facilities (indeed, even concerning the running of their own offices, it seems), then obviously we would have to contemplate taking action. That is as far as I can go at this stage, and members should wait and see the impact of the Federal budget and then wait for the State budget itself.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable member for Price.

### CHEMICAL SPILLAGE

**Mr De LAINE:** My question is addressed to the Minister for Environment and Planning and relates to the recent ETSA gas odour additive leak at Torrens Island which affected large areas of the north-western suburbs, especially Wingfield and Gillman. What action does the Minister intend to take to ensure that such accidents do not occur in future?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It has been revealed that in fact the odour emanated from ETSA and that it was caused by a chemical product called mercaptan, which, if I recall my chemistry correctly, is a class of chemical compound, although exactly which one I am not sure. It produces an extraordinary odour, even in a low concentration. The material is stored in 200 litre drums and, even when the drum appears to be empty, there could be sufficient traces in the drum to cause a considerable odour. I believe that the amount spilt which led to this unfortunate incident was only about a cupful. Having identified the source of the problem, ETSA has assured the Government that it will alter some handling procedures to ensure that there is no repetition of this unfortunate incident.

### THREE DAY EVENT

**Mr INGERSON:** Will the Premier take immediate and positive public action to clear up confusion about the financial position of the World Three Day Event? The Premier was pleased to be associated with the event while it was being organised and staged. Our 'good news' Premier had a message in the official program which recorded the Government's full support. However, those creditors who provided services for the event and have yet to be paid are now wondering just what that support means.

This morning's *Advertiser* reports the Premier as saying that others must find answers to the financial problems, problems which have left many small businesses seriously in debt to the tune of many thousands of dollars. Yesterday, I was approached by one company that has a debt of \$49 800 and is facing foreclosure from the bank. Another is owed more than \$57 000. The Gawler Racing Club is owed \$11 000; a security company \$80 000; a signwriting company \$57 000; a small hardware store in Gawler \$7 000; and earthmovers \$4 500. I understand that total outstanding bills may exceed \$600 000 and that these small South Australian businesses are particularly frustrated that a Victorian company that demanded payment first before providing goods for the event had its demands met. Instead of just

sitting back waiting and inviting others to deal with the problem, the Premier should demand to know immediately what is the full financial position—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. In placing questions before the House members are entitled, with leave of the House, to explain the question, but such explanation should be based on statement of fact and not on statement of opinion. I suggest that, in that context of refraining from giving an opinion, the honourable member should be more judicious in the introduction of adjectives. The honourable member for Bragg.

**Mr INGERSON:** As I have been advised that the financial position of many of these small businesses is in jeopardy, will the Premier make a full public statement on this matter?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The situation is certainly one of concern to those small businesses and other contractors who in good faith undertook work in relation to the event, as well as being one of concern to the organising committee which had charge of the staging of the event and to the Government. There is no question of that. Let me briefly trace the history of the event. It was conceived as a major Jubilee 150 event by those involved in the Equestrian Federation of Australia, and securing the event for the Southern Hemisphere was considered to be a major coup. It was recognised that considerable costs would be involved in staging such an event here. On the other hand, however, it was suggested that the event itself could raise much money by way of sponsorship and attendances to help defray those costs.

It was adopted as a Jubilee event, and funds were provided by the Jubilee 150 Committee to the organising committee, an incorporated body, to stage the event. Substantial funds were involved: I believe over \$500 000. Supplementary grant assistance was also given to the event by the Department of Tourism. That was the extent of Government support. We also offered assistance to the event in terms of the provision of land which the Government acquired on behalf of the committee. We have also throughout helped the organisers of the event in terms of staff and deployment of Government services where that was appropriate. So, there has been much Government support for the event, although the Government was not running it.

It was obvious that budgetary problems were involved with the event. A few weeks before it was due to be held, members of the committee told me that they had a financial crisis. It was clear that there would be a shortfall in their budget, the order of which could not be assessed accurately because at that stage it was not possible to predict the revenue that would be gained from sponsorship and attendances. However, it was evident that there would be a shortfall. In that instance, and faced with either the cancellation of the event, which would have involved considerable cost simply wasted because much expenditure had occurred to that point of time, the Government decided that it would make available a further substantial sum, up to \$800 000, in order to ensure that the event would go ahead. We were assured on the budgeting we received that calculations had been made showing that this would provide ample assistance for the event, to ensure its success, that everyone would be paid for work done, and that it would come in on budget.

The event was staged extremely successfully, as any member of Parliament or the public who attended would know. The Government's support of it as a staged event was fully justified and vindicated. It was unquestionably of considerable economic and promotional value to South Australia, and many millions of dollars was spent by participants,

supporters and others from other States and overseas. The staging of the event resulted in large benefits to this economy and this community. However, I was alarmed to be told recently that in fact the assessment of accounts, the final reckoning by the committee, showed that there was a considerable shortfall. There had been some over-expenditure but, far more gravely, there had been a shortfall in the revenue expected.

Interestingly enough, I understand that in some cases the attendances were adequate but how much of those attendances was paid and whether they matched the revenue is one of the issues that needs to be looked at. The committee's proposal basically was to say, 'You supported us last time; you had better come good again.' However, I find that unsatisfactory. The time must stop when the Government should simply be considered as the repository of any mistakes, over-expenditure or failures of fundraising in such events. The Government stands ready to support and assist that committee and has considerably done so in this case. However, it is not good enough to be told, after everything has been finalised and the event is over, 'We are terribly sorry. There is a further shortfall. Please sign the cheque and leave the amount blank. We will fill that in. Thank you very much.'

That situation will not be tolerated. I have told the committee that, first, I want a detailed analysis of the financial statement, in particular, reasons for the overruns and the shortfall in revenue; I want details from the organising committee of how it proposes that the shortfall be covered, apart from the Government's simply providing an open cheque; and I want to know what chance there is of future recoupment of funds by the running of other events or whether there are other ways of utilising the equipment. At the moment those questions are being directly and urgently addressed by the committee.

As far as creditors are concerned I suggest that if they can hold off for a few more days—and the Government is well aware of their plight and their problems—the committee may well be able to make a statement and the Government may well be able to adjudge the question. It is obviously clear that legal liability lies with the committee. I also accept on a moral basis that there could well have been contractors undertaking their support of that event in good faith, believing that the Government was totally underwriting it. That is a question that obviously has to be addressed as well.

However, I suggest to all members of Parliament, particularly those on the Opposition benches, that they should clearly understand that we are no longer going to see Governments as the last resort for anything that goes wrong in the community. Most of these committees, incidentally, are run by private sector managers who manage large companies, handle budgets, and are experienced in commercial affairs. We have good reason to feel confident in them, but it seems to me at times that their attitude to these events is very different from the attitude they might take in their own businesses. I would hope that similar practices would be followed with events such as this. A classic example of where the Government was directly involved was the Grand Prix, and there were no such problems there. That is the position, and I lay it before the House. We are addressing it as a matter of urgency.

#### OPPOSITION LEADER'S OFFICE

**Mr TYLER:** Will the Premier say whether it is true that the Opposition Leader has refused to accept the financial restraints being imposed on the community in general and

whether he is now asking for more money to distribute propaganda throughout the community? During the past few days the media has treated us to the spectacle of the Opposition, which in the past has continually called for cuts in Government spending, urging the Government to grant it more funds for sending telexes to the media. It has been put to me that the position now taken by the Opposition seems at odds with its previous calls. Will the Premier inform the House whether he intends to take any action over the Opposition's calls for an increase in Government spending?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I understand the concern of members opposite who are interjecting about this matter being raised. This matter was raised directly and publicly by the Leader of the Opposition, who chose not only to send me a three page letter setting out his accusations and his pleas for more public expenditure on his office, but also ensured that, even before I received the letter, it was circulated to the media, so that it was well publicised. The letter and the claims made by the Leader of the Opposition are a classic example of a dishonest and misleading use of data. By mixing up a lot of totally unrelated matters and taking best case and worst case as it suited him, the Leader of the Opposition has created a completely false impression. Let me correct it.

The burden of the Leader of the Opposition's complaint, as I understand it, was that he indicated that he would not be receiving operating expenses—which are the incidental or non-salary expenses for running his office—that he felt he was entitled to and that he was taking a 50 per cent cut in the area. I make the point that in 1985-86, in consequence of there being an election and in recognition of the extra costs that that would involve for him, we doubled the Leader of the Opposition's operating expenses—about a 100 per cent increase. In the year 1986-87, when there will be no election in South Australia, I think it is strange that the Leader of the Opposition wants to use as the basis for this year's expenditure on his operations that special election allocation. He has put that in and because we have removed it from the base, he is saying, 'Look how badly I have been treated.' That is the first dishonesty. The amount is not being cut; it is simply that he cannot expect in a non-election year to get the special assistance and support that the Government gave in an election year.

Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition refers to a contingency, a \$5 000 allocation for consultancy services. That was allowed because he pointed out that, in his overall salary bill, he was going to make some savings during the year. He identified an amount of \$5 000 and asked the Government whether that could be applied to a consultancy rather than for the employment of staff or return to Treasury. If the Leader of the Opposition was really keen on saving the taxpayer money, no doubt he would have offered it as savings, as we are requiring Ministers and departments to do. However, that is fair enough. I agreed that the \$5 000 should be applied to consultancy.

Now the Leader of the Opposition is quite free again this year, if he is going to underspend his salaries line or if there are other factors of that kind, to ask for a similar arrangement. What I have refused is an extra \$35 000 to make that consultancy a full time position. That is the second misleading point.

Then the Leader of the Opposition goes on to talk about expenditure in my office. This is where real dishonesty comes in. The Leader of the Opposition now quickly slips from operating expenses to the issue of overall costs of

office, which includes salaries and other aspects and which he excluded from his earlier request and from the earlier parts of his letter. If we restrict it to those operating expenses I am talking about, between 1982-83 and 1985-86, funds for operating expenses of my office increased by 22 per cent against an inflation rate of 35.9 per cent. That is not a bad effort. The Leader of the Opposition over that same period in his office showed an increase of 100 per cent. That is very interesting. The use of the proper figures and comparison of like with like indicate a very different result from that which the Leader of the Opposition presented.

Then there is the question of the telex. The Leader of the Opposition apparently is concerned that he will not be able to churn out his telexes to the media. That may be a relief to the media. However, it would be a disappointment to the Government, because I am in favour of the Opposition's exposing itself as often and as comprehensively as possible. However, I make the point in relation to the telex machine that, in the three years I spent in that office as Leader of the Opposition, we had no telex machine at our disposal. It is something that this Leader of the Opposition has had, has been able to use, and has had full advantage of throughout his period in Opposition.

In a couple of other points he was making about salaries, he singled out a couple of my staff, particular *bete noirs* of the Opposition, to quote them as having had salary increases. I point out that those increases were directly as a result of an assessment made by the Public Service Board in relation to ministerial and press secretaries some time ago, and what was applied in those cases was applied to the Leader of the Opposition's staff. I wish that he had let us know that he did not want to take them. I wish that he had advised us of that, and we could have saved a bit of money.

The final point relates to word processing facilities which the Leader of the Opposition claims he is being denied. A budgetary allocation was made in 1985-86 for the Leader of the Opposition to acquire a word processor. I might add that I did not have a word processor, nor was I granted approval for one, in the period I was in Opposition. That allocation was made, and the Leader of the Opposition, for whatever reason, has not taken it up and had it installed. I advise him that in 1986-87 that will still be available for him. Let me conclude by saying, I am certainly not interested in denying facilities and rights to the Opposition, but I am saying—

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You did a darned good job—

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I think I have demonstrated completely the opposite. There has been an actual incremental support for the Leader of the Opposition's office. However, I think it is gross hypocrisy to have the Leader of the Opposition bellowing every day against Government expenditure, taxes and charges while, on the other hand, giving me a three page letter in which he wants more resources. The taxpayer pays as much for the Leader of the Opposition as for education, health, community services, and everything else. Let us not forget that. I choose to dismiss the hypocrisy and the misleading way in which it has been framed.

**Mr OSWALD:** Will the Leader of the Opposition say what advice he received from the Department of Housing and Construction regarding his office expenses?

**The SPEAKER:** I call on the Leader of the Opposition, although I remind him that he is not necessarily obliged to answer.

**Mr OLSEN:** I would be delighted to answer, Mr Speaker. I want to take issue with a number of points that the



Premier has mentioned in answer to a question. First, the allocation for the Premier's office over the past three years, according to the program budget papers tabled in this Parliament by the Premier and Treasurer, indicates a 62 per cent increase for the operation of his office. They are not my figures, but figures tabled in this Parliament by the Premier and Treasurer himself, so let us put clearly in perspective that the Premier and Treasurer has given himself a 62 per cent hike in allocation over the three year period.

*The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is in the papers you have tabled in this Parliament. Secondly, the allocation to the Leader of the Opposition's office in the year 1982-83, the last year in which the present Premier served in that position, was some \$12 100. Since then, the allocation has increased to \$13 000 for the year 1986-87. That \$13 000, in real terms, is a reduction of one-third in the allocation to the Leader of the Opposition's office for the same period. So, we are comparing like with like. The Premier's allocation has gone up 62 per cent and the Leader of the Opposition's has gone down by one-third.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is interesting that the Government does not like it when the true figures are laid out, when the true perspective of this budget allocation is laid before this Parliament. The office of the Minister of Housing and Construction advised me this week that there was to be a reduction of some \$5 000 for consultancy services in my office. That advice I received from the Minister's office. If the Government is going to change that and revert to the original guarantee, then I am pleased, because somebody's wage depends upon the receipt of that \$5 000.

Let me also indicate, in relation to the word processors in the office, that there has been an allocation. We have asked the department on a number of occasions to purchase them, without any response from the Department of Housing and Construction. So, the budget line has been there, we have asked for them, but the department has not provided them. Once again, the Premier was slightly wrong about the provision of word processors to my office.

The telex was approved by the Government in 1984, after all Ministers had obtained access to telex facilities and after installation costs had been paid by the Government. The Government is now effectively withdrawing funding for the telex by reducing our allocation to that which applied before the telex was installed. We are not asking for operating expenses that are not fair and equitable.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** You just want more money.

**Mr OLSEN:** I just want a fair deal and I want the Opposition in this Parliament to be treated on the same basis, equitably, as the Government. The Premier well knows that his former Press Secretary (and I presume his current Press Secretary) had about a \$7 000 pay increase about three months before the last State election. That was not provided to the Leader of the Opposition's staff, yet the convention has always been that the Leader of the Opposition's staff in the same category as the Premier's staff get paid the same salary base. That has been a convention for many years. That convention has been broken by the Premier in paying his staff additional funding and not providing it on the same basis, the same equitable basis of fairness to those members who work on the Leader of the Opposition's staff.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It ought to be put in proper perspective, because the Premier today has done a 'Jack Wright': has attempted to fudge the issue in this Parliament as it relates to allocations to the Leader of the Opposition's office for

funding and operational expenses. I invite the Premier to look at those specific figures in the categories I have put before the House today. He will not be able to deny that there has been, on advice received from the staff of the Minister of Housing and Construction, a very significant reduction in the allocation for the operation of my office for the 1986-87 financial year.

I can well understand how the Government is irritated about the telex services. It keeps all the Ministers on their toes, and it requires the Ministers to be up front, answering questions which they might otherwise be embarrassed about. We can react quickly and positively to community issues. One only has to ask that of the Minister of Health in relation to the issue a week or so ago of a property tax. So, clearly, there has been a reduction, on the advice given. I hope that the budget papers that come down in five weeks time correct what clearly is an attempt by the Government to muzzle the Opposition in this State.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable Minister of Labour to order.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has just called the Minister of Labour to order, and he should show the same deference to the Chair as any other member.

#### DIRECT MAIL

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House of the obligations of a householder who receives unsolicited material—usually cards or posters—by way of the post from a direct mailing company on behalf of a charity or company? Recently my electorate had been circularised by a direct mailing company providing a series of postcards from a group of people in New South Wales. Included with this material is an invoice directly billing the person concerned. There is also a note stating that, if the person does not wish to purchase the enclosed postcards, he is directed to post them back. This procedure often creates problems for my constituents, particularly those who are not mobile and who have problems getting to the post office to purchase stamps and envelopes large enough to return the unwanted material. Any information that the Minister can give on the obligations of recipients of such material would be most useful to my constituents.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which raises a matter that I am sure has concerned all members from time to time. I have received a memo from the Attorney-General with respect to this matter and I am able to refer the members of the House to the Unordered Goods and Services Act 1972, wherein protection is provided for consumers in these circumstances. I point out to the House that under that law a period of three months is allowed for the holding of such goods that are posted or delivered to a person's home. If no-one comes to claim those goods, they become the property of that consumer. Indeed in many circumstances the recipient of the cards (in this case), as I understand it, is often the recipient of an addressed envelope for the return of those goods if they are not required.

I advise all honourable members to tell their constituents in these circumstances to avail themselves of the opportunity simply to return the goods if they do not wish to purchase them. As I have said, there is provision in the law whereby the recipient of cards has no obligation at all to buy them and in fact becomes the owner of the goods after



a prescribed period of time, which, as I have said, is usually about three months. On the other hand, if the sender or owner of the cards does attend at the address before that period of time has elapsed, the recipient is obliged to hand them back.

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I refer to the promise made in the Premier's election policy speech, as follows:

I give South Australian parents a guarantee that there will be no funding cuts to schools.

Will the Premier now give a guarantee that there will be no cuts in education funding in the forthcoming State budget?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** A lot of rumour, innuendo and genuine misinformation are being peddled around about what is going to appear in the education budget. Of course, we are going through the process of finalising the budget at the moment. The exact allocations will be made known when the budget is delivered. When constructing this budget in which our revenue will be sharply down from last year we have obviously had a look across the whole range of Government services to see where savings can be made and where efficiencies can be introduced. Education cannot be exempt from that process. We have also made some major commitments to improving the quality of education in some areas. Most notably, the Minister of Education announced the agreement under which extra ancillary staff, in consequence of our election promise, will be made available to schools progressively over the next four years. That will be of major benefit to teachers, to the time that they must spend on tasks that are not directly connected with their classroom teaching and that function, and will result in considerable improvements.

In relation to the level and quality of education in schools, it must be remembered that our allocations are being provided against a background of declining enrolments: something of the order of 17 000 fewer students attended schools over the past three or four years, and there will be a further decline in enrolments in our State schools next year. So, in fact, we have an opportunity to ensure that there is constraint on increases in expenditure and greater efficiencies against a background in which the quality of education to children in the schools, where it counts, will improve. That is what is being developed in the course of our budget package, and that is what the Minister of Education will be promoting over the next few years. In so doing, we are certainly keeping in line with our education policy and promises.

### PEST CONTROL INDUSTRY

**Mr ROBERTSON:** I direct my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will the Minister consider implementing an inquiry into overcharging in the pest control industry? I was recently approached by a constituent who expressed the concern that some pest control companies might have been involved in substantially over-charging clients. In a communication with me, my constituent, who owns a rental property at Somerton Park, informed me that his tenant had contacted Adelaide Pest Control with a view to removing bird nests and bird lice from the roof space of the house and rendering the roof space bird proof.

According to my constituent, 'the firm's employee inspected the inside of the roof. He said there were only

three nests to be removed and three holes to be proofed. He then said the price for the complete job was \$85'. This occurred on 19 November last year. On Wednesday, the 20th, the following day, he says:

I received from Adelaide Pest Control an invoice . . . for \$250. Luckily for me, I received the invoice two days before the work in question was to be carried out. It enabled me to stop Adelaide Pest Control from removing the nests and to call for two other quotes. One was for \$95 and the other from Amalgamated Pest Control, which included all the work Adelaide Pest Control enumerated in their invoice, plus, for good measure, a 12 month guarantee . . . the total price was \$75.

Needless to say, my constituent engaged Amalgamated Pest Control to carry out the work, but he wonders what might have happened had he not been quick-witted enough to intervene before Adelaide Pest Control started the job. Furthermore, he has expressed the opinion that Adelaide Pest Control might operate a more exorbitant scale of fees for landlords, in the hope that its overcharging would escape scrutiny.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that, if you did not give a direction, you made a request earlier in this Parliament that the names of people or the names of companies should not be used, in particular, where there is no absolute proof. We have had names and other words used promoting one organisation and condemning another through the parliamentary process. I believe there was a suggestion, if not a request, by you, Mr Speaker, that we should avoid this as a practice. I raise this with you early in this new session because I believe it is important that we avoid this practice. As has been pointed out to me, I think there was a report in the *Sunday Mail* or the *News* where you made a comment to this effect as Speaker of this House.

**The SPEAKER:** I cannot uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** Especially if you're wrong.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. A member is responsible for his own words and actions in this place. Nevertheless, it is correct that references to persons outside Parliament should be made judiciously although I cannot uphold the point of order in this case.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question and I will ensure that the information that he has given to the House is transmitted to my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, for due inquiry.

### PROPERTY TAX

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Did the Premier at any time before the Minister of Health's announcement of 17 July that there should be a property tax to help fund the Government's welfare spending give the Minister of Health an instruction that he should not raise the matter publicly?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I cannot recall giving any such instruction. It is a purely speculative question. The circumstances of this whole issue have been very adequately canvassed in the media. I simply refer the honourable member to the statements that have been made.

### LOTTERY PRIZES

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport investigate the conditions as they relate to lotteries which have prizes of travel? Promoters of lotteries which incorporate travel, particularly overseas, seem to come into conflict with persons winning such prizes. Recently I dealt

with a complaint from a prize-winner. My constituent won an overseas trip which included air fares and a number of tours. As the person could not use it all she sought to take the air fare and part of the tours herself and transfer the remaining tours to a family member who had already planned overseas travel. Conflict was apparent between the promoter and the recipient of the prize. Rules were laid down which had not previously been indicated in the conditions for winning. From the type of aggravation related to me, it seems such comments as 'You should think yourself lucky to have won this prize for \$1' indicate that prize-winners arranging to activate their travel are not in a clear position in this type of situation.

I understand that the department provides sample tickets to encourage promoters to clearly define conditions that relate to the purchaser of such lottery tickets and the facts relating to prizes such as travel. However, as I have dealt with constituents who feel that not enough information is provided as to what they can and cannot do with prizes won and claimed, I ask the Minister to give consideration to more effective methods whereby promoters can indicate clearly to all ticket holders the conditions which apply to winners.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for her question. Most members would appreciate her interest and energy in these areas in representing her constituents. Again, it shows her enthusiasm in endeavouring to alleviate the difficulty that has occurred from time to time in the area of small lotteries. The department is not unaware of this problem. In fact, to give a brief history, some four years ago the same type of problem arose, although in somewhat different circumstances, whereby a lottery winner had some difficulty with the promoters of the lottery in regard to the winning prize. As a consequence, the Department of Recreation and Sport changed the lottery ticket sample that is provided to all promoters and placed on the back of it a far more detailed description of what promoters should place, by way of information, on the prize tickets so that people who took out a ticket would know the obligations on the promoters of the tickets. As a consequence, there is a legal obligation between the winner and the promoter, and the matter to which the honourable member has referred again highlights the difficulty. Indeed, the organisation which is promoted and which is a large well known company had some difficulty in regard to the honourable member's constituent.

In the light of the matter that the honourable member has raised, discussions have taken place between her and departmental officers. The matter requires further information being placed on the sample ticket that is provided to promoters. In addition, I make the point to all members and the public at large that, if they do encounter difficulties of this type, they should raise the matter immediately, either with my department or with the Department of Consumer Affairs, so that we can address it and endeavour to conciliate between the parties so as to resolve the difficulties that are encountered. I thank the honourable member for her question, as it is a very important issue. Certainly, it does occur from time to time, and I am sure that in the future where some difficulties occur in terms of people wanting to make some change in regard to the application of the prize it will continue to occur. However, we will try to alleviate that situation to the best of our ability.

#### WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** My question is addressed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the evidence provided in the

report released today by Professor Michael Porter from Monash University which clearly demonstrates the dramatic cost escalations experienced by public workers compensation monopolies interstate and overseas, will the Minister hold back on reintroducing the Bill until there is a full investigation of other options? The report, provided to the Minister this morning, explodes the fondly held belief of ALP members that big government is best. It points to the grave problems that are being experienced in the New Zealand scheme, and we are talking of cost escalations of 339 per cent over a 10 year period. Some sections have experienced cost escalations of 750 per cent. Even members opposite, with their limited mathematical knowledge, would realise the inflation figures of the day.

The report also refers to difficulties in the Victorian system, about which we will hear more later, along with the Ontario system, all of which have been founded on the same basis as the Minister intends to have South Australia adopt. I understand that the qualifications of Michael Porter are quite impeccable. If the Minister wishes to ask the Premier about his qualifications, I am sure that the Premier will inform him that Professor Porter is indeed well qualified. In view of the evidence that has just been produced today (and, indeed, the report that was produced for the members of the Upper House), will the Minister seek a full investigation before proceeding further?

**Mr Lewis:** You're not going to hold back?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thought that I made it clear enough—I said 'No'. I deliberately kept it simple for the benefit of the honourable member. I was going to have a one word answer, but the honourable member does not understand, so I will have to explain what the word 'No' means. I have not yet seen Mr Porter's report. Apparently it arrived in my office at 11 o'clock, but I had left long before then. My understanding is, from what I have read in the paper, that this is the third report that has been done for the Employers Federation. I think that perhaps after all the money it has spent it may have a report that it agrees with. It had to go to Professor Porter, who would be well known to the honourable member as a right wing academic who is one of the darlings of the new right. The report, from what I have heard, just seems to be a general ramble to the effect that small is beautiful.

Let us look at the history of the Employers Federation in the issue of workers compensation. The Employers Federation originally commissioned an actuary, Mr Jim Gould of New South Wales, to undertake a cost study for it. That report was delivered in January 1986 and originally it was estimated that there would be no savings by going through a sole insurer because, Mr Gould said, insurance companies were not making any money and were in fact charities. The Auditor-General, of course, bought into it shortly afterwards and said that that was not quite the case and that, if the insurance companies are not making anything today, which is arguable, they will certainly be making plenty tomorrow.

Mr Gould then revised his estimates and said that in fact that they do make profits and that those profits are about 5 per cent of premiums. The Employers Federation did not like that so, via the Democrats, it put its hand in members' pockets and produced \$60 000, and engaged Mr Gould again; and Mr Gould thinks it is Christmas. So, the Employers Federation engaged him again, along with Mr Cumpston. I will come to Mr Cumpston in another question, as I am sure the honourable member will ask me another question. Mr Gould was engaged by the Democrats and the South Australian Employers Federation. The Democrats study came up with costings on moving to a sole insurer and saying that it did bear out what Mr Gould said previously, which

is not surprising as they are paying him again. He said there would be savings of between 10 and 20 per cent by going through a sole insurer. However, they were still not happy.

After all this money being paid to a person, they then went to Professor Porter. He may be an excellent economist, although that is arguable. However, I am certain that he has no qualifications as an actuary, and I do not know what he knows about the insurance industry. I know what he is—he is an extreme right wing member of the so-called new right, whose philosophy has been embraced by the Opposition. The South Australian Employers Federation really could not miss if it went to Mr Porter and asked him what he thought of a sole authority. I do not know whether they paid him, although I am sure that they did, but I could have told them for nothing what he would say.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will be happy to debate economic questions or any other questions with the member for Bragg. Suffice to say that I will not be withdrawing the Bill. The Bill will go ahead and the Parliament will be compelled at some stage to decide whether it wants workers compensation reform in this State or if it is happy and all the members of the Employers Federation, who must have spent \$50 000 or \$60 000 on these endless reports, want the present system to remain. If they do, the Parliament can act accordingly. However, I do not want to hear the Employers Federation or any other organisation complaining to me about the present system of workers compensation.

#### MINISTERS' REPRIMAND

**Mr LEWIS:** Following the Premier's statement, which was reported in the *Advertiser* of 5 June, that he would reprimand Government Ministers who had not announced increased State charges before they were gazetted, will he name the Ministers whom he reprimanded, or was this just another broken promise?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The last part of the question is out of order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I was going to answer 'No' and 'No' but, if the second part of the question is out of order, I shall delete the second 'No' and say 'No' only once.

#### SAMCOR LAND

**The Hon. T.M. McRAE:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what is the correct nature of Government planning for the SAMCOR paddocks at Pooraka? After some years of discussion, I understand that the Government intends that this area shall be maintained as what is now called second generation parklands. I further understand that, as part of this concept, a hockey-lacrosse stadium will be developed. However, recent press reports have led to confusion and conflicting claims; so, on behalf of my constituents, I seek clarification.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because there has been speculation in the press and among the public at large concerning the nature of the discussions that have taken place in relation to the SAMCOR site. As the honourable member will appreciate, the discussions are in their infancy. Certainly, there has been consultation with the various people concerned in the area, but at this stage we are not looking at the complex that was mooted in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*. If any such complex were considered, there would be full consultation and it would have to be in the staged program, as everyone

knows. The hockey and lacrosse complex is a high priority project, and the Government and I aim to ensure that hockey and lacrosse are given an international-level facility in this State.

The proposal involving the National Sports Facility Program, which is Commonwealth funded to the extent of \$1.875 million with the balance to be provided by the State, will proceed. I hope that the SAMCOR paddock site, which as the honourable member had said is regarded as a second generation park area, will be an adequate and appropriate location for such a facility. I assure those members of the hockey and lacrosse communities in this State, who have waited patiently for the facility to be established in South Australia, that in fact the Government is committed to it. I hope that, when the capital works budget is announced, we can indicate our commitment and priority for this facility. Indeed, I hope that discussions will continue to proceed as satisfactorily as they have proceeded so far concerning the SAMCOR site.

#### GOLDEN GROVE ROAD TRAFFIC LIGHTS

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Minister of Transport inform the House on the inquiry into the need for pedestrian controlled lights on Golden Grove Road, opposite the swimming pool known as Water World? In November 1985, residents of Modbury North and Modbury Heights requested that lights be installed on this road opposite the swimming pool, so that children and other persons crossing the road to use the facility provided by the City of Tea Tree Gully could cross the road without danger from speeding motor vehicles.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question, as I am well aware of the representations that he has made on behalf of his constituents in relation to this section of Golden Grove Road. Investigations have been undertaken by the Highways Department and, subsequent to those investigations, two further checks have been made. These would seem to indicate that the road is not as heavily used by pedestrian traffic as might be believed by the honourable member's constituents.

As Minister of Transport, I find that this is one of the most difficult areas with which to deal: where the community strongly believes that a section of a major road is dangerous and where there is a conflict between pedestrian and motor traffic. There are established criteria under which the Highways Department operates and in South Australia these criteria are more generous in terms of schoolchildren and the elderly than they are anywhere else in Australia. Indeed, in South Australia the Highways Department is more likely to recommend that crossing lights be installed than would be the case in other States.

However, in the case under review the information available to me from a 12-hour test period on this site showed that only 43 pedestrians (30 adults and 13 children) crossed the road, including 11 in the morning peak traffic and nine in the afternoon peak traffic. The balance crossed at mid-peak times. The Highways Department, on evidence that was supported by two subsequent checks, considered that criteria were not established to enable it to recommend to me as Minister that lights should be installed there. The department continually monitors traffic situations on its major arterial roads, and it will continue to do so in relation to the problem which the honourable member has brought to my attention, as it will in the case of all other major or arterial roads in the metropolitan and hills areas, in respect of which members are frequently constrained to refer to me the concern of their constituents.

The answer to the honourable member, therefore, is that I have accepted the Highways Department's recommendation that at this stage there is no warrant for the installation of the lights. However, we will continue to monitor the situation and, if the conflict between pedestrian and motor traffic tends to worsen to the stage where it meets the established criteria, I shall be only too happy to agree to have lights placed in that location.

#### DEATH OF Mr JOHN CHERRY

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** By leave of the House, I wish to pass some remarks on the death of Mr John Cherry, a former Attendant in this House. All members were saddened during the parliamentary break to hear of the death, on 4 May, of John Cherry. Extremely well known to all of us, John was an Attendant in this House from 1973 onwards. He was 59 years of age. His death was premature and unexpected, and came as a considerable shock. John Cherry typified the sort of servant of the House that enables Parliament to go about its business, to do it sensibly and efficiently, and in a spirit of cooperation. The most notable thing about John was the quiet, friendly and obliging way in which he catered to the needs of members and went about his duties.

I think that his efficiency was obviously something that he valued particularly. His earlier career was in the Navy, which he joined, it is said, under age, by suggesting that he was a bit older than he was. He served as a gunner on HMAS *Pirie* and other ships during the war. After the war he served with the army occupational forces in Japan. This obviously gave him a diligence and attention to duty—a concept of duty—that made him extremely efficient in the job of Attendant to this House. It is always sad when long-term servants of the House retire, resign or no longer work with us. However, it is particularly sad when they no longer work with us due to such circumstances. We will all miss John Gordon Cherry. I would like to put that on the record and express condolences to his wife Maureen and their four daughters. I record our thanks to John for the work he did as an Attendant to this House.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I support the comments made by the Premier and I am sure I speak for all members of my Party and this House in saying that I was sorry to hear of the recent death of John. John was a member of the House of Assembly staff for some 13 years, after joining in 1973. During my short period here I knew him mainly as the Attendant who sat in the centre hall. Those who knew him remember his quiet disposition and willingness to help with various requests. The Opposition, with its office located here in the Parliament, heavily relies on the support and assistance of the Attendants. Certainly John's obliging nature was helpful not only to me personally but in serving the Opposition in this Parliament.

He served his country by altering his birth date, as the Premier said, so that he could join the Navy. He served as a gunner with the HMAS *Pirie*; of course, I share representation of Port Pirie with the Minister of Transport. His service during the Second World War is noted and recognised. John seemed to remain calm and obliging even when Parliament sat until all hours of the morning. Mr Speaker, I ask that my sympathies and the sympathies of my Party be placed on record at his passing and be passed on to his widow and daughters.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I wish to pass on my condolences and the condolences of the member for Flinders. I served as Whip for the full time that John was here and he was always polite, obliging and cooperative. The Whip places some burdens on parliamentary Attendants that other members may not. It is sad when a person who has not really had any retirement years is taken from us after serving his country and this Parliament. I pass on to all those closely associated with John the condolences of everyone that I have been associated with in this building.

**The SPEAKER:** I thank members for their contributions. Their words indicate the high esteem in which John Cherry was held. The large number of parliamentary members and staff whom I observed at John Cherry's funeral indicated his popularity amongst everyone he worked with in the building. I will convey the condolences of the House to his widow Maureen and their four daughters.

#### RESTORATION OF BILLS

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I move:

That the Oil Refinery (Hundred of Noarlunga) Indenture Act Amendment Bill 1986 and the Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery Indenture Act Amendment Bill 1986 be restored to the Notice Paper as lapsed Bills pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy)** brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Eastick, Ferguson, and Oswald.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs Lewis, Meier, and Robertson.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs S.J. Baker, De Laine, Ingerson, and Rann.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Mrs Appleby and Messrs Bannon, Hopgood, McRae, and Slater be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech on opening Parliament and to report on Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** When I first came into this place I believed that no quarter should be asked and no quarter should be given. However, I believe that there comes a time in one's life when one should say that enough is enough.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** You have mellowed a little.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, as my colleague said, I have mellowed a little. During the recess I picked up a profound piece of literature which appeared in the *News* of 30 April, written by Tony Baker. The article says, 'All hop aboard the gravy train.' It explains how we design our own job, get paid \$800 a week, the hours, the attendance required every other day, the expenses, the canteen, the travel, and so on: a day in the life of the average politician! The author then goes on to talk about how, from time to time, the people have forced upon them mealy-mouthed bleatings about how hard members work. The article gained a reaction from a number of my colleagues (the member for Hayward being one) and me. When I read that article I thought, 'Where have you gone wrong?' Much to my delight I found that in the *Sunday Mail* of 7 February 1982 Tony Baker also wrote, in part, the following:

Tiger Kev snaps out. To say Kevin Hamilton has an inquiring mind is like saying cyclone Tracy was a bit of a blow.

He went on to talk about the number of questions I have asked in Opposition, and said that, as I sat in a safe Labor seat, I could afford to sit back as lobby fodder and not do a great deal. He goes on to say:

Instead, he goes around asking pertinent questions . . . to which I can only say that it is splendid inconveniences like Kevin Hamilton who give democracy a good name, and I hope he keeps up the good work if and when his Party gets back into office.

He goes on to mention the number of leaflets I put out in my electorate. Somewhat bemused by all of this, I thought there was only one way to arrive at the truth and that was to write to Tony Baker (I will call him TB, because it is a long name) to ask what was going on. Dated 15 May, my letter states:

Dear Tony,

I noted with interest your bucketing of State members of Parliament in your recent articles referring to salaries and so-called lurks and perks.

Your most unkind and ill-informed statement that members of Parliament turn up for work every second day is inane, to say the least.

Your many inaccuracies, too numerous to mention and respond to in this letter, should be answered, and therefore I would welcome the opportunity to have a discussion with you at some time convenient.

Finally I extend to you the opportunity to reside at my home for one week and work the same hours as I do and observe my activities as a member of Parliament, so that you may well be better informed in the future.

Yours sincerely,

I make no apologies for what I am about to say. To use an expression that is used in my family, I get fed up and sick about people who say politicians are mealy-mouthed and sit on their butt and do not do a great deal. I would like Mr Tony Baker, if he has the intestinal fortitude, to put up or shut up. I would like him to come down to my electorate. I have not gained the percentage that I have by sitting on my butt like some people and getting freebies handed out. I will leave it at that.

What I do object to is half truths. There is an old saying: 'Beware of half truths, you may have the wrong half.' Please note, TB! This article was written by TB on 30 April, so this document is not something that has been conjured up since then. I would like to have inserted in *Hansard* a summary of the April activities of Mr Kevin C. Hamilton, MP, JP, member for Albert Park. I seek leave to have that information inserted.

**The SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that it is completely statistical?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes. This list was given to my sub-branch members showing the sorts of activities that members of Parliament are involved in, what they do in their electorate, and the hours that they work.

Leave granted.

KEVIN C. HAMILTON, M.P., J.P.  
MEMBER FOR ALBERT PARK

*Summary of April Activities*

(Monday 31 March 1986—Public Holiday)

Tuesday 1 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m. Electorate office.
- 10.15 a.m. Seaton High School—Presentation of Student Representative Council badges and address assembly.
- 12 noon-5.15 p.m. Electorate office—appointments and correspondence.
- 6 p.m.-8 p.m. Represented Minister of Recreation and Sport at Civic Reception at Woodville Town Hall for National Rowing Titles.

Wednesday 2 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m.-9 a.m. Electorate office.
- 9.30 a.m.-12 noon Public Accounts Committee meeting.
- 12.30 p.m.-5.20 p.m. Appointments and correspondence at Electorate office.
- 8 p.m.-9.30 p.m. Trades Hall—*re* State Election review by candidates.

Thursday 3 April 1986

- 8.45 a.m.-9.50 a.m. Electorate office.
- 10 a.m.-11.45 a.m. West Lakes Primary School—meeting with Principal.
- 11.45 a.m.-3.45 p.m. Inspection of and discussion *re* West Lakes Aquatic Centre activities.
- 3.45 p.m.-5 p.m. Electorate office.
- 7.30 p.m.-10.30 p.m. Represented Premier at A.F.C. Conference, Hilton Hotel.

Friday 4 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m.-10.45 a.m. Appointments and office work.
- 11 a.m.-12.15 p.m. Opening of J.O.B. Centre at Port Adelaide.
- 12.30 p.m.-3 p.m. Electorate office.
- 3 p.m.-4.35 p.m. Discussions *re* equipment, etc., with Management and Education Officer *re* Aquatic Centre curriculum.
- 4.50 p.m.-5.45 p.m. Selling meat tray, Hendon Hotel.

Saturday/Sunday 5 and 6 April 1986

- Attended Kings Cup Regatta at West Lakes and presentation of trophies.

Monday 7 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m.-5.15 p.m. Appointments and electorate office work.
- 7 p.m.-10 p.m. A.L.P. Sub-branch meeting.

Tuesday 8 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m. Electorate office.
- 9.15 a.m.-11.30 a.m. S.A.H.T. briefing.
- 12 noon-1 p.m. Lynn Arnold's P.L.P. Committee briefing.
- 1.30 p.m.-5.30 p.m. Electorate office work and appointments.

Wednesday 9 April 1986

- 9 a.m. Open Seminar for Minister of Health.
- 2 p.m. P.L.P. Committee, Highways Department.
- 8 p.m. Little Athletics meeting.

Thursday 10 April 1986

- 8.45 a.m.-11 a.m. Electorate office.
- 11.30 a.m.-12.45 p.m. Inspection of taxis for the disabled, Angus Street.
- 1 p.m.-2.45 p.m. Guests for lunch and Parliament House tour.
- 3.15 p.m.-5 p.m. Electorate office.
- 7.30 p.m.-10 p.m. A.L.P. State Council meeting.

Friday 11 April 1986

- 8.50 a.m.-10.45 a.m. Electorate office.
- 11 a.m.-12.30 p.m. Open Alfreda hydrotherapy pool (by KCH).
- 12.40 p.m.-2.50 p.m. Electorate office.
- 3 p.m. Messenger Press photo *re* railway crossing, May Street, Albert Park.
- 3.10 p.m.-5.50 p.m. Electorate office.

Saturday 12 April 1986

Sunday 13 April 1986

- Port Adelaide F.E.C. meeting.

Monday 14 April 1986

- 8.45 a.m.-5 p.m. Electorate office.
- 7.30 p.m.-9 p.m. Fort Glanville Consultative Committee meeting.

Tuesday 15 April 1986

- 9 a.m.-5 p.m. Electorate office.
- 6.30 p.m.-8.30 p.m. Comskill meeting, Woodville.

Wednesday 16 April 1986

- 8.30 a.m.-9 a.m. Electorate office.
- 9.30 a.m.-11.30 a.m. P.A.C. meeting.
- 12 noon-4.20 p.m. Electorate office.

- 4.30 p.m.-6.15 p.m. S.A. Film Corporation.  
7.30 p.m.-10 p.m. Guest Speaker, Semaphore A.L.P. Sub-branch.
- Thursday 17 April 1986  
8.50 a.m.-9.30 a.m. Electorate office.  
9.30 a.m.-11.30 a.m. E.G.L.O. Engineering, inspection *re* submarines.  
12 noon-3.30 p.m. Parliamentary Joint House Committee meeting.  
4 p.m.-5.45 p.m. Electorate office.
- Friday 18 April 1986  
4 a.m.-5 p.m. Electorate Office—catch up on correspondence and appointments.  
5 p.m.-6 p.m. Selling raffle, Hendon Hotel.
- Saturday 19 April 1986
- Sunday 20 April 1986  
11 a.m. Official opening, Fort Glanville.  
11.50 a.m. Speech and presentation of trophies, Triathlon at West Lakes.  
3.30 p.m. Sea Scout Regatta presentation of trophies.  
4.30 p.m.-9 p.m. Attended function at Salisbury.
- Monday 21 April 1986  
8.50 a.m. Electorate office.  
12 noon-3.30 p.m. Overseas guests luncheon, Parliament House and tour.  
3.50 p.m.-5.30 p.m. Electorate office.  
7.35 p.m.-10.15 p.m. West Lakes High School Council meeting.
- Tuesday 22 April 1986  
8.15 a.m.-10.45 a.m. Electorate office.  
11 a.m.-12.30 p.m. Westfield Marathon presentation (Cliff Young, etc.).  
12.45 p.m.-4.30 p.m. Electorate office.  
5 p.m.-6.45 p.m. Briefing with Minister of Education, Flinders Street.  
7.30 p.m.-11.05 p.m. Seaton High School Council meeting.
- Wednesday 23 April 1986  
8.20 a.m.-8.50 a.m. Electorate office.  
9.30 a.m.-11 a.m. Public Accounts Committee meeting (city).  
11.30 a.m.-3.15 p.m. Electorate office.  
3.15 p.m.-6 p.m. Discussions *re* West Lakes Aquatic Centre.
- Thursday 24 April 1986  
8.50 a.m.-4.45 p.m. Electorate office.  
4.50 p.m.-6 p.m. Raffle, Hendon Hotel.
- Public Holiday: Friday 25 April 1986  
1.45 p.m.-4.45 p.m. Electorate office.
- Saturday 26 April 1986  
9.30 a.m.-12 noon Electorate office.  
1.30 p.m.-3.30 p.m. Olympic Sports Field, Little Athletics.
- Sunday 27 April 1986  
150 Jubilee Function, Westwinds, Royal Park.
- Monday 28 April 1986  
8.30 a.m.-5.15 p.m. Electorate office.
- Tuesday 29 April 1986  
8.15 a.m.-5 p.m. Electorate office.  
7 p.m. Retired Members' Dinner, Parliament House.
- Wednesday 30 April 1986  
8.30 a.m.-9 a.m. Electorate office.  
9.30 a.m.-11.30 a.m. Public Accounts Committee meeting (city).  
12.30 p.m.-2.45 p.m. Discussion with Recreation and Sport officer *re* World Canoeing Championship.  
3.15 p.m.-5.10 p.m. Electorate office.  
7.30 p.m.-9 p.m. Visiting constituent.
- Thursday 1 May 1986  
6.35 a.m.-9.30 a.m. Electorate office.  
10 a.m.-12.45 p.m. P.L.P. Transport Seminar (city).  
1.45 p.m.-3 p.m. West Lakes Primary School Sports Day.  
4 p.m.-5.10 p.m. Meeting with Terry Hemmings (city).  
7.30 p.m.-10 p.m. Woodville Council, Naturalisation Ceremony.
- Friday 2 May 1986  
8.30 a.m. Electorate office.  
5 p.m.-6 p.m. Running raffle, Hendon Hotel.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I work damn hard, and my supporters work damn hard, and the thing that galls more than anything is the fact, to use an expression used in the last day or so by a radio commentator whose name escapes me at the moment, when complaining that he was criticised for something he said about football—

**Ms Gayler:** Was it KG?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, it may have been KG. If I remember correctly, he said, in terms of his children, 'If you hurt me, you hurt my wife and you hurt my kids.' I could not disagree with those sentiments; I totally agree. Some people in the media have short memories until they get hit. I recall an incident late last year, when a television reporter spoke about the intrusion into his home after people knocked on his door concerning an alleged murder in the Adelaide Hills. Another incident related to a house burnt down in the Hills in 1983 and the report on it. When the knife hits home, or when wives and kids are affected, I can understand how K.G. Cunningham and many others feel.

I object to being called mealy-mouthed. I looked it up in a couple of dictionaries. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines it as 'afraid to use plain expressions'. Another definition was 'not outspoken'. I do not believe that anyone could accuse me of fitting either of those descriptions. Another definition was 'apt to mince words'. I have never been one to mince words, as my colleagues have said.

I have nothing against Tony Baker personally, but I think he should look at himself before he starts criticising politicians, talking about the big white cars and the hours we work, turning up every other day. I do not know where he has been; he is probably living in cloud-cuckoo-land if he believes that. Certainly, if he would like to come out my way, I will show him what it is all about. If he would like to come to my electorate and do a bit of letterboxing with me in the early hours of the morning, I would be delighted with the assistance and the opportunity to show him what members of the Parliament do.

He does not mention the number of hours we work. My phone is switched through to my home after I leave my electorate office, giving a 24-hours a day service to my constituents. He does not mention the inconvenience to my wife and children when they answer the phone while I am out at public functions, taking messages or, as in one case, my wife speaking to a woman for well over two hours one Christmas time when the woman was on the verge of committing suicide. After the phone call, the woman was a lot more peaceful in her own mind. Those things are not printed by the press, but Tony Baker should remember that it is very easy to tip a bucket on someone. Moral indignation, one might say, is probably jealousy with a halo.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** There are a number of things I would like to draw to the attention of the House during the opportunities I have to do so in the course of grievance debates. They have been exacerbated by virtue of the simple fact that the Government has not had this place in session since early March this year, having called us together in February. We sat effectively for nine working days. That is not bad; nine days out of nine months. I would say that is a fair indication of the contempt that this Government has for this institution, or, alternatively, it is a fair indication of the fear that it has of being exposed to the processes which this institution provides.

*The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** One or the other, I do not really mind. The tragedy is, however, that democracy is not served. The head of steam that has built up in the community about matters that ought to be addressed and grievances—

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I will come to the honourable member in a minute. The member for Fisher should not speak too soon. This afternoon he made an unprincipled attack on the Leader of the Opposition, without getting his facts right about the resources allocated to my Leader's office, while

not more than 10 months ago he took liberties with taxpayers' money in his position as a ministerial assistant, and went off campaigning to win a seat in this place. He has mentioned nothing about that. Is that not a double standard, Mr Speaker?

That is a grievance, which I will address at some length at a subsequent time, about the way in which Government Ministers use their staff posts as training grounds for candidates of the Labor Party to be subsequently elected to this place, and in the process obtain a salary ostensibly to provide a public service in a position which is nothing more or less than providing an income for the people who are aspiring politicians. That is only exceeded in its cynicism by the move to amend the Constitution in the fashion that has occurred to allow members of another place to simply nominate themselves for Lower House seats. While they retain their seat in another place until the day before the writs are issued, they can campaign for the Lower House seat against the sitting member and then resign to contest the seat in the Lower House. I think that that in itself is even more unprincipled than the practice which the member for Fisher engaged in—indeed, the device he used to get in here without having to make any individual commitment of his savings, income or time at all. The member for Fisher used taxpayers' money in that quite unprincipled fashion.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I ask the member for Fisher to hold his peace or I will expose some more unsavoury aspects of the fashion in which he conducted himself during the time he was a ministerial assistant at taxpayers' expense. It is nothing personal—I am purely exposing the transgressions of the member for Fisher when he was ostensibly employed by a Minister for the purpose of providing a public service through that Minister's office when indeed that was not the case. Therefore, I come back to the point I was making in support of my Leader, who is the only member on this side given staff of a skill level, at least in terms of the relative pay levels of members of the Public Service, equivalent to Ministers.

There are 13 Ministers of the Crown but only one Leader of the Opposition. All the Ministers have telex machines, they all have word processors, they all have a greater number of man hours at their disposal to get their message through. The Leader of the Opposition is outgunned not only when it comes to staff numbers but also in terms of the resources at his disposal not only to expose but also to probe the decisions, announcements and pronouncements of Government Ministers about what they think ought to be done or how they would like the earth to be other than the way it really is. I have noticed a number of statements by Ministers in recent times which are pretty much akin to what we could expect from the Flat Earth Society. The Ministers say what they want the state of nature to be rather than saying what it really is. That is not a matter of truth; that is a matter of belief on their part, as opposed to the reality of the truth, the state of nature that I referred to.

The Leader of the Opposition is justifiably aggrieved and indeed we, as an Opposition, are clearly disadvantaged compared with the position we had as an Opposition some two years ago. It is like the inanity of the Premier to imagine that in an election year an Opposition ought to have more resources provided for it at taxpayers' expense. It underlines and reinforces the point I made earlier and set out to make in the first part of my grievance: that is (aided by the member for Fisher's interjection, to use him as an example) the cynical way in which the Government believes that membership of this place and its function is purely for the purpose of doing the bidding of political Parties, rather than

representing the interests, needs and aspirations of members of the community regardless of their inclination to support one or another or no political Party.

That is tragic, because it is then a commentary on the Government's attitude to Parliament. It sees Parliament as a rubber stamp. The real argument and debate about the decisions made by the Government do not occur here in Parliament where it should—it occurs behind locked doors. Members of the general public are then not privy to the reasons why the Government decides to pursue the policies it adopts, nor are members of the public given any insight as to whether or not certain members agreed or disagreed with those decisions. All members of an ALP Government are compelled to vote the way Caucus decides, and they are compelled to constrain their remarks in keeping with the ultimate decision, which has the imprimatur of the Party room. In here the numbers are simply crunched. That is the way it is. However, it is not the way it ought to be and it is not the way it was intended to be—not at any point during the 700-odd years of the history of this institution and its development to serve the society we live in and hopefully our children and their children will live in subsequently.

However, I fear for the kinds of changes that are now being made to the way in which members of this institution ignore the value of the institution to the society that has evolved over that period of time. They also ignore their responsibility to the future capacity of this institution to respond to the frustrations and anxieties of the people it is supposed to serve—not only serve in terms of making laws that regulate their lives and the way they will behave, relate to each other and treat with each other, but also the way in which it will bring to the attention of the Executive Administration their grievances about the way in which the bureaucratic administration has treated them. If Parliament sits for only nine days in nine months, we are not getting enough opportunities—no matter who it is, what political Party one belongs to or which district one represents—to let off the head of steam which builds up in the minds of constituents.

**Mr Tyler:** What about Queensland?

**Mr LEWIS:** If the member for Fisher wants a banana republic, he should go and live in Queensland. I have no sympathy whatsoever with fools who abolish parts of an institution that ensure that it can survive as a real institution. That is what the Party of members opposite did in Queensland. The mess that is there now goes back 60 years—the travesty to democracy and the kind of indifference to political integrity.

**The Hon. D.J. Hopgood:** That all dates from the abolition of the Legislative Council.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes it does, and it can be traced quite clearly from that time. Some Acts now passed by that Parliament are never proclaimed. Ministers have egos that are too big to acknowledge that, where a member in the House discovers the inadequacy of a clause of a Bill, a Minister cannot accept the amendment necessary to redress it; he crunches the numbers, pushes the Bill through and leaves it to sit on the Statute Book until after the next election before he brings in another Bill with the appropriate amendment, passes it and then proclaims it. That kind of legislative process delays the way in which the response that ought to be taken by this institution in relation to the needs of the public is taken. It is not in the interests of democracy. The interjection by the member opposite acknowledges that point.

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** At this point, since we are now half way through the International Year of Peace, I



thought it might be appropriate to review the year's activities for the benefit of the House and give a progress report on the predictions of doom with which the year began. We have had no totalitarian takeover of Australia, we have had no invasion by communist hordes, children have not taken up arms against their teachers, parents have not been slaughtered in their beds, and the incidence of child molestation, teenage pregnancy and general godliness has not quadrupled, as the doom sayers predicted.

**Mr Meier:** And Rambo is still being shown.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Exactly. Admittedly, the dollar has had a hard time on the international exchange markets and there have been severe floods in southern China but, otherwise, things are pretty much as they were before IYP began. Let us look at some of those terrible, dangerous radicals who have been responsible for planning and overseeing the International Year of Peace in South Australia. Judith Barr, the ex-ABC and currently 5DN afternoon talk show host, who is a member of the Consultative Committee, wrote in a letter to the *Advertiser* in February of this year that:

Peace is not a radical, political concept. It is the basis of a just and humane co-existence for all peoples of the world. It is just as important and relevant to the family unit as it is to the conduct of international relations. As such, the promotion of peaceful methods of conflict resolution will be a vital feature of IYP activities.

She was supported by the outgoing President of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, Mr M. Henley, who stated the following in January of this year:

If we want a peaceful society we should talk about peace on a broad view as a concept that we use all the time when we say peace of mind or peace and quiet, but we think nothing of it. We have a lot of young people out there believing there is no future or hope. Peace studies will give them some hope of a future and will give them the skills to resolve conflict on a personal level.

The Moderator of the Uniting Church in South Australia, the Rev. Dr Charles Biggs, said that the IYP was one of the most important things yet designated to a year. He also said:

It gives us an opportunity to focus on both the need for peace and the ways in which we may go about trying to bring peace.

The proposal to teach peace studies in schools, which caused so much of a furore in January and February of this year, was accurately summed up by the Director-General of Education, John Steinle, when he said:

Peace studies is an approach, not a subject or a unit. It is an effort to make understanding violence a little better and it is about living together at all levels, local and international.

**An honourable member:** And parliamentary.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Yes. The Editor of the *Advertiser*, a paper that is more often associated with fish and chips than philanthropy, was forced to concede that the Director-General of Education could not have had any intention of subverting schoolchildren.

However, that was not enough to stop the forces of reaction. Alex Talbot, the self-elected President of the Primary Principals Association and a man whose credibility, even amongst primary principals, is severely limited, felt moved to launch a full scale frontal attack on the very idea of teaching children to be peaceful. He claimed that a large element in the peace movement, including some teachers, would seek to subvert children to achieve objectives of nuclear disarmament, unilateral disarmament and abandonment of collective security arrangements. He also charged that the peace movement was, on the whole, anti-American and pro-Russian and said that people in the peace movement had been prepared, either deliberately or inadvertently, to act on behalf of communist totalitarianism in the Soviet war machine. Very strong stuff indeed!

He also claimed that allowing propaganda, such as a kit prepared by the Red Cross, to influence children in schools would require the complicity of teachers in lies and gross distortions which were at odds with the bipartisan policies of this country. I submit, with some respect, that Mr Talbot is off the planet! He was not alone, however. He was joined by Ian Wilson, President of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations (SAASSO), who expresses concern that many parents would be worried about their children being indoctrinated to a 'particular political framework'.

It is worth pointing out that Mr Wilson's youngest child matriculated from Daws Road High School in 1980 and he has remained President of SAASSO ever since, although why nobody can quite imagine. His children now have children of their own and he is out of touch with schools and parents alike. Mr Wilson claimed that there was a 'hidden agenda' behind peace education and that the hidden agenda was nuclear disarmament. He claimed that people in the peace movement were not concerned about the peaceful resolution of conflict, but were 'politically motivated'.

Naturally enough, Alex Talbot and Ian Wilson were joined by that voice of country commonsense Senator Don Jessop, whose politics lie somewhere to the right of Genghis Khan and a little to the left of Russ Hinze. He said that study material provided for IYP by Red Cross had been prepared by people who were politically motivated and unprofessional. He also accused teacher organisations, such as SAIT, of lacking balance and being pro-socialist and anti-American. If anybody knows anything about SAIT, they will realise that that is a joke. Not to be outdone was the Victorian President of the RSL, Mr Bruce Ruxton, who has never been one to knock back a good stoush, at least not since the war finished. He is the direct antithesis of Sir Robert Menzies, whose glorious military career was cut short by war, as Eddie Ward once remarked. Bruce Ruxton's fighting began when the war stopped. His rhetoric is so intense that, beside him, Catherine the Great looks like the tooth fairy. He is one of those intellectual denizens of the deep whom Bob Hawke would probably have described in his ACTU days as a 'droglodyte.'

Mr Ruxton was quick to seize on the opportunity to attack the peace movement and everybody associated with it. He declared *carte blanche* that attempts to promote the peace movement in Australian schools were communist backed. He said:

It is common knowledge that the peace movements world wide are funded by Moscow and the Australian Government has been hoodwinked into allocating \$3 million for the International Year of Peace.

In a sad and sorry saga of opposition to what is surely a most worthwhile project, I should give the final word to the former poet engaged by the *Advertiser*, Max Fatchen, who wrote a little soliloquy, called 'The Age of Rage', which states:

I wonder what this peace can be  
That causes so much rage,  
Affecting us, we're led to think,  
At quite a tender age?  
What makes it such a battleground  
Where people glare and thunder?  
For goodness sake (the child reflects)  
What can it be, I wonder?  
Resource materials and such  
Have guidelines clearly stated  
So long as one is not misled  
On matters peace related,  
It seems a worry when you're young  
That some will turn your head,  
The child is wiser than the man  
(Or so a poet said).

The social climate and its tone  
Must have consideration,  
And they will leave unturned no stone  
On total devastation,  
For what is peace (be careful now,  
Your protests they may smother)?  
It is (so says the puzzled child)  
Just liking one another.

The circulars express concern,  
And peace would seem a plague,  
The arguments rage to and fro,

Both boisterous and vague  
With confrontations and concerns,  
Debates that never cease,  
It's curious (so says the child)  
The way they handle peace!

Motion carried.

At 4.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 5 August  
at 2 p.m.